

APPENDIX E

NON-ISSUES

Appendix E - Non-Issue Environmental Impact Categories

This section contains a list of environmental impact categories in FAA Order 1050.1F, Chapter 4 that would not be affected by the Preferred Alternative and alternatives considered, as well as rationale for absence of anticipated effects. The categories are:

- Air Quality
- Biological resources (including fish, wildlife, and plants)
- Climate
- Coastal resources
- Farmlands
- Hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention
- Land use and Transportation Plans
- Light Emissions & Visual Effects
- Natural resources and energy supply
- Water resources

E.1 Air Quality

The Municipality of Anchorage MOA) has an EPA approved Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plan through 2024. The Plan has a defined CO maintenance area boundary. The south end of Runway (R/W) 15/33 is within the CO maintenance area.

DOT&PF produced a general conformity analysis for the Proposed Action Alternative which accounted for direct and indirect construction emissions and other direct or indirect emissions. The conformity analysis concluded constructing the proposed project would result in an increase of approximately 11 tons CO if the proposed project is constructed in one year. Construction emission and other direct or indirect emissions would remain the same as existing or decrease. The proposed project is below the *de minimis* threshold of 100 tons per year and therefore a full general conformity analysis is not required. See DOT&PF conformity analysis and DEC statement the proposed project is below the *de minimis threshold* in Appendix B

E.2 Biological resources (including fish, wildlife, and plants)

The following Federal laws, regulations, and Executive Orders apply to biotic communities in the Airport Study Area:

- The Endangered Species Act¹
- Related Essential Fish Habitat Requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as amended by Sustainable Fisheries Act²
- Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980³
- Executive Order 13112, Invasive Species⁴

¹ 16 U.S.C. Sections 1531-1544. See Chapter 8, Section 2 of the *Desk Reference for Airport Action*.

² 16 U.S.C. Section 1855(b)(2).

³ 16 U.S.C. Section 662.

⁴ Vol. 64 *Federal Register*, page 6183, Feb. 1999.

-
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1981⁵

Essential Fish Habitat

DOT&PF reviewed the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) Anadromous Waters Catalog mapper on April 7, 2017 and found no anadromous stream or waterbodies within or adjacent to the proposed project area. The Proposed Project construction limits have no intersection with marine waters.

Endangered Species Act

The USFWS in a letter dated November 12, 2012 stated:

At this time, no federally listed or proposed species or designated or proposed critical habitat under FWS jurisdiction occur in the Anchorage and/or Matanuska-Susitna area (AMS). Section 7 of the ESA, and our implementing regulations, require that for federally executed (funded, authorized, etc.) activities, our concurrence is required when it is determined that the activity *may affect* a listed endangered or threatened species or critical habitat. Concurrence is not required for activities that will have *no effect* on listed species. Because no listed species under FWS jurisdiction occur in the AMS area, it is reasonable to conclude that proposed projects confined to the AMS will have no effect.

On April 8, 2017, DOT&PF reviewed the joint ‘USFWS-National Marine Fisheries Service Endangered, Threatened, Proposed, Candidate, and Delisted Species in Alaska (updated February 18, 2014) webpage. The review found no threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate species within or near the proposed project area. Therefore, the USFWS November 1, 2012 letter remains valid and the Proposed Action would have no effect on threatened or endangered species.

Cook Inlet Beluga Whale and Critical Habitat

Cook Inlet Up to Mean High Water is designated critical habit for the listed endangered Cook Inlet Beluga Whale (CIBW). The Cook Inlet coastline is located approximately 200 ft from the north end of RW 15/33. The Proposed Action is likely to generate construction stormwater runoff. Cook Inlet would be the receiving water body for construction stormwater runoff.

Pollutant discharge into Cook Inlet is managed under the ADEC Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (APDES). On May 1, 2008, the State of Alaska submitted a final application to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for authority to permit wastewater discharges in Alaska, and on October 31, 2008, EPA approved the application. ADEC assumed full authority to administer the wastewater and discharge permitting and compliance program for Alaska on October 31, 2012 and issued a new Construction General Permit on February 1, 2016.

