

Chapter 5

Environmental Consequences and Mitigation

This Chapter provides a summary of the impacts of the two alternatives under analysis, Alternative 1 (No Action), and Alternative 3 (Preferred Alternative), for each of the environmental elements described in the previous chapter. In some cases, the impacts may be short-term, generally associated with construction activity, or they may be long-term, associated with the new facilities or the operation of the improved airport. In some cases, there may be no impact. Where applicable, the reader may be referred to an appendix containing a topic-specific report that provides greater detail.

5.1 Air Quality

5.1.1 Regulatory Setting

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has adopted air quality standards that specify the maximum permissible short-term and long-term concentrations of air contaminants. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) consist of a primary and secondary standard for each pollutant. Air quality standards are the levels established to protect the public health and welfare from harm within a margin of safety. All areas of the country are required to demonstrate attainment with the NAAQS.

FAA Order 1050.1E (change 1) *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* identifies the analysis requirements for air quality. That approach relies on the FAA's *Air Quality Procedures for Civilian Airports and Air Force* to provide guidance concerning the breadth of air quality review required under NEPA. That document indicates:

... not all of the steps are required for every action. Many projects at airports and air bases are too small to require detailed air quality analysis and only a few projects are both broad enough in scope and located in nonattainment or maintenance areas such that the full complement of analyses described in this handbook would be required. Screening techniques that streamline the process for many air quality assessment actions are available... (Page 7)

Actions that would not increase airport capacity, lead to increased congestion of roadways or airfields, or relocate aircraft or vehicular activity closer to sensitive receptors are not likely to exceed the NAAQS for CO. For deciding whether a NAAQS assessment should be considered, the total number of airport passengers and general aviation/air taxi operations should be evaluated. If the level of annual enplanements exceeds 1,300,000 (or 2.6 MAP), the level of general aviation and air taxi activity exceeds 180,000 operations per year or a combination thereof, a NAAQS assessment should be considered. Forecasts prepared for the Airport show

56,498 operations in 2006 (the base year) and 98,405 forecasted operations in 2025, which is far below the NAAQS threshold.

5.1.2 Analysis

As noted in prior sections of this EA, the proposed action would not alter the number of aircraft operations serving the McCall Airport, as the proposed action is relocating an existing taxiway. Additionally, aircraft taxi patterns would not be altered with the proposed project and aircraft emissions are not anticipated to increase appreciably due to the longer taxiway connectors.

Construction equipment will be used during the taxiway relocation, although this would be a temporary, construction-related impact.

5.1.2.1 No Action Alternative

With the No Action, the proposed project would not be undertaken. Therefore, no project-related construction would occur and there would be no construction emissions.

5.1.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative does not increase airport capacity, nor does it alter the fleet mix of aircraft using the Airport. It does not significantly increase on-Airport travel distance or time, such that aircraft emissions would increase. No long-term air quality impacts are anticipated from implementing the Preferred Alternative.

5.1.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is required, as the proposed projects do not result in an increase of emissions.

5.2 Biotic Resources

5.2.1 Regulatory Setting

According to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 1050.1E Chg 1, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, a project would have significant impacts on biotic communities when analysis or consultation with agencies having jurisdiction over or special expertise with regard to a non-listed species indicates that a project would have a substantial adverse effect on such species. This could include substantial effects on reproductive success rates, natural or non-natural mortality rates, and the ability of a species to maintain adequate population levels. According to FAA Order 1050.1E, a project would have significant impacts on biotic communities when:

- input from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that substantial, project-induced damage to wildlife cannot be mitigated to minimal levels; or,
- analysis indicates that project implementation would result in the loss of a substantial amount of habitat, of habitat that supports rare species, or of small amounts of sensitive habitat with a significant accompanying loss of plant communities and

displacement of wildlife when these adverse impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitat cannot be mitigated to the satisfaction of the resource agencies.

5.2.2 Analysis

A *Biological Evaluation* was conducted for the project. Vegetative communities were mostly species of non-natives and typical of highly disturbed, grazed open fields and pastures. Both Federal and State officials were contacted for a list of species potentially impacted by the project.

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game provided a list of “Species of Greatest Conservation Need” that have been reported to occur within a five mile radius of the McCall airport. Based on the lack of presence, lack of suitable habitat, or impacts to nesting/feeding grounds, there should be no impacts to: a spur-throat grasshopper, black-backed woodpecker, blue grosbeak, Columbia spotted frog, common loon, flammulated owl, Gillette's checkerspot, merlin, northern goshawk, pristine pyrg, pygmy nuthatch, shiny tightcoil, thinlip tightcoil, upland sandpiper, or white-headed woodpecker. Based on this information, the *Biological Evaluation* determined there would be no potential for disturbance of bird habitat or nesting/feeding grounds, per the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Potential impacts to the following species were identified, and ultimately dismissed as reported below:

