U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
Great Lakes Region
Minneapolis Airports District Office

DRAFT
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/ RECORD OF DECISION

DRAFT

For 2020 Improvement Project
At the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport
Minneapolis, Minnesota

January 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page #
I	Introduction	
II	Purpose and Need	
III	Alternatives	
	a. Alternatives Examined but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis	
	b. Alternatives Examined in Detail	
	c. Sponsor (MAC's) Preferred Alternative	
IV	Proposed Federal Action	
V	Environmental Consequences of the Preferred Alternative	
VI	Environmental Mitigation	
VII	Public and Agency Coordination	
VIII	Agency Findings	
IX	Decisions and Orders	
Attachment A	Comments and Responses on the Draft Environmental Assessment	
Attachment B	Tables Listing Development Included with Each Alternative Carried Forward for Additional Review	

DRAFT

I. Introduction

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) prepared this draft Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) for the proposed 2020 Improvement Project at the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP), managed and operated by the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC), Minneapolis, Minnesota. The attached Environmental Assessment (EA), dated December 2012, has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines and requirements set forth by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and the FAA to implement the environmental review and disclosure provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

In accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures,* FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions,* and based on the evaluation in the EA, there are no significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be prepared and a draft FONSI/ROD is being issued. This FONSI/ROD provides a review of the impacts expected to occur to the environment from a decision to implement the Proposed Action, mitigation requirements, and the basis for FAA's finding. Specific details are defined further in the attached EA.

II. Purpose and Need

MSP is a large commercial service airport situated on 3,400 acres approximately seven miles south of downtown Minneapolis and seven miles southwest of downtown St Paul in Minnesota. The airfield consists of four runways, numerous taxiways, and service roads. There are two terminals (Terminal 1-Lindbergh and Terminal 2-Humphrey) with 127 combined aircraft gate positions. Landside facilities include terminal curb roadways, ground transportation centers, parking facilities, rental car facilities and access roads.

Chapter 2 of the Final EA provides additional details on the Purpose and Need. Airport facilities (terminal and landside facilities such as parking, roadways, etc.) do not currently meet existing demand and will not meet future demand. As passenger activity grows, as a result of general natural growth at MSP, current congestion will be exacerbated and will spread to other airport facilities (terminals and landside facilities). Conditions will continue to deteriorate and become overcrowded:

- Total enplanements at MSP are projected to increase from 15.7 million in 2010 to 20.2 and 23.1 million in 2020 and 2025, respectively.
- Total vehicular trips are estimated to increase from 82,000 in 2010 to 111,000, 129,000 and 145,000 in 2020, 2025, and 2030, respectively.
- Operations have grown and are projected to continue to grow at Terminal-2 Humphrey. As a result, the ability to meet the needs of seasonal charters has deteriorated.
- Concourse E requires refurbishing to be able to accommodate passengers without a decline in the level of service.
- The waiting area for the ticket counter and the baggage claim area at Terminal 1-Lindbergh are crowded and will continue to worsen as passenger levels increase.
- International facilities are unable to meet current peak demand.
- The arrival curb at Terminal 1-Lindbergh is currently overcrowded.
- Commercial vehicle loading spaces will be insufficient in 2020.

- Additional parking will be needed to meet future demand (2020).
- Rental car spaces will be insufficient in 2020.
- Currently there are periods of congestion at the existing I-494 and 34th Avenue South interchange. This congestion is expected to worsen as traffic forecasts increase. In 2020, without any improvements, the interchange will operate at a Level of Service (LOS) F during the AM peak hour.
- Westbound I-494 currently operates at a LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours between TH 77 and 24th Avenue South.
- The south intersection at TH 5 and Post Road will operate at a LOS F in 2020.

The purpose of the proposed project is to accommodate the expected demand such that the level of service is acceptable throughout MSP's facilities (terminal and landside facilities such as gates, security checkpoints, parking lots, roadways, etc.) under both existing and 2020 conditions and regional roadways under 2030 conditions. MSP's airfield is sufficient to handle the current and future forecasted operations. The Proposed Action does not include any changes to airfield facilities (runways, taxiways, etc.). In addition, the Proposed Action will not result in an increase in operations. The forecasted growth in operations will occur regardless of which alternative is selected.

III. Alternatives Considered

The EA identified and evaluated all reasonable alternatives in Chapter 3.