The Protected Resources Division of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is responsible for developing management and conservation plans for the CIBW. By determination of the EPA and NMFS, NMFS does not consult with the State of Alaska for discharges under the authority of the APDES. Specifically, those discharges would be construction stormwater pollutants from constructing the proposed project.

⁵ 16 U.S.C. Sections 703-711.

The proposed project would not change existing drainage patterns or overall volume once constructed. Stormwater and authorized non-stormwater discharges from the proposed project would be managed by a DOT&PF-approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) pursuant to the APDES 2016 Construction General Permit (CGP). Adhering to the SWPPP and CGP, construction stormwater and authorized non-stormwater discharges from the proposed project would be controlled by best management practices, scheduled inspections and timely maintenance. Disturbed ground would be permanently stabilized. FAA has determined the proposed project would have no effect on the CIBW or designated critical habitat either during construction or from airport operations after the project is constructed.

Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980

The Proposed Project has no involvement with resources managed by this act.

Executive Order 13112, Invasive Species

A review of the University of Alaska Anchorage, Alaska Exotic Plants Information Clearinghouse web portal⁶ on June 5, 2017 and found a number of invasive plant species sites within or adjacent to the proposed project area. DOT&PF would comply with Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species), and all other federal, state, and local laws and regulations to ensure that ground disturbing activities are minimized. Disturbed areas would be re-vegetated with Alaska Plant Materials Center certified seed to minimize potential importation of new weed propagules from outside Alaska.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1981

Construction for the Proposed Action would occur on existing operational areas. In addition, the Airport has an active management plan to prevent birds from nesting on airport property. As a result, nesting birds are unlikely to occur within construction disturbed ground limits.

Nesting Bald Eagles

Bald eagle nests exist in the vicinity of the Airport. According to correspondence with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) - Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)- Wildlife Services, Anchorage, Alaska, there is an inactive bald eagle nest about located about 1,700 feet from RW 15/33. In the near future, USDA-APHIS plans to remove the inactive bald eagle nest while it is still inactive.

E.3 Climate

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would increase temporarily during construction of the Proposed Action from operating construction equipment. GHG emissions from aircraft during the RW 15/33 construction shutdown would increase only a small fraction. After the Proposed Action is constructed, aircraft operations would return to pre-construction conditions since the Proposed Action would not cause changes to the existing aircraft fleet mix or existing flight operations other than the proposed threshold shift which is not expected to increase GHG emissions. General support, travel to and from the airport and operation and maintenance caused GHG emissions would remain the same as existing during construction and after construction except maintenance GHG emissions would decrease post construction (see the General Conformity Analysis in the EA Appendix B). Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in

⁶ <http://aknhp.uaa.alaska.edu/apps/akepic/>

a net increase in GHG emissions. The No Action alternative would not result in a net increase in GHG emissions because existing conditions would not change under the No Action alternative.

E.4 Coastal resources

MOA has a 1991 management plan in cooperation with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to manage the Coastal Wildlife Refuge. The Refuge extends from Point Woronzof south for 16 miles. DOT&PF anticipates the proposed project once operational would not affect the Refuge since the fleet mix and number of aircraft operations would not change from existing. There may be temporary construction noise effects from increased air traffic on R/W 7/25 since R/W 15/33 would be closed for rehabilitation.

The State of Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP) expired by operation of Alaska Statutes 44.66.020 and 44.66.030 on June 30, 2011. As a result, the ACMP was withdrawn from the National Coastal Management Program on July 1, 2011, and Alaska no longer has a Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) program. Because a federally approved coastal management program must be administered by a state agency, no other entity may develop or implement a federally approved coastal management program for the State.

E.5 Farmlands

The US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey assesses Prime and Unique Farmland. The USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey does not contain data pertaining to the proposed project area.⁸ The proposed project area would be constructed on previously placed fill that has no value as an agricultural soil.

