U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
CENTRAL REGION

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND RECORD OF DECISION

Proposed Replacement Passenger Terminal and Enabling Projects

Des Moines International Airport
Des Moines, Iowa

June 2019

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

WHAT'S IN THIS DOCUMENT? This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Record of Decision (ROD) for the proposed Replacement Passenger Terminal at Des Moines International Airport located in Des Moines, Iowa. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA). This document discusses all alternatives considered by FAA in reaching its decision, summarizes the analysis used to evaluate the alternatives, and briefly summarizes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action Alternative and the No Action Alternative, which are evaluated in this FONSI and ROD. This document also identifies the environmentally preferred alternative and the agency preferred alternative. This document identifies applicable and required mitigation.

BACKGROUND. In April 2019, the Des Moines Airport Authority, prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA). The Draft EA addressed the potential environmental effects of the proposed project including various reasonable alternatives to that proposal. The Draft EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)[Public Law 91-190, 42 USC 4321-4347], the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) [40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and FAA Orders 1050.1F. *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. The City published the Notice of Availability for the Draft EA on April 5, 2019. A public open house was held on May 7, 2019. The Draft EA was made available for public comment between April 5, 2019 and May 10, 2019. No comments were received. The FAA approved the Final EA on June 17, 2019.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO? Read the FONSI and ROD to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed project to replace the passenger terminal.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS? The Des Moines Airport Authority may begin to implement the Proposed Action Alternative.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
CENTRAL REGION
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND RECORD OF DECISION

PROPOSED REPLACEMENT PASSENGER TERMINAL
AND ENABLING PROJECTS

DES MOINES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
DES MOINES, POLK COUNTY, IOWA

INTRODUCTION:

This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Record of Decision (ROD) (FONSI/ROD) prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) for the proposed replacement passenger terminal and enabling projects at Des Moines International Airport (Airport), in Des Moines, Polk County, Iowa. The Des Moines Airport Authority (Authority) is responsible for the operations of the airport. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with NEPA and other applicable statutes before taking any actions that are necessary prior to implementation of the project. NEPA requires that after preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA), federal agencies must decide whether to issue a FONSI and approve the proposed project, or prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prior to rendering a final decision on approval of a proposed project. The FAA has completed the environmental assessment, considered its analysis, and determined that no further environmental review is required. Therefore, the FAA is issuing the FONSI/ROD accompanied and supported by the FAA's Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA), completing environmental review requirements for the project.

PURPOSE AND NEED:

The Airport is a publicly owned passenger and cargo airport. The Airport is located in the southern portion of Polk County, Iowa about three miles southwest of downtown Des Moines and serves residents and visitors of the Des Moines metropolitan area including Polk, Dallas, Warren, Des Moines, and Guthrie counties. The passenger terminal building and most of the support buildings are located on the east side of the airport and general aviation/fixed base operator facilities are located in the north, south, and east areas. There is no development on the west side of the Airport.

The existing passenger terminal building was constructed in 1948 and has had various upgrades and improvements over the years. In 2013, the Authority conducted major improvements to the passenger terminal building after pieces of the ceiling fell to the floor. In addition, the Authority has seen a rise in passenger traffic. Given the age of the terminal building, the building does not have the capacity to accommodate this increase

in passenger traffic. With the continued need for improvements and lack of capacity to efficiently serve its customers, the Authority undertook a long-range planning process in order to develop a long-term solution to the inefficiency of the passenger terminal building, assess how functional components of the Airport can grow to meet projected demands, and develop an overall terminal plan to meet the financial and functional needs of the Airport and its customers.

The Authority identified a number of deficiencies within the existing passenger terminal. The passenger check-in, baggage screening, security checkpoint queue, and baggage claim exceed their capacity during peak periods. The configuration of the existing terminal building has areas that are not used due to less-than-ideal locations and out-of-date design. The existing terminal has limited concessions post-passenger security screening, small passenger hold rooms, less than adequate restrooms and an inability to expand. Given that passenger growth is forecasted, the terminal's deficiencies will be even further magnified. Additionally, a variety of general aviation (GA) and commercial service aircraft use the east apron area which causes a mixture of activities and can interfere with one another.

The purpose of the proposed new replacement terminal is to provide a better customer experience for passengers. Other purposes include ensuring continued safe, secure and efficient airport operations by providing space for current and potential future demand.

The Authority completed a *Terminal Area Concept Plan Technical Report* in 2014 (2014 Report). The 2014 Report included an inventory of existing facilities at the Airport, aviation and passenger forecasts, facility requirements, analysis of alternatives for future development, and analysis of the Authority's financial capacity. In 2016, the Authority prepared *Addendum to the Terminal Area Concept Plan Technical Report* (2016 Addendum), which updated the 2014 Report.

The studies concluded that additional space and facilities are needed to accommodate the existing and forecast increase in passengers. Modernizing the passenger terminal and associated facilities would provide the space needed for passengers (e.g., parking, unloading, ticketing) and the security requirements associated with traveling (e.g., passenger security screening). Additionally, separating GA and commercial service activities would enhance the efficiency and safety of aircraft movement around the apron areas, along with increasing the security of the commercial apron.

Chapter 2 of the Final EA describes the Purpose and Need that will be accomplished through the construction of the proposed project. The Proposed Action includes several individual development components that collectively would improve the customer experience for passengers and ensure continued safe, secure, and efficient airport operations by providing space for current and potential future demand. This FONSI/ROD addresses the Airport's proposed replacement terminal as described below.

PROPOSED ACTION AND REQUESTED FEDERAL ACTIONS:

The Proposed Action consists of the following improvements, as shown on the July 12, 2018, conditionally approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and as described in detail in Chapter 1 of the Final EA:

The components of the Proposed Action, as shown in Figure 1-3 of the Final EA, include:

Project 1: Construction of a Replacement Passenger Terminal Building
Project 2: Demolition of the Existing Passenger Terminal Building
Project 3: Construction of a Terminal Apron with New Deicing Pad, Remain Overnight (RON) Pad, and Relocation of the Storm Control Building
Project 4: Construction of an Elevated Pedestrian Bridge
Project 5: Realignment of the Roadway Loop/Curbside
Project 6: Construction of a New Parking Structure
Project 7: Construction of a New Entry Plaza to Parking
Project 8: Construction of a New Exit Plaza from Existing Parking
Project 9: Relocation of the Employee Parking
Project 10: Relocation of the Cell Phone Lot
Project 11: Construction of a New Entry Intersection at Fleur Drive
Project 12: Relocation of Signature and DSM Flying Services
Project 13: Demolition of Buildings 34/35
Project 14: Construction of General Aviation (GA) Hangars
Project 15: Expansion of the South Apron
Project 16: Construction of a New Taxiway Entry
Project 17: Construction of a New Cargo Deicing Pad
Project 18: Improvements to South Roadways and Parking
Project 19: Construction of a New Rental Car Customer Service Building and Ready-Return Area
Project 20: Construction Borrow Area
Project 21: Construction of a New Dry Detention Basin

FAA will take the following actions to authorize implementation of the proposed projects:

- Unconditional approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) to depict the proposed improvements pursuant to 49 USC §§ 40103(b) and 47107(a)(16).
- Determinations under 49 USC 47106 and 47107, relating to the eligibility of the Proposed Action for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and/or determinations under 49 USC 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR 158.25, to impose and use passenger facility charges (PFCs) collected at the airport to assist with construction of potentially eligible development items shown on the ALP.