- **Alternatives Examined but Eliminated from Detailed Study**
  The EA considered numerous alternatives that were eventually discarded.
  - **Off-Site Alternatives**
    - The evaluation of off-site alternatives included the consideration of the use of other airports as well as other modes of transportation.
      - **Other Airports**
        The ability to divert passengers to other airports as a means of eliminating the need for improvements at MSP was considered. Even if other airports were able to capture 100 percent of their local markets, the need for MSP terminal and landside improvements would only be delayed, not resolved. Therefore, it was concluded that the use of other airports would not meet the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action and were eliminated from further consideration. The Minnesota legislature made the decision in 1996 to keep and expand the airport in its current location, thus narrowing the options for MAC. In addition, MSP has adequate airfield capacity beyond the 20-year planning horizon. Therefore, it was concluded that the use of other airports would not meet the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action and were eliminated from further review. See Appendix B for more information on the use of other airports.
      - **Competing Connecting Hub**
        The development of another airport into a competing connecting hub would provide the best opportunity to alleviate the need for improvements at MSP. The markets for alternative airports were found to be too small to be considered viable candidates for a connecting airline hub. In addition, the airline industry trend has been to reduce and consolidate hubs rather than to expand into new markets or

develop new hubs. Even if an airline would be willing to establish a competing connecting hub at another airport in Minnesota, the need for the Proposed Action would only be delayed.

- **Low Cost Carrier Supplemental Airport**
  Low cost carrier behavior was examined to determine the possibility of a low cost airline to provide service at another airport. In recent years, low cost carriers have started to add service at major metropolitan area airports while reducing service at supplemental/secondary airports. Therefore, the possibility of a low cost carrier moving to another airport is low. Even if a low cost carrier would consider moving to another airport, the need for the Proposed Action would only be delayed.

- **Other Modes of Transportation**
  Alternatives involving travel modes other than aviation were also considered. Among the other modes considered (automobile, bus, and rail), high-speed rail has the highest potential to divert passengers from air travel and therefore, was the focus of the alternatives considered. These alternatives will not meet the Purpose and Need and were eliminated from further study.

  - **Twin Cities to Madison/Milwaukee/Chicago High Speed Rail**
    The Twin Cities to Madison/Milwaukee/Chicago corridor is part of the proposed Midwest Regional Rail System. The planning process for the corridor between the Twin Cities and Madison/Milwaukee began in 2010 with the initiation of an EIS. Two factors were considered in estimating the number of passengers that could be diverted from air travel to high speed rail: (1) how trip distance influences transportation mode selection and (2) the likelihood of connecting passengers to use alternate transportation. Using these factors, it was determined that the diversion of air travelers to high speed rail would only delay the need for the Proposed Action and would not resolve the identified needs.

  - **Northern Lights Express**
    The Northern Lights Express Passenger Rail is a proposed high speed rail line that would provide service between the Twin Cities and Duluth. The diversion of air travelers to the Northern Lights Express would have little or no effect on the identified needs at MSP.

  - **Zip Rail**
    Zip Rail is the name of the proposed high speed rail line between the Twin Cities and Rochester. The diversion of air travelers to the Zip Rail would have little or no effect on the identified needs at MSP.

- **On-Site Alternatives - New Terminal**
  The MSP 2020 Concept Plan, from the 1998 Dual Track Final EIS, included the construction of a new terminal on the west side of MSP. Changes in the airline industry and at MSP since the creation of the MSP 2020 Concept Plan have impacted the feasibility of constructing a west side terminal. In addition, the investment needed to develop a new west side terminal (roadways, parking facilities, underground hub tram, etc) would be markedly greater than expanding the existing facilities. For these reasons, this alternative was eliminated.

- **Alternatives Examined in Detail**
  The following alternatives were carried forward for review in the EA.