E.6 Hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention

The construction contractor will be required to prepare and implement a Hazardous Materials Control Plan (HMCP) in accordance with State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) requirements and DOT&PF contract specifications to address storage and handling of hazardous materials, including fuel and lubricants and spill response. All construction waste would be managed and disposed of in accordance with all State and federal solid-waste-management laws and regulations.

Three ADEC Contaminated Sites that are active or have institutional controls are within 1,500 feet of project limits. ADEC requires the contractor to obtain their Excavation Dewatering General Permit in the event contaminated groundwater is encountered during construction. DOT Aviation Design anticipates the contract will encounter groundwater during excavation. The DOT&PF construction contract will require the Contractor to obtain the ADEC Excavation Dewatering General Permit before commencing excavation activities.

The DOT&PF construction contract also will have a standard provision dealing with the contractor encountering contaminated soils. In this event, the contractor notifies the DOT&PF Project Engineer. All work would stop until coordination with ADEC in accordance with 18 Alaska Administrative Code 75.300 has been completed. All contamination would be handled and disposed of in accordance with a DEC-approved corrective action plan.

E.7 Land Use and Transportation Plans

⁸ <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>

The proposed project would be constructed on existing airport property owned by the State of Alaska DOT&PF. The proposed would not alter the existing fleet mix, number or type of aircraft operations or air traffic. DOT&PF does not anticipate any permanent aviation-related noise impacts or impacts to land uses. The proposed project is compatible with existing and planned land uses in the project vicinity.

E.8 Light Emissions & Visual Effects

The existing single beacon runway light on a pole at the north end of RW 15/33 would be replaced by a light array consisting of five incandescent steady burn lights and one blinking light. The new lights are not anticipated to significantly increase the existing light emissions from the ANC complex.

The proposed action would not affect aesthetics in the area as the rehabilitated runway would be essentially the same as existing. The new approach light array would increase the amount of light in one short section of the Point Woronzof Road and Tony Knowles Coastal Trail. However, the area that would experience increased light and aesthetics effects from the new light array is relatively small.

E.9 Natural Resources, Energy Supply, and Sustainable Energy

The proposed action would not cause demands that would exceed available or future natural resource or energy supplies.

E.10 Water resources (including wetlands, floodplains, surface waters, groundwater, and wild and scenic rivers)

Water resources (including wetlands, floodplains, surface waters, groundwater, and wild and scenic rivers) Water resources (including wetlands, floodplains, surface waters, groundwater, and wild and scenic rivers)

Wetlands and Other Waters of the U.S.

DOT&PF reviewed the MOA Wetlands mapping application on June 5, 2017 and found no wetlands within or adjacent to the proposed project limits.

Floodplains and Regulatory Floodway

A review of the MOA Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Rate Insurance Maps on April 17, 2017 indicated no Zone A floodplains or regulatory floodways within or adjacent to the Proposed Action

Water Quality (surface waters)

A review of Alaska's Final 2010 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report found no impaired water bodies located within or adjacent to the proposed project area. Lake Hood, located over 4,000 ft east from the proposed project area, is listed as impaired for low dissolved oxygen from urban and industrial runoff. DOT&PF anticipates there would be no water quality impacts to Lake Hood from constructing the proposed project or once the proposed

project is functional because of distance from the proposed project and lack of any waterway connectivity to the lake.

Stormwater and authorized non-stormwater discharges from the proposed project would be managed by a DOT&PF-approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) pursuant to the APDES 2016 Construction General Permit (CGP). Adhering to the SWPPP and CGP, construction stormwater and authorized non-stormwater discharges from the Proposed Action would be controlled by best management practices, scheduled inspections and timely maintenance. Disturbed ground would be permanently stabilized

Groundwater and Drinking Water

Since 2012, the Airport by order of ADEC has shut down all groundwater drinking sources on Airport property as a result of contamination.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

On June 5, 2017, DOT&PF reviewed the National Park Service National Rivers Inventory (NRI) webpage for Alaska river segments and found no NRI rivers within, adjacent, or near the Proposed Action project limits.