- Determination under 49 USC § 44502(b) that the airport development is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense.
- Approval of potential modification to FAA air traffic control facilities resulting from implementation of the proposed action.
- Approval of a Construction Safety and Phasing Plan to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5370-2F, Operational Safety on Airports During Construction (14 CFR Part 139 [49 USC § 44706]).
- Approval of changes to the airport certification manual pursuant to 14 CFR Part 139 (49 USC § 44706).
- Determinations, through the aeronautical study process, under 14 CFR Part 77, regarding obstructions to navigable airspace (49 USC Section 40103 (b) and 40113).

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Chapter 3 of the Final EA describes the alternatives considered and screening process used to evaluate the alternatives.

As described in Chapter 1 of the Final EA, the Authority completed a *Terminal Area Concept Plan Technical Report* in 2014 to assess the current function of the Airport and determine if improvements to the existing passenger terminal building were needed in order to continue to effectively and efficiently serve the airlines and passengers. A 2016 Addendum to the 2014 Report was prepared to address changes that occurred with respect to master planning variables. The 2014 Report and the 2016 Addendum provide the basis for the alternatives outlined below.

As described in Section 3.2 of the Final EA, the following alternatives were considered:

- **Alternative 1 – North Concept:** This alternative would construct a replacement terminal northwest of the existing terminal location, in the north quadrant of the Airport's property.

- **Alternative 2 – East Concept (Preferred Alternative):** This alternative would be constructed in the east quadrant of the airport property, just north of the existing passenger terminal building.

- **Alternative 3 – Refurbish Existing Terminal Building:** This alternative would continue the use of the existing facility by rehabilitating the existing terminal and constructing building extensions to provide for more space.

- **Alternative 4 – South Concept:** This alternative would construct a replacement passenger terminal southwest of the existing terminal location, in the south quadrant of the airport property.

- **Alternative 5 – No Action:** No changes would be made from the existing conditions and the terminals would remain as they are today.

As discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EA, a two-step screening process was used to identify a range of reasonable alternatives responsive to the Purpose and Need. The first step in this screening process was to determine if an alternative could address the Purpose and Need by providing a better customer experience and ensure continued safe, secure, and efficient airport operations by providing space for current and potential future demand. The second step of the screening process considered reasonable in terms of constructability, cost, airfield safety, and operational functionality. If an alternative advanced through both steps, it was retained for a more detailed environmental evaluation in the EA.

As described in Section 3.2 of the Final EA, Alternatives 1 and 5 do not meet the stated Purpose and Need as they would not provide a better customer experience or ensure continued safe, secure, and efficient airport operations by providing space for current and potential future demand. As described in Section 3.2 of the Final EA, Alternatives 3 and 4 meet the Purpose and Need, however, they are not practical or feasible to implement from a constructability, cost and operational functionality standpoint.

As stated in Section 3.2 of the Final EA, Alternative 2 meets the Purpose and Need by providing a better customer experience; ensuring continued safe, secure, and efficient airport operations by providing space for current and potential future demand. This alternative is also practical and feasible to implement because it allows uninterrupted operations during construction of the replacement alternative and the use of existing terminal campus utilities and main roadway connections, as well as reduce the need to relocate current tenants. Therefore, this alternative was retained for further environmental evaluation.

The No Action alternative (Alternative 5) does not meet the project Purpose and Need. However, to satisfy the intent of NEPA, FAA Order 5050.4B (*NEPA Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions)*, FAA Order 1050.1F (*Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures)*, and other special purpose environmental laws, the No Action alternative was retained for further environmental evaluation and does serve as a baseline for a comparison of impacts to the Proposed Action.

ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION:

Chapters 4 & 5 of the Final EA address the applicable environmental impact areas in accordance with FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B and analyzes the potential for significant impacts. The Final EA was reviewed by the FAA to determine if it adequately

described the potential impacts of the Proposed Action and whether any of the affected impact categories exceeded an established threshold of significance. The FAA determined that the Final EA adequately described the potential impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative.

The Proposed Action will not significantly affect environmental resources as discussed and analyzed in the Final EA, which contains detailed discussions, analyses, and conceptual mitigation measures of all affected impact categories. Statements of consistency with community planning from state and local governments are highlighted in the Final EA.

Two study areas were defined, the Regional Study Area and the Project Study Area. The Regional Study Area depicts the areas surrounding the Airport and covers approximately 5,800 acres. The more refined Project Study Area covers approximately 850 acres and depicts the area that may be physically disturbed (direct impacts) with the development of the Proposed Action and its alternatives. Both study areas are shown on Figure 4-1in the Final EA.

FAA examined the following environmental impact categories: Air Quality; Biological Resources; Climate; Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) and Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act, Section 6(f) Resources; Farmlands; Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; Historic, Architectural, Archeological or Cultural Resources; Land Use; Natural Resources and Energy Supply; Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use; Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks; Visual Effects; Water Resources; and Cumulative Impacts. Impacts in these categories are described in detail in Chapter 5 of the Final EA and summarized below.

Mitigation measures that would be a condition of FAA's approval of the Proposed Action are specifically identified below. The Authority should comply with any applicable Federal, state or local requirements during implementation of the Proposed Action.

Resources Not Affected: Section 4.2 of the Final EA discloses that the following environmental impact categories were not evaluated further because the resources do not occur in the Study Area:

- Coastal Resources
- Wild and Scenic Rivers (under Water Resources)

Air Quality: Sections 4.4.1 and 5.1 of the Final EA describe the air quality analysis that was conducted. This air quality analysis included preparation of emission inventories that were used to meet the requirements of the general conformity analysis under the Clean Air Act and to assess the potential impacts of the proposed action under NEPA. As stated in FAA Order 1050.1F, Exhibit 4-1, the FAA's significance threshold for air quality is whether the action would cause pollutant concentrations to exceed one or more of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or to increase the frequency or severity of any such existing violations.

The analysis in Section 5.1 of the Final EA shows that the Proposed Action would not cause an increase above the applicable federal *de minimis* thresholds. During construction, the Proposed Action would have temporary construction-related impacts, however those impacts would not cause an increase above the applicable federal *de minimis* thresholds. Thus, these temporary construction impacts would not result in significant construction impacts relative to air quality. Therefore, there are no significant air quality impacts for the proposed action.

Section 5.1.4 of the Final EA provides best management practices (BMPs) which could be implemented to help reduce emissions and fugitive dust emissions associated with construction vehicles and equipment.