- **Bald eagle** - Wintering bald eagles are commonly observed in the area from late October to mid-March to perch and feed along the banks of the river and near the lakes, however, construction for the airport improvements is not scheduled to take place during these months—thus there will be no impacts to bald eagle wintering habits as a result of the project. No nest sites or potential roosting, or nesting trees will be affected by the project. Since the improvements bring the airport into FAA “compliance”, the relocated taxiway does not necessarily allow for a greater amount of air traffic or larger aircraft—thus impacts to bald eagles as a result of the project should not change from impacts already present.
- **Great gray owls** – This species is known to frequent the area and have been sighted in open field areas east of the airport. However, the taxiway construction should not affect the owls or their potential nesting sites. There is always the potential that airplane/bird strikes could occur. However, the owls are largely nocturnal and day use of the new taxiway should not adversely affect their use of the field areas. Thus, there will be no impacts to great gray owls. Since the improvements bring the airport into FAA “compliance”, the relocated taxiway does not necessarily allow for a greater amount of air traffic or larger aircraft—thus impacts to great gray owls as a result of the project should not change from impacts already present.
- **Mountain quail** - Mountain Quail have been documented in the areas west of the taxiway - their preferred habitat use, however, appears to be in shrubs areas (which are

present west of the airport, but not east where the proposed taxiway is proposed to be constructed. Thus, there will be no impacts to mountain quail.

- **Western toads** - Western toads are known to utilize both upland and wetland areas. There are wetland areas south and east of the existing taxiway that could potentially be habitat for this species. Any wetland habitat impacted by the taxiway will be reconstructed and/or mitigated in some manner to offset the potential loss of habitat for this species. Thus, there will be no impacts to western toads.

5.2.2.1 No Action Alternative

There would be no change to the habitat types found on and around the airport, other than continued maintenance.

5.2.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The *Biological Evaluation* concluded the Preferred Alternative would have no impact to vegetative communities. The Western toad has the potential for habitat loss; however, any wetland habitat impacted will be mitigated off-site.

5.2.3 Mitigation

As the potential habitat loss to the Western toad does not exceed a threshold of significance, no mitigation is required. However, the wetland mitigation, described later in this chapter, will serve as a best management practice for the Western toad.

5.3 Compatible Land Use

5.3.1 Regulatory Setting

Order 1050.1E Chg 1 states, “the compatibility of existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of an airport is usually associated with the extent of the airport’s noise impacts.” In addition, if a project would result in other significant impacts having land use implications, the effects on land use may be described under the appropriate impact sections, with cross-referencing as necessary to avoid duplication.

5.3.2 Analysis

Airport noise level projections were performed using the FAA Integrated Noise Model (INM) in the 2007 Master Plan. The FAA’s INM is widely used by the civilian aviation community for evaluating aircraft noise impacts near airports. INM is an average-value model and is designed to estimate long-term effects using average annual input conditions.

The Master Plan concluded the 65 dBA DNL extends off airport property to the north, south, and west. To the north the zoning is community commercial, Civic, and Low Density Residential; to

the south it is Rural Residential; and to the west it is Industrial, Civic, and Medium Density Residential.

5.3.2.1 No Action Alternative

The no action alternative would maintain noise at its current level. Aircraft noise will increase slightly over time, as operations are forecasted to increase modestly in the next 20 years.

5.3.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative will not alter the noise levels from the No Action Alternative level. Aircraft noise while taxiing to and from the runway will shift slightly east – concurrent with the taxiway relocation – however, it will be negligible, as land adjacent to the relocated taxiway is either vacant or in airport-related use (a compatible land use).

5.3.3 Mitigation

No mitigation measures are proposed, as the noise increases are not significant according to according to FAA criteria (an increase of 1.5 dBA or more above the 65 dBA noise exposure line).

5.4 Construction

5.4.1 Regulatory Setting

All construction would be conducted in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-10A, *Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports*, Item P156, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion, and Siltation Control (FAA, 1991). Additionally, the City of McCall would obtain authorization under the US Army Corps of Engineers for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit (1200-C) and prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control stormwater runoff and obtain an air quality permit for land clearing/earthmoving activities.

5.4.2 Analysis

The No Action Alternative includes minimal construction and minor maintenance activities over a 20-year timeframe. The Preferred Alternative would be built over two construction seasons in accordance with funding availability.

The construction impacts of the project will predominantly be temporary, resulting from activities that are necessary to meet the project's purpose and need.

5.4.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would have minimal construction impacts, as no construction would take place. Over a 20-year timeframe, minor maintenance activities, such as re-

paving the taxiway surface may occur. These actions would be contained on the existing airport footprint.

5.4.2.2 Preferred Alternative

Specific effects during construction, which may create adverse environmental impacts, include noise of construction equipment on the site; and noise and dust from delivery of materials and transport of construction equipment to the site. The impacts of the project will predominantly be temporary, resulting from activities that are necessary to meet current standards.