DRAFT

- **Airlines Remain (Alternative 1)**
  The Airlines Remain Alternative includes improvements needed through 2020 with the airlines remaining in their current terminals. This Alternative also includes regional roadway improvements through 2030. The improvements included with this alternative are listed in Table 3.2.1 in the Final EA, which has been included with this finding in Attachment B. The Final EA provides a detailed description of this alternative on pages 3-7 to 3-21.
- **Airlines Relocate (Alternative 2)**
  The Airlines Relocate Alternative includes improvements needed through 2020 for aviation projects and regional roadway improvements through 2030 with the non-Sky Team airlines relocating from Terminal 1 to Terminal 2. This alternative was developed during the Long Term Comprehensive Plan update when it was determined that the two terminal system could be used more efficiently. Table 3.2.2 provides a list of the improvements included with this alternative, which may be found in the Final EA and with Attachment B of this finding. The Final EA provides a detailed description of this alternative on pages 3-21 to 3-38.
- **No Action Alternative**
  The No Action alternative includes basic maintenance and routine activities but does not include any improvements to address the identified needs. The No Action Alternative includes natural growth that is projected to occur at MSP, with or without the project. This alternative represents a reasonable estimate of how MSP and the airlines would attempt to accommodate demand if the Proposed Action does not proceed. It also provides a baseline to determine the impacts of the alternatives.

- **MAC's Preferred Alternative - Airlines Relocate (Alternative 2)**
  The MAC selected the Airlines Relocate as its preferred alternative. This alternative improves customer service both during and after construction and provides sufficient facilities for future growth beyond 2020.

IV. Proposed Action

After careful analysis and consultation with various resource agencies, the MAC selected Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative. This alternative satisfies the purpose and need for the project while minimizing impacts. The No Action alternative does not meet the purpose and need but is included as a baseline of comparison for environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action does not include approval for Performance Based Navigation (PBN). PBN is a separate project being completed by the FAA Air Traffic Organization. However, the noise impact of partial implementation of PBN consistent with the MAC's recommendation is disclosed in the cumulative impact section of the Final EA. In addition, the Proposed Action does not include any changes to airfield facilities (runways, taxiways, etc.) nor will the Proposed Action result in an increase in operations. The forecasted growth in operations will occur regardless of which alternative is selected.

The Proposed Action includes the following:

- Terminal 1-Lindbergh Improvements
  - Expand and remodel Concourse G
  - Construct a new international facility

- Install a new Concourse G tram
- Remodel and reconfigure terminal lobby
- Reconfigure and expand baggage claim area
- Remodel Concourse E
- Expand terminal arrivals curb and relocate commercial ground transportation center
- Construct a new parking ramp
- Relocate portions of Glumack Drive
- Extend underground hub tram tunnel
- Add dual lane exits to the outbound ramps from Glumack Drive to Trunk Highway 5 (post 2020)
- Relocate Runway 30L deicing pad
- Relocate airfield service road
- Extend Aircraft Operations Area tunnel and A Street
- Relocate Concourse G Fuel Main Line

- Terminal 2-Humphrey Improvements
  - Expand terminal
  - Expand terminal curb
  - Expand existing and construct new parking ramps
  - Expand terminal apron
  - Construct remain overnight aircraft apron
  - Construct new taxiway
  - Demolish Building F
  - Relocate run-up pad
  - Demolish and relocate Delta Air Lines flight kitchen
  - Relocate ground support equipment facility
  - Reconstruct 34th Avenue South interchange at I-494
  - Add lane to Northbound 34th Avenue South
  - Improve intersection of East 72nd Street and 34th Avenue South
  - Reconfigure the intersections of 34th Avenue South/East 70th Street and Humphrey Drive/East 70th Street
  - Reconfigure East 70th Street
  - Construct a new Trunk Highway 5 and Post Road Interchange
  - Remove existing and construct a new bridge over Trunk Highway 5
  - Realign Post Road and Northwest Drive
  - Relocate the intersection of Northwest Drive and Post Road

DRAFT

- Relocate SuperAmerica
- Close taxi cab staging lot and accommodate displaced taxi cabs
- Construct a dual lane exist from eastbound I-494 to 34th Avenue South
- Construct a dual lane exist from westbound I-494 to 24th Avenue South
- Construct auxiliary lane improvement on westbound I-494 between 24th Avenue South and the exit to southbound Trunk Highway 77
- Construct a bridge braid for 34th Avenue South entrance ramp to westbound I-494 and exit ramp to 24th Avenue South from westbound I-494 (post 2020)
- Additional expansion of the 34th Avenue South interchange at I-494 (post 2020)

V. Environmental Consequences

Environmental impact categories identified in FAA Order 1050.1E and FAA Order 5050.4B were evaluated in the attached EA. Environmental consequences of the No Action alternative, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are detailed in Chapter 5 of the EA.