The Proposed Action meets applicable requirements under the Clean Air Act. The Proposed Action would not create any new violation of the National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), delay the attainment of any NAAQS, nor increase the frequency or severity of any existing violations of the NAAQS. As a result, no adverse impact on local or regional air quality is expected due to the Proposed Action.

Biological Resources: Sections 4.4.2 and 5.2 of the Final EA describes the analysis of biological resources. As stated in FAA Order 1050.1F, Exhibit 4-1, a significant impact in this category would result if there were a determination that the action would likely jeopardize the continued existence of a federally listed threatened or endangered species or would result in the destruction or adverse modification of federally designated critical habitat.

Impacts to these resources were assessed within the Project Study Area (see Figure 4-1of the Final EA). The Project Study Area consists primarily of developed/industrial area currently used for airport operations. Scoping letters were sent to the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing conditions at the airport would remain in place, therefore, there would be no development that would cause impacts to this resource.

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Action would include clearing and grubbing. The habitats within the Project Study Area are not unique, rare, or protected. As Section 4.4.2 of the Final EA describes, the Project Study Area has low overall suitability for two federally-listed bat species. The suitable habitat is located within wooded drainage ways in the central portion of the Project Study Area. The Proposed Action may include the removal of trees as part of the creation or maintenance of stormwater detention areas and/or construction borrow area; however, none of the trees that would be removed as part of the Proposed Action were identified as suitable bat habitat in the *Biological Resources Field Survey* (see Appendix B of the Final EA) as depicted on Figure 5-1 of the Final EA.

The Proposed Action would not likely result in a direct adverse effect but may result in indirect adverse effects to the Indiana bat and/or Northern long-eared bat through the loss of foraging habitat. The Proposed Action may affect, but not likely adversely affect listed bat species and therefore would not have a significant impact to biological resources. Potential effects to the Indiana bat and Northern long-eared bat can be reduced by minimization of the number of trees removed by the Proposed Action and by removal of foraging habitat between October 31 and April 1, outside of the maternal season of the bats. Consultation with the USFWS was required due to the presence of potential bat habitat. The USFWS responded that they have no comments on the Proposed Action (see Appendix B of the Final EA).

Climate: Sections 4.4.3 and 5.3 of the Final EA states that FAA has not identified specific factors to consider in making a significance determination for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions nor has it established a significance threshold.

Absent any criteria for determining significance threshold, a qualitative analysis was performed. Operation of the Proposed Action would result in slightly longer taxiing distance from the proposed replacement passenger terminal to three of the four runway ends while decreasing the taxi distance to one of the runway ends. The increase in taxiing distance would be minimal, and would therefore, be expected to result in emissions below *de minimus* air quality thresholds. Construction of the Proposed Action would cause temporary construction-related GHG emissions. Following completion of the Proposed Action, there would be no additional GHG emissions associated with the operation of the Proposed Action.

Based on the analysis, after implementation the Proposed Action would not result in an increase of GHG emissions as compared to the No Action Alternative. Accordingly, the Proposed Action would not have an adverse impact to the climate as compared to the No Action Alternative.

Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) and Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act, Section 6(f) Resources: Sections 4.4.4 and 5.4 of the Final EA describes the impacts for both the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives. As stated in Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F and Paragraph 5.3.7 of the 1050.1F Desk Reference, a significant impact would occur when the action involves more than a minimal physical use of a Section 4(f) resource. A significant impact would not occur if mitigation measures eliminate or reduce the effects of a use below the threshold of significance.

As Section 4.4.4 of the Final EA describes there are no Section 4(f) resources within the Project Study Area. There are three Section 4(f) resources within the Regional Study Area: bike trail, cemetery, and a park (refer to Figure 4-3 of the Final EA).

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing conditions at the airport would remain in place, therefore, there would be no development that would cause impacts to Section 4(f) resources.

Construction of the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport Property and would not require the physical use (direct use) of any section 4(f) resource. Operation of the Proposed Action would not significantly affect the area's air quality, climate, natural resources, noise, or water resources (see Sections 5.1, 5.3, 5.9, 5.10, and 5.13, respectively of the Final EA). For those reasons, the Proposed Action would not constructively use (indirectly affect) Section 4(f) resources.

Farmland: Sections 4.4.5 and 5.5 of the Final EA describes the analysis of farmland. As stated in Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F and Paragraph 6.3.1 of the 1050.1F Desk Reference, a significant impact would occur when the total combined score on Form AD-1006, *Farmland Conversion Impact Rating*, ranges between 200 and 260 points. In addition to this threshold, Exhibit 4-1 provides additional factors to consider when the action would have the potential to convert important farmlands to non-agricultural use such as pastureland, cropland, and forest considered to be prime, unique, or statewide or locally important.

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing conditions at the airport would remain in place, therefore, there would be no development that would cause impacts to this resource.

As described in Section 5.5 of the Final EA, the construction borrow area for the Proposed Action is proposed for areas that include prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, and current farm leases, see Figure 5-2 of the Final EA. However, after implementation of the Proposed Action, the borrow area would return to farmland. Coordination with the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) confirmed that there would be no impact to farmlands since the conversion of farmlands would be temporary (see Appendix H of the Final EA).

Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention: Sections 4.4.6 and 5.6 of the Final EA describe the impacts for both the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives. FAA Order 1050.1F Exhibit 4-1 indicates that FAA has not established a significance threshold for this impact category.

With the No Action Alternative, the existing conditions at the Airport would remain in place. Therefore, there would be no hazardous materials or solid waste impacts not already occurring or expected to occur.

As described in Section 5.6 of the Final EA, construction of the Proposed Action would require demolition of buildings and would generate other construction debris that would cause a short-term, temporary increase in the quantity of solid waste. Building materials generated during demolition may contain hazardous materials such as asbestos-containing materials or lead based paint. Pre-demolition surveys would be conducted to

identify the potential presence of hazardous materials and assist in developing plans for removal and disposal in accordance with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements. The local landfill has the capacity to accommodate the solid wastes generated by construction of the Proposed Action. The increase in solid waste produced by the Proposed Action would not exceed the capability of the waste management system currently in place. Additionally, the Authority recycles all concrete when possible and would do so for the Proposed Action. This would reduce construction-related solid waste being transported to the landfill.

Construction of the Proposed Action could disturb areas of contaminated soil and/or groundwater. The levels of any contaminants remaining in soil and groundwater at the three known leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites within the Project Study Area, described in Section 4.1.2 of the Final EA, is anticipated to be low based on the IDNR site classification of "No Action Required". Should contaminated soil or groundwater be encountered during construction, coordination with the IDNR would occur prior to resuming construction activities to ensure proper management and disposal of affected material.

As described in Section 5.6 of the Final EA, the Proposed Action would require removal or relocation of underground and aboveground emergency generator storage tanks containing diesel fuel and transformers containing dielectric fluid during building demolition activities. Decommissioning, removal, or relocation of these tanks would be performed in compliance with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements.