No construction related impacts are anticipated for Compatible Land Use, Section 4(f) Resources, Environmental Justice, Farmlands, Federally Listed Endangered and Threatened Species, Induced / Secondary Socioeconomic, and Social.

5.4.2.2.1 Air Quality Impacts

Earthmoving activities, such as those for grading the new taxiway location and removing existing taxiway pavement, create the potential for particulate matter. Construction specifications will include requirements for best management practices to be used for dust suppression including dust removal from equipment and construction site watering. Upon completion of construction, unpaved areas will be seeded in grass or grass-type vegetation to provide soil stabilization.

5.4.2.2.2 Biotic Resources

As stated above, any wetland habitat impacted by the taxiway relocation has the habitat potential for the western toad. Wetlands impacted by the project will be mitigated off-site to offset the potential loss of habitat for this species, so there will be no impacts to the western toad.

5.4.2.2.3 Energy Supplies, Natural Resources, and Sustainable Design

Construction impacts on energy supplies, natural resources and sustainable design would be limited to sand gravel and asphalt. These resources are not in short supply and the project would not create an undue burden.

5.4.2.2.4 Hazardous Materials

Any time construction occurs; there is a risk that fuel, lubricants or other potentially hazardous materials may be accidentally spilled. The contractor will be required to have a spill prevention and pollution control (SPPC) plan in place, as well as maintain a supply of absorbent materials on-site in the event a spill occurs.

5.4.2.2.5 Historical, Architectural, and Cultural Resources, including Native American and Tribal Resources

The Cultural Resources Report (Appendix G), and subsequent consultation with the potentially affected tribes, suggest that resources are not likely to be present in the project work area. There is a remote possibility that during the earthwork phases, resources may be uncovered.

If any archaeological or historic materials are encountered during construction, work will stop and the State and Tribal historic offices will be contacted. If materials that are considered sensitive materials are found the City and the contractor, will:

- Implement reasonable measures to protect the discovery site, including any appropriate stabilization or covering;
- Take reasonable steps to ensure the confidentiality of the discovery site; and,
- Take reasonable steps to restrict access to the site of discovery.

5.4.2.2.6 Light Emissions and Visual Effects

During the construction process, the view of the area will change temporarily. Construction equipment and material stockpiles will be visible. These may include earth (fill), sand, gravel and recycled pavement from the existing taxiway.

5.4.2.2.7 Noise

Construction will add to the background noise in the project area. Limiting construction to daylight hours, and noise suppression equipment on construction machinery will be required to minimize noise impacts.

5.4.2.2.8 Solid Waste

Removal of the existing taxiway will generate solid waste. Pavement material may be recycled into the new taxiway. Other construction-related waste material may include other temporary structures; food and packaging waste from construction workers; and containers from oil, lubricants and other materials used in construction. Some of these materials may be recycled by the contractor on future projects. The contractor will be required to provide a collection area for non-recyclable waste and arrange for its removal as appropriate.

5.4.2.2.9 Water Quality

The Preferred Alternative will expose large areas of bare ground. This has the potential to create erosion. The project will require a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) 1200C Construction Stormwater Permit and be required to implement erosion control methods per the permit conditions. The NPDES 1200C Permit focuses on preventing pollution from erosion and runoff. In addition, the permit requires permittees to inspect and maintain their controls to ensure they are

working properly to prevent erosion and sediment runoff from leaving the site. Other Best Management Practices (BMPs) will also be required, per FAA Order 1050.1E.

Additional construction-related water quality impacts may occur from spills, as discussed above in Hazardous Materials.

5.4.2.2.10 Wetlands

The project will involve 1.39 acres of impacts to jurisdictional wetlands, including ditches and adjacent wet pastures. These impacts will be mitigated off-site, as discussed in following sections. Best management practices, such as use of silt fences, will be implemented to limit impacts to adjacent wetlands.

5.4.3 Mitigation

Specific effects during construction that may create adverse environmental impacts include noise of construction equipment on the site; noise and dust from delivery of materials and transport of construction equipment to the site; and water pollution from erosion and spills. No mitigation is required but minimization and avoidance techniques will be employed.

BMPs for construction impacts include a variety of measures, discussed above, to minimize impacts. In summary, these include:

- Limits on hours of construction
- Requirements for engine mufflers for construction equipment to reduce noise
- SPPC Plan and on-site materials for spill containment and clean up
- Washing earthmoving equipment before it leaves site
- Recycling of pavement and other waste materials where appropriate
- Neighborhood notification and road posting in advance of traffic closures/detours
- Neighborhood notification of tree removal activity, which will occur during the non-nesting period that typically begins after September 1st
- Upon completion of construction, unpaved areas will be seeded in grass or grass-type vegetation to provide soil stabilization
- Federal and State recommended BMPs for erosion control and water quality protection

5.5 Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f) Resources

5.5.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 indicates that a significant impact would occur when the Preferred Alternative involves more than a minimal physical use of the 4(f) property or is deemed a “constructive use” substantially impairing the 4(f) property, and mitigation measures do not eliminate or reduce the effects of the use below the threshold of significance.