Given the location and nature of the Proposed Action, impacts to the following environmental resource and impact categories do not occur:

- Coastal Resources
- Farmlands
- Floodplains
- Secondary (Induced) Impacts
- Wetlands
- Wild and Scenic Rivers

The EA discusses the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action, which include:

- Air Quality
  Hennepin County, including the area surrounding MSP, is currently designated as attainment for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) except for carbon monoxide (CO). Hennepin County is designated as a CO maintenance area. This designation signifies that violations of NAAQS for CO have occurred in the past but that the area is currently in attainment. CO concentrations for all three alternatives are below the NAAQS de minimis levels.

  The differences in emissions between alternatives are minimal. A General Conformity Determination is not required. The I-494 and 34th Avenue interchange improvement is listed in the Metropolitan Council's 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. When funding for the other roadway improvements becomes available, the MAC will request that the improvements are included in the updated TIP. The Mobile Source Air Toxic emissions are not expected to differ substantially between alternatives and no impacts are anticipated.

  The Proposed Action will not result in a significant impact to air quality.

DRAFT

- Climate
  The difference in greenhouse gas emissions between alternatives is minimal (less than 1% difference when comparing the No Action to either action alternative). Therefore, the Proposed Action will not result in a significant impact.

- Compatible Land Use
  There is minor difference (less than 2%) between the 65 DNL contours for the action alternatives compared to the No Action Alternative. The number of noise sensitive land uses within the 65 DNL contour varies slightly between the alternatives. For 2020, there are 2162 residential units within the 65+ DNL contours and 10236 residential units within the 60-64 DNL contour for the No Action Alternative; 2172 within the 65+ DNL and 10257 within the 60-64 DNL for Alternative 1; and 2166 within the 65+ DNL and 10106 within the 60-64 DNL for Alternative 2. All residential land uses within the 65+ DNL for both action alternatives in 2020 and 2025 have been provided mitigation and are considered a mitigated incompatible land use. The Proposed Action was therefore found to be compatible with surrounding land uses.

- Construction Impacts
  Implementation of the Proposed Action requires construction, which may create unavoidable temporary impacts. Construction related emissions would be within the de minimis levels. There are no anticipated changes to aircraft noise during construction as the runway use is not expected to change. The use of construction equipment with elevated noise levels (pile drivers, jack hammers, etc.) will be prohibited during nighttime hours to the extent possible. Best management practices will be included with the Proposed Action to protect against temporary water quality impacts. All contaminated soil, asbestos-containing material and other regulated materials will be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. A temporary traffic control plan will be developed to maintain traffic flow during construction. Based on these considerations, the Proposed Action will not result in significant construction impacts.

- DOT Section 4(f)
  The Proposed Action may impact a potential archaeological resource during the construction of the Trunk Highway 5 and Post Road interchange improvements. Additional studies to determine if archaeological resources are present will be conducted after the completion of the Final EA when detailed design is available. If the site is found to contain cultural resources and is found to warrant preservation in place, the site may be protected under Section 4(f). It is not expected that the site will be found to warrant preservation in place. However, if it is determined that the archaeological resources should be preserved in place, a Section 4(f) evaluation would be completed as required.

  The proposed work at the Trunk Highway 5 and Post Road interchange may impact the park entrance to the Fort Snelling State Park, a Section 4(f) resource. Coordination with the Minnesota Department of Resources will be conducted prior to construction to ensure safe vehicular access for park visitors during construction. As a result, it is concluded that construction would not impair the use of Fort Snelling Sate Park.

  The FAA has determined that a Section 4(f) evaluation is not warranted at this time. If the Proposed Action will result in any impacts to Section 4(f) resources, a Section 4(f) evaluation will be completed prior to any construction activities.

DRAFT

- Fish, Wildlife and Plants
  No federal or state listed species, critical habitat, natural plant communities or other natural features were reported in or adjacent to the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action generally consists of proposed improvements in previous disturbed areas. Therefore impacts to biotic resources will be negligible.

  In response to comments received from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), potential impacts to bald eagles and aquatic species were determined. There were no bald eagle nests identified within the Proposed Action area. However, new nests could be built prior to construction. Therefore, USFWS guidelines to avoid disturbing nesting bald eagles will be implemented during construction. The Proposed Action will have little impact on the quantity or quality of runoff to the Minnesota River. Therefore, the Proposed Action will not impact downstream aquatic invertebrate or vertebrates.

- Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste
  Hazardous materials will be encountered during construction. All contaminated soil, asbestos containing material and other regulated materials will be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. The Proposed Action will not impact a site on the National Priority List. Therefore, the Proposed Action will not impact or generate hazardous materials.