Construction of the Proposed Action would result in temporary increases in the storage of hazardous materials. This would primarily be in the form of diesel fuel and lubricants for operation and maintenance of construction equipment. The storage and use of these hazardous materials would be at a centralized construction equipment staging area. The materials would be stored in compliance with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements and permit conditions requiring implementation of pollution prevention measures.

Operations resulting from the Proposed Action would not significantly change the type or quantity of hazardous materials stored and used at the Airport. Under the Proposed Action, the materials currently used at the Airport will be stored and used as it currently is today. The Authority would be responsible for continuing to store and use hazardous materials in accordance with the federal, state, and local rules and regulations. The Authority would update its Stormwater Pollution Prevention Permit (SWPPP) and Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) plan to reflect facility changes and maintain compliance with applicable regulatory requirements.

Since the Proposed Action would comply with all federal, state, and local regulations and permitting conditions, construction and operation of the Proposed Action would not significantly affect hazardous materials, solid waste, or pollution prevention at the Airport.

Storm water discharges associated with construction of the Proposed Action would require permitting and compliance under the Iowa National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. A SWPPP would be prepared and permit authorization would be obtained prior to commencing ground disturbing activities. Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would be in accordance with the permit conditions, including implementation of BMPs to avoid or minimize any potential releases of fuel, oils, sediments, and other contaminants to storm water. In the event of an accidental release of hazardous materials during construction, development activities would cease and remediation would follow all federal, state, and local requirements.

For these reasons, significant impacts in this category due to the Proposed Action are not anticipated.

Historic, Architectural, Archeological or Cultural Resources: Section 4.4.7, Section 5.7 and Appendix D of the Final EA describe FAA's evaluation of the direct and indirect impacts from federal actions on historic, architectural, archaeological, and other cultural resources under Section 106, the principal statute concerning such resources. Section 106 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on properties that are listed in or determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and to consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO), and other parties to develop and evaluate alternatives or modifications to the undertaking where necessary to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F provides that the FAA has not established a significance threshold for Historical, Architectural, and Cultural Resources. A factor to consider is whether the action would result in a finding of adverse effect through the Section 106 process; however, an adverse effect finding is not automatically a significant impact triggering preparation of an EIS.

For this analysis, FAA established both a Direct and an Indirect Area of Potential Effect (APE) which correspond with the Project Study Area and Regional Study Area respectively. These are shown on Figure 4-6 of the Final EA. In order to identify historic properties within the APEs, previous archeological and cultural resources surveys conducted for the Airport were reviewed. For more information please see Sections 4.4.7.1 and 4.4.7.2 of the Final EA. To gather additional information regarding the Direct and Indirect APE, an archeological survey was completed in August 2018 and an architectural and historic properties survey was also completed in August 2018. The surveys found no historic properties eligible to be listed on the NRHP within the Direct or Indirect APEs.

The FAA coordinated with the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Omaha Tribe, Ponca Tribe of Nebraska, Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa/Meskwaki Nation, and the Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota. The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma responded that they have no objection to the project. The Omaha Tribe responded that they are interested in consulting further; however, no response on the Draft EA and other correspondence was received. The other tribes did not respond.

With the No Action Alternative, no changes would be made from the existing conditions and the terminals would remain as they are today. Therefore, no impacts to historical, architectural, archeological, or cultural resources would occur.

As Section 4.4.7 of the Final EA describes, six archaeological resources were identified during the archaeological investigation. These sites are located within the Direct APE and all were recommended as not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The intensive architectural/historic investigation recommended the existing passenger terminal and other buildings as not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP as individual buildings. In addition, an assessment of the Airport as a potential historic district, recommended the Airport not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The FAA determined, and the Iowa SHPO concurred that no historic properties will be effected.

The Proposed Action would not cause direct or indirect effects to any historic properties. However, if unanticipated discovery of archeological material is found during construction, construction activities would stop immediately and the Authority will notify the FAA and Iowa SHPO. Construction activities would not resume without verbal and/or written authorization.

Land Use: Sections 4.4.8 and 5.8 of the Final EA describes the impacts for both the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives. The FAA has not established a significance threshold for land use, and the FAA has not provided specific factors to consider in making a significance determination. The determination that significant impacts exist in the land use impact category is normally dependent on the significance of other impact categories.

The existing land uses within the Regional Study Area are primarily made up of Airport property consisting of vacant/open land with business/industrial and some residential. The existing land uses within the Project Study Area are mostly made up of developed land used for Airport operations.

With the No Action Alternative, the existing conditions at the Airport would remain in place and there would be no impacts to land use not already occurring or expected to occur. Section 5.8.3.2 of the Final EA states the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport property and would not change the current land use designation of the Airport. Noise-sensitive residential areas in the Airport vicinity would not be affected. Additionally, as described throughout Chapter 5 of the Final EA, the Proposed Action would not significantly affect other resources that could indirectly affect land use. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not change the land use in or around the Project Study Area.

The Authority provided a Sponsor Land Use Letter, dated June 7, 2019 which states “that appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations, including the landing and takeoff of aircraft. This assurance applies to both existing and planned

land uses." For these reasons, the Proposed Action would be compatible with existing and expected zoning and surrounding area land use plans and no significant impacts are anticipated.

Natural Resources and Energy Supply: Sections 4.4.9 and 5.9 of the Final EA describe the impacts for both the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives. The FAA has not established a significance threshold for natural resources and energy supply; however, situations should be considered where the proposed action or alternative(s) would have the potential to cause demand to exceed available or future supplies of these resources.

With the No Action Alternative, no changes would be made from the existing conditions and the terminals would remain as they are today. Therefore, no impacts to natural resources or energy supplies would occur.

Construction impacts, as a result of implementing the Proposed Action, would require the use of typical construction materials such as wood, metal, sand, gravel, concrete, dirt for fill material, glass, water, and asphalt. As stated in Section 5.9.3 of the Final EA, these materials are not rare or in short supply, and the quantity required for development of this size would not place an undue strain on supplies. The Proposed Action would not consume a notable quantity of natural resources, nor would it exceed local supplies for fuel and energy. In addition, many of the proposed new facilities and utilities would replace older, less efficient facilities, which could potentially achieve a reduction in energy use and water usage. Therefore, no significant impacts to natural resources or the local energy supply would occur as a result of the Proposed Action.

Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use: Sections 4.4.10 and 5.10 of the Final EA provide the noise analysis that was conducted for potential noise effects associated with the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives.

FAA Order 1050.1F, Exhibit 4-1, provides the significance threshold for noise and noise-compatible land use, which states that a significant noise impact would occur if the analysis shows that the Proposed Action would result in noise-sensitive areas experiencing an increase in noise of DNL 1.5 dB or more at or above DNL 65 dB noise exposure, or that will be exposed at or above the DNL 65 dB level due to a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase when compared to the No Action alternative for the same timeframe.