5.5.2 Analysis

A review of maps of the local area shows potential resources, three City Parks and one State Park. These parks are north of the Airport, ranging from approximately 1.0 to 2.0 miles from the taxiway. Other noise sensitive areas, such as schools and churches are located around the City of McCall.

The only potential “constructive use” of these properties by the airport is associated with noise.

5.5.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not alter the way airport noise is perceived at these two recreation sites.

5.5.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The noise sensitive areas are sufficiently removed from the Airport such that the improvements will have no effect. The proposed action will not change aircraft operation levels and the taxiway shift will not significantly alter noise perceptions.

5.5.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed, since no Section 4(f) properties will be affected.

5.6 Federally Listed Endangered and Threatened Species

5.6.1 Regulatory Setting

According to FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1, a project would have significant impacts on special status species when the USFWS determines that the proposed action would be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of Federally listed endangered or threatened species, potentially resulting in extinction or extirpation, or would result in the destruction or adverse modification of Federally-designated critical habitat in the affected area.

According to FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1, a project would have significant impacts on special status species when:

- input from the USFWS or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) indicates that listed or proposed to be listed species are present within the area affected by the proposed action, and the biological assessment for the proposed action indicates an adverse effect on endangered or threatened species or on critical habitat;
- input from the USFWS indicates that substantial, project-induced damage to wildlife cannot be mitigated to minimal levels; or,
- analysis indicates that project implementation would result in the loss of a substantial amount of habitat, of habitat that supports rare species, or of small amounts of

sensitive habitat with a significant accompanying loss of plant communities and displacement of wildlife when these adverse impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitat cannot be mitigated to the satisfaction of the resource agencies.

5.6.2 Analysis

A *Biological Evaluation* was conducted for the project. The United State Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) species list for Valley County includes: gray wolf (experimental/non-essential), Northern Idaho ground squirrel; Canada lynx; bull trout, spring/summer chinook salmon; steelhead trout (all threatened [+ designated critical habitat for chinook and steelhead]); and yellow-billed cuckoo (candidate) (14420-2009-SL-0041). However, a project specific request resulted in the identification for potential impacts to only two species: bull trout and the Northern Idaho ground squirrel.

- **Bull trout** - Since there are no streams or creeks in the project area that harbor or could potentially harbor bull trout, there will be no impact on this species
- **Northern Idaho ground squirrel (NIDGS)** - Because modeled NDIGS habitat is present within the vicinity of the project area, field studies for its presence/absence were undertaken by Dr. Yensen (Department of Biology, The College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho) in June 2009, which concluded, “relocation of the taxiway should have no negative impact on northern Idaho ground squirrels.”

5.6.2.1 No Action Alternative

There would be no change to the habitat types found on and around the airport, other than continued maintenance.

5.6.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The *Biological Evaluation* concluded the Preferred Alternative would have no impact to federally listed threatened or endangered species.

5.6.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed, as there are no anticipated negative impacts to threatened or endangered species.

5.7 Energy Supplies, Natural Resources, and Sustainable Design

5.7.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 provides the NEPA requirements for the analysis of impacts and the information needed for environmental assessment when an action’s construction, operation or maintenance would cause demands that would exceed available or future natural resource or energy supplies. For purposes of the EA, the proposed action will be examined to identify any

proposed major changes in stationary facilities or the movement of aircraft and ground vehicles that would have a measurable effect on local supplies of energy or natural resources. If there are major changes, power companies or other suppliers of energy will be contacted to determine if projected demands can be met by existing or planned source facilities. The use of natural resources other than for fuel need be examined only if the action involves a need for unusual materials or those in short supply.

5.7.2 Analysis

On-airport improvements will not increase demand for electricity, as the taxiway does not have edge lighting. If the new taxiway were designed to include taxiway edge lighting, additional electricity use would be minimal.

The increased runway/taxiway connector lengths will increase fuel consumption slightly.

Construction materials to be used for the project, including gravel, rock and asphalt paving material are not in short supply in the project area.

Where appropriate, existing pavement may be removed and recycled into base material for the new taxiway.

5.7.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not alter the current use of energy and natural resources at the airport.

5.7.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The proposed action will create new paved areas for the taxiway and connector taxiways.

5.7.3 Mitigation

No mitigation measures are proposed since the proposed action does not involve a need for unusual materials or those in short supply.

5.8 Environmental Justice

5.8.1 Regulatory Setting

Determining significance under NEPA is guided by FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1. According to the Order, a major airport development proposal could potentially have induced or secondary impacts on public services in surrounding communities. Normally, induced socioeconomic impacts on public services would not be considered significant unless there were significant impacts in other categories, such as land use. For purposes of analysis, an action is considered to have a significant impact on public services if construction of major new facilities, such as a permanent new school building or a community center, is required to accommodate the projected demand from the action.