  The Proposed Action includes steps to prevent the creation of pollution. In addition, implementation of the Proposed Action will not increase the amount of post-construction solid waste generated.

- Historical, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources
  The only resource that has the potential to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) is the potential archaeological site located by the Trunk Highway 5 and Post Road interchange. Detailed design to determine the limits of construction and additional studies are needed to determine if the Proposed Action will impact this potential resource. However, detailed design will not be completed until after the completion of this EA. Therefore, the Proposed Action was broken into two separate phases to allow portions of the project to move forward while still meeting the requirements of NEPA.

  Phase I includes the entire project area except for the area around the Trunk Highway 5 and Post Road intersection. Phase II includes the Trunk Highway 5 and Post Road intersection as well as all associated work. Each phase will be considered separate undertakings for the purposes of Section 106. Each phase will conclude with its own Section 106 finding.

  The reconnaissance assessment and archaeological assessment did not identify any resources listed on or eligible for listing on the NRHP for Phase I. Therefore, the FAA issued a No Historic Properties Affected finding on August 24, 2012 and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred (in a letter dated October 3, 2012). Please see Appendix F for more information.

  The finding for Phase II of the Proposed Action will be issued after the EA is complete. However, the FAA and the MAC will have flexibility to consider alternatives outside the Proposed Action included in this EA to avoid or minimize impacts. If an alternative is selected that is different from what was included in this FONSI/ROD, the FAA and the MAC will complete additional work, as required, to comply with NEPA.

DRAFT

- Light Emissions and Visual Effects
  Lighting that would create an annoyance or interfere with normal activities is not included with the Proposed Action. In addition, the Proposed Action will not result in any visual impacts.
- Natural Resources and Energy Supply
  With the exception of electrical consumption, the Proposed Action would not impact energy consumption. The Proposed Action will increase electrical consumption by approximately 23% compared to the No Action Alternative. However, the increased electrical consumption is not anticipated to exceed supply. No unusual materials or those in short supply would be used to construct the Proposed Action.
- Aircraft Noise
  There are no areas of sensitive land uses that will experience a 1.5 decibel (dB), or greater, increase within the 65+DNL noise contour when comparing the 2020 and 2025 Proposed Action and No Action Alternative. Changes in decibels between the alternatives are -0.2 to 0.3 for 2020 and -0.4 to 0.6 for 2025.

  For 2020, there are 2162 residential units within the 65+ DNL contours and 10236 within the 60-64 DNL contour for the No Action Alternative; 2172 residential units within the 65+ DNL and 10257 within the 60-64 DNL for Alternative 1; and 2166 residential units within the 65+ DNL and 10106 within the 60-64 DNL for Alternative 2.

  For 2025, there are 2742 residential unit within the 65+ DNL contours and 11396 with the 60-64 DNL contour for the No Action Alternative; 2661 residential units within the 65+ DNL contour and 11410 within the 60-64 DNL contour for Alternative 1; and 2832 residential units within the 65+ DNL contour and 11873 within the 60-64 DNL contour for Alternative 2.

  While not part of this project, the cumulative impact discussion disclosed the partial implementation of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) consistent with the general support expressed by MAC. This information can be found in the cumulative impact discussion below.

  The minor differences between alternatives are attributed to FAA air traffic control procedures during low-demand time periods in conjunction with the Runway Use System and the different geographic locations of new gate additions. All residences within the 65+ DNL contours have been provided noise mitigation.
- Vehicular Noise
  There was no change in the number of modeled receptors that approach or exceed state standard or federal noise abatement criteria under the 2030 Proposed Action when compared to the 2030 No Action Alternative. None of the modeled receptor locations are projected to experience a substantial increase in traffic noise levels from existing conditions to the Proposed Action.
- Socioeconomic Impacts
  The Proposed Action does not require any residential relocation. It will require the SuperAmerica located at Trunk Highway 5 and Post Road to be relocated to the south of its current location. The relocation will not result in a socioeconomic impact since the business will be replaced instead of removed. The Proposed Action includes construction within airport property or within existing road right-of-way and will therefore not result in division of communities or disruption of planned development.

DRAFT

Both on and off airport ground transportation facilities were evaluated to determine potential impacts to circulation and traffic. The Proposed Action will not result in any impact to on-airport ground transportation facilities. The Proposed Action will result in off-airport facilities operating significantly better than the No Action Alternative.