As stated in Section 4.4.10 of the Final EA, the FAA uses 14 CFR Part 150, Airport Noise Compatibility Planning, land use compatibility guidelines to determine compatibility with most land uses. Generally, all land uses exposed to noise levels below the DNL 65 dB noise contour are considered compatible. As stated in Section 4.4.10 of the Final EA, the Authority conducted a 14 CFR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study in 2006. As a result of this study, incompatible land uses were identified within the DNL 65 dB contour. As mitigation, the Authority purchased avigation easements, which are a property right acquired from the landowner that protects the use of the airspace by aircraft, including the right of the aircraft to cause noise. Figure 4-10 of the Final EA shows the DNL 65 dB noise

contour for the Airport resulting from that study. Although completed in 2006, these contours represent the best available noise information for the airport.

FAA Order 1050.1F Desk Reference provides for using aircraft noise screening which may rule out the need for more detailed noise analysis and provide documented support if screening shows no potential for significant noise. The potential noise effects were evaluated using the FAA's Area Equivalent Method (AEM) (Version 2C SP2). This screening tool evaluates proposed actions and alternatives at an airport which result in general overall increase in daily aircraft operations or the use of larger/noiser aircraft, as long as there are no changes in ground tracks or flight profiles. If the AEM calculations indicate that the action would result in less than a 17 percent (approximately a DNL 1dB) increase in the DNL 65 dB contour area, there would be no significant impact over the noise sensitive areas and no further noise analysis would be required. The AEM analysis is available for reference in Appendix I of the Final EA.

Under the No Action Alternative, the Authority would not implement the replacement terminal and enabling projects. The Authority would continue to operate the Airport and serve forecast aviation demands. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not have noise effects.

As stated in Section 5.10.3.2 of the Final EA, the Proposed Action includes the construction of new GA hangars. The construction of these hangars could attract new GA tenants that do not currently operate at the Airport. The operation of the Proposed Action is estimated to increase GA operations at the Airport by 4 percent which would cause a 0.2 percent increase in the size of the DNL 65 dB noise contour in 2032 according to the AEM analysis. Because the potential noise increase associated with the Proposed Action would be substantially lower than the 17 percent significance threshold established by the FAA, no significant impact would occur.

The replacement passenger terminal would be oriented so that the majority of its gates are facing McKinley Avenue and the residential area to the north of the Project Study Area. However, runway use would not change at the airport as a result of the Proposed Action. Because taxiing noise rarely contributes to airport noise contours, and because the potential noise increase associated with increased GA operations is below the 17 percent significance threshold, no significant impact would occur.

As stated in Section 5.10.3.2 of the Final EA, Construction of the Proposed Action would cause noise from construction vehicles and machinery and would generally be limited to the immediate vicinity of the construction work occurring. The majority of construction is expected to occur during day-light hours. The closest residential areas are about 300 feet east of the Project Study Area and is buffered from the Airport by a general retail area along Fleur Drive. While construction noise associated with the Proposed Action may be heard in this residential area, it is not anticipated to significantly affect the area given the distance from the Project Study Area and the existing buffers between the residential areas and the Project Study Area.

Since the AEM indicates that the potential noise increase associated with the Proposed Action would be substantially lower than the 17 percent significance threshold established by the FAA, no new noise sensitive land uses would be subject to noise levels of DNL 65 dB or greater due to an increase in noise of DNL 1.5dB or greater when compared to the No Action alternative for the same timeframe. Further, no existing noise sensitive land uses within the DNL 65 dB would be subject to an increase in noise of DNL 1.5 dB or greater. Therefore, no significant aircraft noise impacts would occur as a result of the Proposed Action.

Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks:

Socioeconomic: Sections 4.4.11.1 and 5.11.1 of the Final EA describes how socioeconomic impacts were assessed to determine the effect that the proposed airport development would have on the social and economic resources of the surrounding communities.

The FAA has not established a significance threshold for socioeconomics. However considerations include extensive relocation of housing or businesses; inducing substantial economic growth in an area; disruption of local traffic patterns and substantial reduction of the level of service of roads serving an airport; or substantially changes the community tax base (See Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F).

Under the No Action Alternative, the Authority would not implement the replacement terminal and enabling projects. The Authority would continue to operate the Airport and serve forecast aviation demands. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not have socioeconomic effects.

The Proposed Action would not result in the acquisition or the conversion of residential properties to Airport property. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result of relocation of residences.

As stated in Section 5.11.1.3.2 of the Final EA, the construction and operation of the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts to businesses located on or off-Airport. The Proposed Action has the potential to benefit the local economy in the short-term with local jobs through temporary construction-based employment, which would provide an increase in local employment taxes, and induced local spending in the surrounding communities. Section 5.11.3.3.2 of the Final EA states that construction and operation of the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport property and would not require the relocation of residents or businesses, aside from the relocation of tenants in buildings scheduled for demolition. Because the Proposed Action would occur in phases, the regular operation of these tenants would not be significantly disrupted.

The Airport is supported wholly by airport user charges and other airport revenues. Therefore, there would be no substantial change in the community tax base as a result of the Proposed Action.

As stated in Section 5.11.2.3.2 of the Final EA, there are no proposed modifications to off Airport roadways except for relocation of the Airport entrance intersection and there is no anticipated increase in surface traffic other than a temporary increase during construction due to the Proposed Action. There would be no reduction in the level of service for the roads serving the Airport and surrounding communities. Therefore, there would be no significant disruption of local traffic patterns as a result of the Proposed Action.

For these reasons, the Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in a significant socioeconomic impact.

Environmental Justice: As stated in Sections 4.4.11.2 and 5.11.3 of the Final EA, there are no environmental justice populations living within the Regional Study Area. Since there would be no significant impacts to any of the environmental impact categories and there are no environmental justice populations living in the Regional Study Area, the Proposed Action would not result in a disproportionately high and adverse impact on any minority or low income populations within the Regional Study Area.

Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks: Sections 4.4.11.3 and 5.11.4 of the Final EA describes the analysis of potential children's environmental health and safety risks. FAA has not established a significance threshold for this category of impacts, but factors to consider include whether the action would have the potential to lead to a disproportionate health or safety risk to children.

Under the No Action Alternative, the Authority would not implement the replacement terminal and enabling projects. The Authority would continue to operate the Airport and serve forecast aviation demands. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would affect children's health and safety.

As stated in Section 5.11.4.3.2 of the Final EA, The construction and operation of the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport property and would not require the acquisition or relocation of any residences, schools, childcare centers, or similar facilities. The Proposed Action would not increase environmental health and safety risks or exposure of environmental contaminants to children in the surrounding community. Construction emissions resulting from the Proposed Action would be temporary and would occur over the duration of construction activities. Based on a review of available data conducted as part of this EA, the Proposed Action would not result in an elevated risk related to health or safety concerns for children. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur as a result of the Proposed Action

Visual Effects: Sections 4.4.12 and 5.12 of the Final EA describes the analysis of the potential visual effects (i.e., light emissions and visual character) of the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action. The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Light Emissions or for Visual Character; FAA Order 1050.1F, Exhibit 4-1.