To determine whether an environmental justice population is present, Federal agencies must refer to U.S Census data to establish the demographic and socioeconomic baseline. If a Proposed Action causes disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on a minority- and low-income population, it would represent a significant impact associated with environmental justice.

Environmental health risks and safety risks include those attributable to products or substances with which a child is likely to come into contact. Disproportionate health and safety risks to children that would result from a proposed action may represent a significant impact. For the purpose of this analysis, a significant impact to air quality, schools or public recreational facilities would be considered a significant risk to children's health and safety.

5.8.2 Analysis

A review of area land use shows a school and two nursing / retirement home facilities north of the Airport. No populations of low income households or minority populations were identified.

5.8.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not alter the airport from its current configuration. There would be no change to the manner in which the airport affects the surrounding community.

5.8.2.2 Preferred Alternative

No residential or business relocations will occur as part of the Preferred Alternative. The alterations will not affect jobs or residences. As discussed in other sections of this EA, the Proposed Action creates minimal off-site impact. No disproportionate impacts would occur to one segment of the population.

5.8.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed, as there would be no disproportionate impacts to one segment of the population.

5.9 Farmlands

5.9.1 Regulatory Setting

Order 1050.1E Chg. 1 deems a significant impact occurs when farmland being taken for a project exceeds Natural Resource Conservation Service standards.

5.9.2 Analysis

The area of proposed acquisition is not considered prime or unique farmland. Natural Resources Conservation Service soil maps indicate the project area is underlain by soils of the Donnel sandy loam (a very deep, well drained soil); Gestrin loam (very deep, moderately well-drained soil); and Melton loam (a very deep, poorly drained soil).

5.9.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not require any property acquisition or conversion of land in farm use for airport compatibility needs.

5.9.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The proposed action would require acquisition and conversion of pastureland into airport use. However, the soil types found at the project site are not characteristic of prime or unique farmland.

5.9.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed, as no prime or unique farmlands would be taken.

5.10 Hazardous Materials

5.10.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 provides the NEPA requirements for the analysis of impacts and the information needed for environmental assessment. According to FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1, the environmental analysis should demonstrate that the FAA (or applicant as appropriate) has determined whether hazardous wastes as defined in 40 CFR part 261 (RCRA) will be generated, disturbed, transported or treated, stored or disposed, by the action under consideration. If so, management of these wastes is regulated by 40 CFR parts 260-280 and transportation is governed by 49 CFR parts 171-199. It should also demonstrate that the FAA or applicant has considered pollutant prevention and control in accordance with EO 12088.

The analysis should indicate the presence of any sites within the action area listed or under consideration for listing on the National Priorities List (NPL) established by EPA in accordance with CERCLA. NEPA documentation should include a discussion of the impact of any NPL or NPL candidate sites on the action area and/or impacts of the action on any NPL or NPL candidate sites. NEPA documentation should also identify sites in the vicinity that have been designated RCRA Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU's) and that may impact or be impacted by the action.

5.10.2 Analysis

Above-ground fuel storage tanks, with the appropriate spill containment aprons, have been installed at the Airport. Periodic monitoring of the fuel tanks shows no leakage has occurred. There is no history of spills or dumping on the site that would indicate contamination.

5.10.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative will not increase the generation of potentially hazardous materials on the airport. The No Action Alternative will not increase the risk of finding previously contaminated areas on- or off airport property.

5.10.2.2 Preferred Alternative

Generation of potentially hazardous materials is typically associated with the presence of a fixed base operator (FBO) at the airport. Typical FBO business includes aircraft maintenance and repair, flight lessons, and fuel sales. The FBO area has been constructed to include aboveground fuel tanks with spill containment aprons.

The relocation of the taxiway will require earthwork in areas the City has acquired, east of the existing taxiway. The City will conduct due diligence on properties it will be acquiring. There is currently no reason to believe that there is any increased risk of finding contaminated areas.

5.10.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is required. If the contractor identifies any material or odors that could be of a hazardous nature, work will cease until the material can be identified and appropriately disposed.

5.11 Historical, Architectural, and Cultural Resources, including Native American and Tribal Resources

5.11.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 provides the NEPA requirements for the analysis of impacts and the information needed for environmental assessment. According to FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1, The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, establishes the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the National Park Service (NPS). Section 106 requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertaking on properties on or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP; Compliance with section 106 requires consultation with the ACHP, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and/or the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) if there is a potential adverse effect to historic properties on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The responsible FAA official determines whether the proposed action is an “undertaking,” as defined in 36 CFR 800.16(y) (and not an undertaking that is merely subject to State or local regulation administered pursuant to a delegation or approval by a Federal agency), and whether it is a type of activity that has the potential to cause adverse effects on historic properties eligible for or listed on the NRHP. If an undertaking may have an adverse effect, the first step is to identify the area of potential effect (APE) and the historical or cultural resources within it.