- Environmental Justice/Children's Health and Safety
  The Proposed Action will not result in any impacts that exceed the threshold of significance for any of the impact categories. Therefore, the Proposed Action will not disproportionately impact minority and/or low-income populations nor children's environmental health or safety risks.

- Water Quality
  The Proposed Action will have negligible impacts on the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff discharged to the Minnesota River. In addition, the Proposed Action will comply with the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and meet the construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and Lower Minnesota River Watershed District permit requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Action will not impact surface water.

  The potential for groundwater impacts from fueling and aircraft deicing activities will be similar for all alternatives carried forward because operations do not vary between alternatives. Therefore, the Proposed Action, when compared to the No Action Alternative, will not result in an impact to groundwater quality.

- Cumulative Effects
  The impacts associated with the Proposed Action are minor. No single impact, even when considered with past, present and future actions, represent a significant impact that cannot be mitigated.

  While not part of this project, the cumulative impact discussion disclosed the future noise contours with the proposed partial implementation of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) consistent with the general support expressed by MAC. For 2020, there are 2166 residential units within the 65+ DNL contours and 10236 within the 60-64 DNL contour for the No Action Alternative; 2175 residential units within the 65+ DNL and 10258 within the 60-64 DNL for Alternative 1; and 2170 residential units within the 65+ DNL and 10109 within the 60-64 DNL for Alternative 2.

  For 2025, there are 2748 residential unit within the 65+ DNL contours and 11344 with the 60-64 DNL contour for the No Action Alternative; 2668 residential units within the 65+ DNL contour and 11328 within the 60-64 DNL contour for Alternative 1; and 2835 residential units within the 65+ DNL contour and 11844 within the 60-64 DNL contour for Alternative 2.

  There are no areas of sensitive land uses that experience a 1.5 dB, or greater, increase in the 65 DNL noise contour when comparing the 2020 and 2025 Airlines Remain Alternative with RNAV/RNP contours to the respective No Action Alternative with PBN DNL noise contours. Therefore, the FAA's impact threshold of significance is not exceeded.
  The Proposed Action will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts.

DRAFT

VI. Mitigation

The Airport has committed to the following mitigation measures as a part of the Proposed Action listed in this draft FONSI/ROD:

- Obtain any necessary permits prior to beginning construction.
- Section 106 requirements for Phase II will begin once detailed design is completed and before any construction begins in the Area of Potential Effect for Phase II. If archaeological resources are identified and are found to warrant preservation in place the requirements of Section 4(f) will also be fulfilled.
- USFWS guidelines to avoid disturbing nesting bald eagles will be implemented during construction.
- Contaminated soil, asbestos containing material and other regulated materials will be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations.
- Excavated material will be managed in accordance with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency approved Soil Management Plan for MAC projects.
- Include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize construction impacts. Construction documents will identify specific control methods to minimize impacts. The Airport will consider residential areas when identifying haul routes and construction activity hours. Construction will comply with the most current version of the FAA AC 150/5370-2 (*Operational Safety on Airports during Construction)* and AC 150/5370-10 (*Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports)*.
- Design any storm water retention/detention ponds in accordance with FAA AC 150/5200-33B (*Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or near Airports).*
- During construction, in the event that previously unknown contaminants are discovered or if a reportable spill occurs, work shall cease until the Airport notifies appropriate local, state, and Federal agencies including the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.
- All work shall cease upon the discovery of any cultural resources during construction until the Airport notifies the State Historic Preservation Office and the FAA. The Airport shall protect the area until cultural resource concerns have been addressed appropriately and the Airport shall take action to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, as appropriate.
- If endangered species are sighted during construction, work shall cease in the immediate area of the endangered species and all sightings shall be reported to the US Fish and Wildlife Services, the Department of Natural Resources, and the FAA.

VII. Public Review and Comment

Public involvement is a vital component of the NEPA process. Public and agency coordination was conducted throughout the NEPA process (Chapter 6 of the Final EA). Early coordination letter were sent to a variety of resource agencies. The MAC also held Community Briefing meetings for community officials to discuss the proposed improvements and the EA process. In addition, the MSP Noise Oversight Committee was involved during the development of the EA and agreed to disseminate information related to the Draft EA via the MSP Noise News newsletter, the MAC website, and two public open houses in July

2011. Another open house was held in January 2012 to share the results of the Draft EA analysis with the public.

The Draft EA was released for agency and public review on August 30, 2012. To facilitate submittal of comments, the MAC conducted open houses on September 17th, 18th and October 1st. The open house on October 1st preceded the public hearing on the same date. Agency and public comments received during the comment period (August 30 – October 11, 2012) were considered in the development of the Final EA. Responses to all verbal and written comments are provided in Appendix R of the Final EA.