Light Emissions: As described in Sections 4.4.12.1 and 5.12.1 of the Final EA, it is anticipated that the proposed replacement terminal would be illuminated by the same basic

types of lighting currently used on the existing terminals. Therefore, lighting from the Proposed Action when compared to the No Action Alternative would not significantly increase the overall light emissions due to their type, intensity, and distance from residential areas.

Visual Character: As stated in Section 5.12.2 of the Final EA, the Proposed Action would be similar to the infrastructure and buildings that are currently located in the Project Study Area, (e.g., runways, apron areas, surface parking, and a passenger terminal), and would not alter the visual character of the area. Because line-of-sight from the closest residential area to the Project Study Area is predominantly shielded by existing vegetation and commercial development along Fleur Drive and the visual character of the Airport would not be changed, no noticeable change to the visual resources and visual character would occur to nearby residents.

For these reasons, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant impact to either light emissions or visual character.

Water Resources: Sections 4.4.13 and 5.13 of the Final EA describe the analysis of the potential impacts to water resources (i.e., wetlands, floodplains, and surface and ground water) of the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action.

Wetlands: Sections 4.4.13.1 and 5.13.1 of the Final EA describes the analysis of wetlands and Waters of the United States (WUS). Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F provides the significance thresholds for this category of impacts. Considerations include where the action would adversely affect a wetland's function, substantially alter the hydrology, or substantially reduce the wetland's ability to retain floodwaters.

With the No Action Alternative, the existing conditions at the Airport would be in place and therefore there would be no impacts to wetlands or streams not already occurring or expected to occur.

A wetlands and WUS delineation was conducted to evaluate potential wetland areas and WUS in the Project Study Area, see Appendix F of the Final EA. Based on the results of the delineation, 3.51 acres of wetlands, 1.4 acres of ponds, 2,280 linear feet of WUS, and 520 linear feet of drainage features were identified in the Project Study Area. Figure 5-3 of the Final EA identifies the wetlands and WUS in the Project Study Area. As stated in Section 5.13.1 of the Final EA, a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination letter dated October 17, 2018 from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) determined 0.84 acres of forested wetland, 2.67 acres of emergent wetlands, and approximately 2,280 feet of stream were determined to be jurisdictional. The pond was determined to be a non-jurisdictional manmade structure and the 520 feet of erosional features were determined to be non-jurisdictional due to lack of a defined bed and bank.

Section 5.13.1.3.2 of the Final EA states the Proposed Action would include the creation or maintenance of stormwater detention areas and/or construction borrow areas near the delineated wetlands and WUS. The preliminary design for the stormwater detention area

includes establishment of a stormwater basin adjacent to WUS-1, north of Army Post Road as shown on Figure 5-3 of the Final EA. Within the basin, the WUS-1 channel would be widened to improve capacity and riffle structures would be added to the channel to control the flow of water. Modifications would be made to the existing culvert structure to facilitate stormwater detention, which would result in impacts to approximately 290 feet of WUS-1. The Proposed Action would minimize the amount of permanent fill placed within WUS-1.

The construction borrow area would be in the southwest corner of the Project Study Area. The approximate limits of the borrow area is shown on Figure 5-3 of the Final EA. The construction borrow area was designed to minimize impacts to wetlands. The proposed construction borrow area would affect 0.33 acres of Wetland 9.

The thresholds of significance would not be triggered due to the following:

- Any proposed wetland impacts within the Project Study Area would not adversely affect the wetland's ability to protect the quality or quantity of municipal water supplies as the wetland areas do not play a significant role in the area's water supplies;
- The functions and values of wetlands within the Project Study Area would not be altered as a majority of the delineated wetlands within would remain unaffected (0.33 acres of wetland impact out of 3.51 acres delineated);
- The Proposed Action would not substantially reduce the affected wetland's ability to retain floodwater or storm associated runoff as an appropriate drainage mitigation/design would be completed to accommodate runoff from any new impervious surfaces;
- The Proposed Action will include storm water improvements that minimize impacts to a WUS while providing additional storm water detention capacity;
- Adverse effects to the maintenance of natural systems supporting wildlife and fish habitat or economically-important resources would not occur as a majority of the wetland areas would remain (3.18 acres) and no economically-important resources exist;
- Would not promote development of secondary activities or services that would affect the resources or functions of the wetland as the proposed fill of 0.33 acres would not cause changes to the remaining wetland resources or functions; and
- Coordination with IDNR would occur prior to implementation of this alternative to ensure consistence with State wetland strategies.

In accordance with stipulations that would be provided in the USACE Section 404 Permit, the Authority is coordinating with the USACE and IDNR for the Proposed Action to ensure that wetlands and WUS are avoided to the maximum extent practicable and, if necessary, would provide appropriate compensatory mitigation for any impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and WUS. The Section 404 permit application was submitted to the USACE and IDRN on March 12, 2019 (see Appendix F of the Final EA). The USACE, in consultation with other interested agencies, concurred with the mitigation plan and validation of the Section 404 permit application on April 3, 2019. Mitigation

specified in the Section 404 permit includes purchasing 0.33 emergent wetland acre-credits prior to construction. The Authority will provide proof of purchase to the USACE.

Floodplains: Sections 4.4.13.2 and 5.13.2 of the Final EA provides the analysis of potential floodplain impacts. Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F indicates that a significant impact in this category would occur when the action would cause adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) identify the Project Study Area as Zone X, areas determined to be outside the 100-year and 500-year floodplain. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not affect the 100-year floodplain. For these reasons, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on floodplains.

Since the Proposed Action would not occur within the regulated floodplain, no mitigation or permitting is required. However, the construction contractor should comply with the construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and the developed construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) developed for the Proposed Action.

Surface and Ground Water: Sections 4.4.13.3, and 5.13.3 of the Final EA provides the analysis of potential surface water impacts. Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F indicates that a significant impact in this category would occur when the action would exceed water quality standards or contaminate public water supplies such that public health may be adversely affected.

The Project Study Area intersects three watersheds. As described in Section 4.4.13.1 of the Final EA, there are wetlands, WUS, a pond/stormwater detention basin, and drainage/erosional features in the Project Study Area. The two delineated WUS are unnamed tributaries of Middle Creek located in the southern quadrant of the Airport. The stormwater detention basin is located between the existing terminal and Fleur Drive in the Yeader Creek-Des Moines River watershed. Wetlands and drainage/erosional features are located in the Middle Creek and Jordan Creek-Raccoon River watersheds in the south quadrant of the Airport.