If a NRHP-eligible property occurs within the undertaking’s APE and the proposed action may affect the property’s historic characteristics, the Responsible FAA Official must apply the criteria of effect listed in 36 CFR 800.5(a). The Official must examine the potential effects in consultation with the SHPO/THPO and any Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization attaching religious or cultural importance to the identified property. 36 CFR 800.5(a)(3) permits phased

assessments of effects when alternatives the agency is considering involve corridors, large land areas, or when access to property is restricted. The FAA Official may propose a “finding of no adverse effect” after determining that the undertaking would not:

- physically destroy the property;
- alter the property, but, if alterations would occur, they meet the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior’s “Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties” (36 CFR part 68);
- remove the property from its historic location;
- introduce an atmospheric, audible, or visual feature to the area that would diminish the integrity of the property’s setting, provided the setting contributes to the property’s historical significance; or,
- through transfer, sale, or lease, diminishes the long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance that Federal ownership or control would otherwise ensure.

5.11.2 Analysis

The Cultural Resource Inventory conducted for this project (see Appendix G) resulted in the identification of two cultural resources, each of which was evaluated for its significance and eligibility to be listed in the NRHP. These resources included one aboveground resource (15072-1) as well as a historic-period archaeological isolated find (15072-2IF). At the time of survey, both site 15072-1 and 15072-2IF were identified within the then-proposed project area. Since the survey, the proposed project boundaries have been modified and now exclude both resources. Consequently, sites 15072-1 and 15072-2IF will not be affected by the McCall Municipal Airport Improvement Project.

The FAA consulted with the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation, Nez Perce tribe, Shoshone-Bannock, tribe and the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on June 9, 2009. A response was received from the Nez Perce Indian Tribe. The tribe had concerns over the lack of involvement it had in setting the APE and the failure of the report to recognize the vicinity of the project as historic Nez Perce territory. The cultural resources report was revised to address his concerns, at which time the tribe verbally closed the consultation for the project; as the concerns had been addressed. The SHPO also sent a letter of concurrence to the FAA on July 16, 2009 stating no additional investigations are recommended.

5.11.2.1 No Action Alternative

Taking no action will have no effect on cultural, archaeological, architectural or historic resources.

5.11.2.2 Preferred Alternative

Based on consultation with the SHPO and tribes included in Appendix G, the Preferred Alternative will have no effect on cultural, archaeological, architectural or historic resources.

The FAA has determined the project may proceed in accordance with Section 106 regulations.

5.11.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed. The potential for discovery of archaeological or historic materials during construction is discussed in section 5.4.2.2.5 above.

5.12 Induced / Secondary Socioeconomic

5.12.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Orders 1050-1E and FAA 5050-4B do not identify threshold criteria for analysis of impacts. However, Order 1050-1E describes general guidance that could be used to measure a potential secondary or induced impact. That guidance is described as induced impacts will normally not be significant except where there are also significant impacts in other categories, especially noise, land use or direct social impacts. In such circumstances, an EIS may be needed.

5.12.2 Analysis

The proposed action is necessary to correct a design deficiency and will not change the type of operations occurring at the airport. As such, no induced impacts are expected. Through the development of the EA, it was clear the public was concerned the proposed action may be a catalyst for a runway extension. However, this project does not give justification for a runway extension, as highlighted in FAA's letter from November 30, 2009 (Appendix H).

5.12.2.1 No Action Alternative

The City has identified a design deficiency per FAA design standards. By acknowledging that these conditions exist, any accident occurring on or adjacent to the airport that could be tied to the deficiency may leave the City exposed to lawsuits. This could result in severe financial consequences to the City and, potentially, the communities whose tax base supports the City.

5.12.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative would bring the Airport up to FAA design guidelines and safety standards for runway/taxiway centerline separation.

5.12.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed, since the project will not create any negative induced socioeconomic impacts.

5.13 Light Emissions and Visual Effects

5.13.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 provides the NEPA requirements for the analysis of impacts and the information needed for environmental assessment. According to FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1, the responsible FAA official considers the extent to which any lighting associated with an action will create an annoyance among people in the vicinity or interfere with their normal activities. Because of the relatively low levels of light intensity compared to background levels associated with most air navigation facilities (NAVAIDS) and other airport development actions, light emissions impacts are unlikely to have an adverse impact on human activity or the use or characteristics of the protected properties.

Visual quality impacts deal more broadly with the extent that the development contrasts with the existing environment and whether the jurisdictional agency considers this contrast objectionable.

5.13.2 Analysis

The Airport currently has runway lighting, as well as a rotating beacon. The lighting is visible at night from surrounding areas. The beacon is visible from parts of the surrounding community as well. With the exception of the beacon, on-Airport lighting is contained on-site and does not spillover into the surrounding community.

The airport beacon will remain in its present location and continue operation.