VIII. Other Issues

Since November 2010, the FAA has been working to develop PBN procedures and plan for implementation. The FAA along with representatives from various airlines, airport users, support contractors, and the MAC developed the PBN procedures. The PBN procedures were presented to the MAC Commission at its November 19, 2012 meeting. The MAC Commission recommended partial implementation of the PBN procedures (recommended PBN procedures for all runways except for Runways 30L and 30R). The FAA Air Traffic Organization is currently reviewing the MAC's recommendation and is in the process of evaluating the recommended procedures.

The proposed PBN procedures are not part of the Proposed Action included in the MSP 2020 Improvement Project Final EA. The PBN procedures have independent utility and are being evaluated in a separate FAA environmental review. Therefore, the cumulative impact discussion has been updated to include the proposed partial PBN procedures to provide a more accurate representation of potential future conditions.

The proposed project does not cause any increases in noise within DNL 65 dB noise levels or newly expose any individuals to DNL 65 dB noise levels. No areas of sensitive land uses would experience a 1.5 dB or greater increase in the 65 DNL noise contour when comparing the No Action Alternative for 2020 and 2025 with either of the action alternatives, Airlines Remain and the Airlines Relocate Alternative for the respective years. However, in the Draft EA/EAW, MAC proposed noise mitigation for homes within the 60-64 DNL contour that are unrelated to the proposed project. MAC's proposal would effectively update and carry forward the mitigation provisions of the 2007 Consent Decree to include or provide enhanced mitigation to homes that are newly exposed 60 DNL or above based on the 2020 forecast noise contours in the Draft EA. The FAA is reviewing MAC's proposal for noise mitigation of homes for consistency with the 1999 FAA Policy and Procedures concerning the use of airport revenue and other applicable policy guidance.

DRAFT

IX. Finding

The FAA conducted an independent review of the factual assumptions contained in the EA and determined the adequacy of the EA and takes responsibility for the document's scope and content. Individuals from the FAA have devoted substantial attention to the EA in order to insure compliance with NEPA, and other environmental requirements. Accordingly, I find that the independent and objective evaluation called for by the CEQ has been provided. The FAA has given this proposal the independent and objective evaluation required by CEQ (40 CFR 1506.5).

After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained herein, I find that the proposed Federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives of Section 101(a) of NEPA and other applicable environmental requirements. The proposed Federal action will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of NEPA.

Therefore, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the FAA, I find that the proposed airport improvement projects described and evaluated in the EA and addressed in this FONSI/ROD are reasonably supported and approved. I direct that action be taken to carry out the following agency actions:

- Unconditional approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) for the Sponsor's Proposed Action for the development listed above.
- Issue final airspace determinations for the development listed above.
- Eligibility for Federal grant-in-aid funds and/or Passenger Facility Charges (PFC) for eligible items

Having met all relevant requirements for environmental considerations and consultation, the proposed action is authorized to be taken when other requirements have been met. These decisions are taken pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 40101, et seq. The FAA findings regarding the proposed airport improvements, and any necessary funding, for the Minneapolis-St Paul International Airport, constitute an order of the Administrator, which is subject to review by the Courts of Appeals of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of Section 1006 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 49 U.S.C. § 46110.

Finally, having based upon the administrative review of this project, I certify, as prescribed by 49 U.S.C. § 44502(b) that implementation of the Proposed Action is reasonable necessary for use in air commerce.

APPROVED: _____

DISAPPROVED: _____

_____
Manager
Federal Aviation Administration
Minneapolis Airports District Office

DATE: _____

DRAFT

RIGHT OF APPEAL

This FONSI/ROD present the Federal Aviation Administration's final decision and approvals for the actions identified, including those taken under provisions of 49 USC Subtitle VII, Parts A and B. This decision constitutes a final order of the Administrator subject to review by the Courts of Appeals of the United States in accordance with the provisions of Section 1006 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 49 U.S.C. § 46110.

DRAFT