Airlines and FBOs conduct aircraft deicing and anti-icing operations during the winter months. The airlines and FBOs conduct deicing and anti-icing operations for aircraft at designated locations on the terminal and cargo aprons. During the winter season, deicer-impacted stormwater runoff from these locations is collected in the storm system and stored in underground detention tanks adjacent to the aprons. Deicer-impacted stormwater in the storage tanks is discharged to the sanitary system in accordance with an industrial discharge permit issued by the Des Moines Metropolitan Wastewater Reclamation Authority. The Airport conducts pavement deicing and anti-icing operations. Pavement deicers are more environmentally benign than aircraft deicers.

As described in Section 4.4.6 of the Final EA, the Airport operates under an Iowa NPDES permit for stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity from vehicle maintenance, equipment cleaning, and deicing/anti-icing areas at the airport. The permit

requires the implementation of a SWPPP and best management practices (BMPs) designed to limit the discharge of pollutants to surrounding surface waters and to meet all numeric effluent limits.

As described in Section 5.13.3.3.2 of the Final EA, the Proposed Action would permanently increase the amount of impervious surface by approximately 20 acres and may directly affect surface waters or wetlands. The increase in impervious surface would increase stormwater runoff in the area and in turn, increase stormwater treatment required. To meet IDNR and City stormwater management requirements, the Proposed Action would include construction of on-site stormwater detention facilities.

The Proposed Action includes the construction of two new designated deicing pads. These deicing pads are intended to improve the current deicing fluid collection and containment system. The new designated deicing pads would provide a designated location for deicing activities in a smaller footprint and provide the opportunity for more efficient collection thereby decreasing the potential for deicing fluids to enter downstream surface waters. These new deicing pads would be subject to the chemical discharge effluent limits that are specified in the Individual NPDES permit.

Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would not have a significant effect on surface water. The Airport would be responsible for ensuring that an NPDES permit for construction activities is obtained prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. In addition, the Airport would need to amend the NPDES Industrial Stormwater General Permit (77-27-0-08) for stormwater discharges associated with industrial activities to include the new facilities. This process includes updating the Airport's SWPPP. The Proposed Action's compliance with the NPDES Permit, the SWPPP, and the City of Des Moines Stormwater Management Plan would help to ensure that the additional anticipated runoff is properly treated and that the stormwater facilities contain enough capacity to comply with the detention requirements.

Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would not affect water quality in any manner that would affect the quality of the public drinking water supply. In addition, the Proposed Action would not increase the use of public water supplies in a manner that would affect the overall supply of public water. The extension of utilities, including water and sewer lines, associated with the Proposed Action would be coordinated with and verified by the local entities. For these reasons, as stated in the EA, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on surface waters.

Sections 4.4.13.4, and 5.13.4 of the Final EA provides the analysis of potential ground water impacts. Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F indicates that a significant impact in this category would occur when groundwater quality standards are exceeded or an aquifer used for public drinking water may be adversely affected.

The proposed dry detention basin construction would not significantly affect the groundwater recharge due to the anticipated shallow depth of the bottom of the facilities and the excessive depth of the aquifer in the area of the construction. The Proposed

Action calls for the construction of two new deicing pads with dedicated collection systems that collect the pollutants associated with the deicing process prior to affecting the groundwater. To aid the collection and provide an additional measure to protect groundwater, an impervious liner is typically installed below deicing pads to prevent deicer fluid from infiltrating the pavement section to reach groundwater.

As stated in Section 5.13.4.3.2 of the Final EA, the construction of the Proposed Action could minimally affect groundwater due to the increase in stormwater runoff from the proposed increase in the impervious surface area. Any effects on the groundwater would be considered minimal and not affect the overall operations of the system and not exceed any water quality standards that are set forth by any local, state, or federal jurisdictions or contaminate the aquifer that is used for the public water supply. The Proposed Action would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on groundwater.

Construction Impacts: Temporary environmental impacts may occur as a result of construction activities. Areas of temporary impacts include: Air Quality; Climate; Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use; Hazardous and Solid Waste; Natural Resources, and Water Resources. Potential impacts are described above in the applicable resource category.

Project design specifications will incorporate recommendations established in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-10, Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports, Item P-156, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion and Siltation Control to help minimize construction impacts using BMPs.

Cumulative Impacts: The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions included in the cumulative impact analysis are presented in Sections 4.5 and 5.14 of the Final EA. Section 4.5 of the Final EA provides the list of the actions assessed between 2013 through 2021. Section 5.14 of the Final EA discusses the evaluation of cumulative impacts from these actions that could result in environmental impacts from implementation of the Proposed Action. The analysis of potential cumulative effects uses the thresholds of significance in FAA Order 1050.1F, Exhibit 4-1 for each individual resource category. Cumulative impacts are only considered for those resources the Proposed Action would affect. Each past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future action was cumulatively analyzed for its potential to impact the same environmental resources impacted by the Proposed Action.

As stated in Section 5.14.3.1 of the Final EA, with the No Action Alternative, there would be no cumulative impacts. Under the No Action Alternative, the Airport would not implement the proposed replacement terminal project. The Airport would continue to operate as is currently and serve forecast aviation demands. Airport development would be subject to review and approval under NEPA and is not assumed under this alternative. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not cause cumulative impacts when considered with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

With implementation of the Proposed Action, as described in Section 5.14.3.2 of the Final EA, the level of cumulative impacts anticipated to occur within these environmental resource categories is not significant due to: the types of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects; the extent of the built environment in which they would occur; the lack of certain environmental resources in the area; and the mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Action. Therefore, as stated in the Final EA, implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts.

ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE AND FAA PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE:

Based on the analysis of environmental impact in the Final EA, the No Action Alternative has fewer environmental effects than the Proposed Action Alternative and thus would be the environmentally preferred alternative. In addition to identifying the environmentally preferred alternative, the FAA also identifies the FAA preferred alternative. In selecting the agency's preferred alternative, the FAA considers a variety of factors, including the ability of the alternatives to satisfy the Purpose and Need of the project as well as environmental impacts of the alternatives examined in the EA. Although the No Action Alternative entails fewer environmental impacts, the Proposed Action Alternative incorporates design elements and construction practices to reduce environmental impacts. Furthermore, after mitigation, there are no significant impacts associated with the Proposed Action Alternative. Finally, the Proposed Action Alternative fully satisfies the Purpose and Need for the project. Because the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the proposed project, and because the Proposed Action Alternative is designed to minimize environmental effects, the FAA's preferred alternative is the Proposed Action Alternative.

AGENCY COORDINATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Agency and Public Scoping: Chapter 7 of the Final EA discusses the agency and public scoping for the environmental assessment. On August 15, 2018, a governmental agency scoping meeting and a public scoping meeting were completed to determine the range of issues to be analyzed and to what magnitude they were to be treated. Key governmental agencies were invited to attend the agency scoping meeting at the Des Moines International Airport and to provide any information they wished to be considered in the EA. The public was notified of the public scoping meeting at least 30 days before the scheduled public meeting date in the Des Moines Register newspaper. Additionally, specific individuals and organizations were invited to attend the Public Scoping Meeting. No agency or public scoping comments were received. A copy of the public scoping meeting newspaper notice, lists of invitees, lists of attendees, and materials presented at the meetings during the scoping process are provided in Appendix J of the Final EA.