5.13.2.1 No Action Alternative

Taking no action would not alter the view of the Airport, nor would it alter the amount of light generated by the Airport.

5.13.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative may be design to include taxiway edge lights, whereas the current taxiway only has edge reflectors. If installed, the edge lights would be visible off-Airport. The runway is currently lighted and any taxiway lights would have similar off-Airport impacts.

5.13.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed, as Airport light emissions will not significantly increase.

5.14 Noise

5.14.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA guidelines indicate 65 DNL is the level of noise “acceptable to a reasonable person residing in the vicinity of an airport.” This is consistent with federal (FAA and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) land use compatibility guidelines and federal noise attenuation grant funding eligibility criteria. Therefore, the primary focus of the noise impact analysis is on areas located within the 65 DNL noise contours for the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative. FAA guidance concerning aircraft noise indicates that noise exposure impacts are considered significant only if there is a 1.5 DNL or greater increase at noise sensitive areas within the 65 DNL noise contour as when comparing the Proposed Action to the No Action Alternative. If this increase is expected, then additional significance thresholds apply. An increase of 3.0 DNL or greater within the 60-65 DNL noise contour is considered significant when comparing the Proposed Action to the No Action Alternative.

5.14.2 Analysis

Noise modeling, using the FAA’s Integrated Noise Modeling (INM) software was prepared for the 2007 Master Plan update (see Appendix I). The noise contours produced were for the baseline year of 2007 and for 2012. The 2012 contours reflected airport layout changes based on recommendations from the Master Plan, which included a southern runway extension.

For both 2007 and 2012, the 65 dBA DNL contour line extends outside the airport to the north, south, and west. The 2012 noise footprint is larger than the 2007 footprint, as a result from increased operations and an extended runway. However, relocation of the taxiway 100’ to the west will have little change in noise perception at the Airport while aircraft are taxiing as noise exposure is typically generated during aircraft takeoff and landing.

5.14.2.1 No Action Alternative

No change to the current conditions will occur.

5.14.2.2 Preferred Alternative

When aircraft are taxiing the perception of noise may increase slightly east of the Airport. However, taxiing aircraft typically have low power settings, and therefore do not have a large noise footprint – in relation to aircraft taking off and landing. The project will not result in a noise increase of 1.5 dB within the 65 DNL contour.

5.14.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed, as there are no significant noise impacts.

5.15 Social Impacts

5.15.1 Regulatory Setting

According to Order 1050.1E, Chg1, there are two categories considered under social impacts, which are children's environmental health and safety risks and socioeconomic impacts. The significance threshold for children's environmental health and safety is disproportionate health and safety risks to children. Socioeconomic impacts factors may be relocation of residents, relocation of community businesses, disruption of local traffic patterns, or substantial loss in community tax base.

5.15.2 Analysis

No residential or business relocations are proposed under the Preferred Alternative. Additional property to the east of the airport is to be acquired as part of the project, which will not affect jobs or residences. Local traffic patterns will not be affected, as operations at the Airport are not dependent upon the proposed project. No changes to the tax base are expected, as there will be no direct impact from relocation of the taxiway in the terms of fuel sales, hangar leases, or the number of airport employees.

5.15.2.1 No Action Alternative

No change to the current conditions will occur; therefore, there is no impact.

5.15.2.2 Preferred Alternative

As described in previous sections, the Preferred Alternative does not relocate any residents or businesses, nor does it create a loss to the tax base. Traffic patterns will not be affected.

The proposed projects do not create significant adverse off-Airport impacts. No disproportionate impacts would occur to one segment of the population.

5.15.3 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed, as the project would not create any negative social impacts.

5.16 Solid Waste

5.16.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Order 1050-1E, Chg 1, does not identify threshold criteria for analysis of impacts. However, Order 1050-1E, Chg 1, describes general guidance that could be used to measure a potential solid waste impact. Generally, additional information or analysis is needed only if problems are anticipated with respect to meet local, State, Tribal or Federal laws and regulation on solid waste management.

5.16.2 Analysis

The Airport currently generates solid waste as associated with conducting the business of airport management. Materials may include paper, food waste and wrappings, and replaced aircraft parts. The construction of the taxiway will include removal of the existing pavement. The asphalt will either be recycled on-site for construction of the new taxiway or be hauled off-site and recycled or disposed of in an appropriate landfill.

5.16.2.1 No Action Alternative

Solid waste generation under the No Action Alternative will increase at the rate of increasing use of the airport.

5.16.2.2 Preferred Alternative

Completion of any of the Preferred Alternative will not affect operations at the Airport in a manner that significantly impacts solid waste generation over the No Action Alternative.

5.16.3 Mitigation

There are no significant impacts to solid waste generation at the Airport; therefore, no mitigation is proposed.