Public Comment Period and Public Open House: On April 5, 2019 a 35-day Notice of Availability (NOA) announcing the availability of the Draft EA and Agency and Public Open House was published in the Des Moines Register and on the Airport's website, https://www.dsmairport.com. The Draft EA was made available to the public on the Authority's website at https://dsmairport.com. In addition, a paper copy of the Draft EA was available for public review at a local library, the Authority's office, and the FAA Regional Office. Electronic copies of the Draft EA were mailed to agencies who requested a copy for review. The comment period for the Draft EA was open from April 5, 2019 to May 10, 2019. A public open house was conducted on May 7, 2019 to offer agencies and the public the opportunity to provide comments on the information contained in the Draft EA. No members of the public attended the open house and no agency or public comments were received. A copy of the public open house newspaper notice, list of attendees, and materials presented at the open house are provided in Appendix J of the Final EA.

INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION:

In accordance with 49 USC§ 47101 (h), the FAA has determined that no further coordination with the U.S. Department of Interior or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is necessary because the Proposed Action does not involve construction of a new airport, new runway or major runway extension that has a significant impact on natural resources including fish and wildlife; natural, scenic, and recreational assets; water and air quality; or another factor affecting the environment.

REASONS FOR DETERMINATION THAT THE PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE WILL HAVE NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:

The Final EA examines each of the various environmental resources that were deemed present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action. As described within this FONSI and in the Final EA, the proposed terminal replacement project at the Des Moines International Airport would not involve any environmental impacts after mitigation that would exceed a threshold of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B.

AGENCY FINDINGS:

The FAA makes the following determinations for this project based on information and analysis set forth in the Final EA and other portions of the project/administrative file.

- **The project is reasonably consistent with existing plans of public agencies for development of the area [49 U.S.C. 47106(a)].** The FAA is satisfied that the Proposed Action is reasonably consistent with the plans, goals, and policies for the area surrounding the airport based on coordination efforts with public

agencies as described in Chapters 4 and 5 of the Final EA. The Proposed Action is also consistent with the applicable regulations and policies of Federal, State, and local agencies.

- **Independent and Objective Evaluation.** As required by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR § 1506.5), the FAA has independently and objectively evaluated this proposed project. As described in the Final EA, the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative were studied extensively to determine the potential impacts and appropriate mitigation for those impacts. The FAA provided input, advice, and expertise throughout the analysis, along with administrative review of the project.

- **Community Interests Considered [49 U.S.C. 47106(b)(2)].** The FAA is satisfied that the interests of the communities in or near where the project may be located were given fair consideration. The planning process for the Proposed Action is described in Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of the Final EA. Nearby communities and their residents have had the opportunity to express their views during the scoping process, during the Draft EA public comment period, and at a public open house.

- **Land Use Restrictions [49 U.S.C. § 47107].** The FAA has received satisfactory assurances from the airport sponsor, letter dated June 7, 2019 that appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with airport normal operations, including landing and takeoff of aircraft.

- **National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106.** The FAA has determined, and the SHPO has concurred, that no historic properties will be effected. The FAA conducted the required consultation with the SHPO and other parties pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

- **Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) [49 U.S.C. § 303].** The Proposed Action would not result in a physical or constructive "use" of any Section 4(f) resource.

- **Avoidance and Minimization.** Based on the information contained in the Final EA, the FAA has determined that all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the Proposed Action have been adopted. The proposed Action avoids and minimizes environmental harm in a variety of ways, including: reducing energy and water usage after project construction is complete; recycling

as much material as practicable; following all state and local regulations, as well as best management practices during construction activities relating to hazardous materials, solid waste, pollution prevention, fugitive dust, and storm water impacts; minimizing impacts to biological resources and wetlands; and other examples provided throughout the Final EA.

DECISION AND ORDER:

Based on the information in this FONSI/ROD and supported by detailed discussion in the Final EA, the Proposed Action has been identified as the FAA's selected alternative and the FAA must either:

- Approve agency actions necessary to implement the Proposed Action, or
- Disapprove agency actions to implement the Proposed Action.

Approval signifies that applicable federal requirements relating to the proposed airport development have been met. Approval permits the Authority to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Action and associated mitigation measures. Disapproval would prevent the Authority from implementing the Proposed Action elements within the Airport.

Under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, I find that the project is reasonably supported. I, therefore, direct that action be taken to carry out the agency actions discussed more fully in the "PROPOSED ACTION AND REQUESTED FEDERAL ACTIONS" section of this FONSI/ROD.

- Unconditional approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) to depict the proposed improvements pursuant to 49 USC §§ 40103(b) and 47107(a)(16).
- Determination under 49 USC § 44502(b) that the airport development is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense.
- Approval of a Construction Safety and Phasing Plan to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5370-2F, Operational Safety on Airports During Construction (14 CFR Part 139 [49 USC § 44706]).
- Approval of changes to the airport certification manual pursuant to 14 CFR Part 139 (49 USC § 44706).
- Determinations, through the aeronautical study process, under 14 CFR Part 77, regarding obstructions to navigable airspace (49 USC Section 40103 (b) and 40113).
- Determinations under 49 USC 47106 and 47107 relating to the eligibility of the Proposed Action for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and/or determinations under 49 USC 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR 158.25, to impose and use passenger facility charges (PFCs) collected at the airport to assist with construction of potentially eligible development items shown

on the ALP including the proposed construction of the replacement terminal and associated actions that may directly or indirectly impact FAA facilities including but not limited to utility relocations.

This order is issued under applicable statutory authorities, including 49 U.S.C. §§ 40101(d), 40103(b), 40113(a), 44701, 44706, 44718(b), and 47101 et seq.

APPROVING FAA OFFICIAL'S STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING:

After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained herein, the undersigned finds that the proposed Federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101 of NEPA and other applicable environmental requirements and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or otherwise include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA. As a result, FAA is issuing this FONSI and will not prepare an EIS for this action.

APPROVED: JAMES A JOHNSON Digitally signed by JAMES A JOHNSON Date: 2019.06.20 14:03:13 -05'00'

Director, Airports Division — Date
FAA Central Region

DISAPPROVED: _____

Director, Airports Division — Date
FAA Central Region

CONCUR: JOSEPH N MINIACE Digitally signed by JOSEPH N MINIACE Date: 2019.06.21 14:16:28 -05'00'

Regional Administrator — Date
FAA Central Region

RIGHT OF APPEAL:

This decision document (FONSI/ROD) is a final order of the FAA Administrator and is subject to exclusive judicial review under 49 U.S.C. § 46110 by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person contesting the decision lives or has a principal place of business. Any party having substantial interest in this order may apply for review of the decision by filing a petition for review in the appropriate U.S. Court of Appeals no later than 60 days after the order is issued in accordance with the provisions of 49 U.S.C. § 46110.