5.17 Water Quality

5.17.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 specifies that the environmental assessment include sufficient description of design, mitigation measures and construction controls applicable to the proposal to demonstrate that state water quality standards and any federal, state and local permit requirements be met. FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 also states that significant impacts on water quality for most Airport actions can typically be avoided by design considerations, construction phase controls, and other mitigation measures. Furthermore, the environmental assessment shall include documentation from regulating and permitting agencies and list required permits. FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 requires that any proposed federal action that would impound, divert, drain, control, or otherwise modify the waters of any stream or body of water is applicable to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA). Under the FWCA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have the authority to investigate and report on all proposals for work in or affecting the waters of the U.S. that need approval from the federal government. FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 also states that consultation with the EPA regional office is required for any project that could potentially contaminate an aquifer designated by the EPA as a sole or principal drinking water source.

5.17.2 Analysis

Water quality is generally governed under the provisions of the federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the Clean Water Act and other amendments. The proposed action will need to comply with all permit requirements for the capture, treatment, monitoring, and reporting of stormwater from a new impervious surface.

5.17.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative creates no long-term water quality impacts.

5.17.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative will result in a decrease of approximately 9,000 square feet of impervious surface (approximately 5,000 square feet of new connector taxiways will be added; however, approximately 14,000 square feet of existing hangar taxilanes will be removed). The project will be designed to convey stormwater discharge through the existing outfall system.

5.17.3 Mitigation

As there is a decrease in impervious surfaces, the existing stormwater runoff system will be maintained. No mitigation is proposed.

5.18 Wetlands

5.18.1 Regulatory Setting

FAA Order 1050.1E Chg 1 states that a significant impact would occur when a proposed action would adversely affect the quality or quantity of municipal water or aquifers; substantially alter the hydrology needed to sustain the functions and values of wetlands supported by the water; cause a substantial reduction in the water-holding capacity of the wetlands; adversely affect the maintenance of natural systems that support wildlife and fish habitat and/or economically important timber, food, or fiber resources in the affected or surrounding wetlands; or would be inconsistent with applicable State wetland strategies.

5.18.2 Analysis

A delineation of wetlands and other waters at the project area was prepared after site visits on October 6-8, 2008. The following features were identified in the study area:

- Nine (9) discrete areas of wetland, including drainage and irrigation ditches, and associated wetlands,
- Four (4) discrete non-wetland “waters” (three drainage ditches and a snow storage basin), and
- One intermittent stream (“water”).

Based on conversations with Mr. Greg Martinez (pers. comm., October 7, 2008), the Corps of Engineers takes jurisdiction over any wetlands or waters that are connected to the North Fork of the Payette River. The intermittent stream and non-wetland drainage ditches (except Area 12), irrespective of whether an Ordinary High Water line is visible, are normally considered jurisdictional, and are classified as “tributaries”. Any areas that meet wetland criteria and are connected to the river by tributaries are considered jurisdictional “adjacent wetlands” or “abutting wetlands”. According to Mr. Martinez, the Corps may in some circumstances determine that duration of flow is insufficient for a channel to be considered a tributary, but the default assumption is that all connected channels are “tributaries” and are under Corps jurisdiction.

The snow storage basin (Area 11) and its associated drainage ditch (Area 12) are not connected to the river, and are considered “isolated” by the Corps, and not under their jurisdiction.

5.18.2.1 No Action Alternative

Taking no action will allow the existing on-Airport wetland areas to remain undisturbed.

5.18.2.2 Preferred Alternative

The proposed action will impact approximately 1.39 acres of jurisdictional wetlands under Corps jurisdiction and will require off-site mitigation.

5.18.3 Mitigation

The project will involve 1.39 acres of impacts to jurisdictional wetlands, including ditches and adjacent wet pastures. Phil Quarterman, WHPacific Senior Wetland Scientist, conducted a site visit on October 11-13, 2010 to review potential wetland mitigation sites for the McCall Airport taxiway relocation project.

Contacts were made before the site visit with several individuals, and five sites were visited, as follows:

1. Proposed mitigation bank (Green Ranch at Cascade)
2. Blackhawk Enterprises mitigation site
3. City of McCall golf course
4. Payette River subdivision, and
5. John Humphries home site

Three of the sites were eliminated from further consideration. The Humphries home site had some areas with potential for wetland creation, but too little area to be used by the project. The Payette River subdivision similarly had some small areas with wetland creation or restoration potential, but not enough area to be used by the project. There were no sites suitable for wetland creation or restoration at the golf course. All available areas were already in wetland in good condition.

Green Ranch at Cascade: The site of this proposed mitigation bank near Lake Cascade was viewed with Jim Fronk of Secesh Engineering Inc. in McCall. The site is approximately 17 miles south of the airport.

Mr. Fronk's client proposes to establish a mitigation bank on a 350 acre site, creating up to 148 acres of various types of mitigation credit units. A draft mitigation banking prospectus has been reviewed by the Corps of Engineers Boise office.

Mr. Fronk attended a meeting between his client and Mr. Martinez, Regulatory Project Manager, Boise Corps office the following day. He reported that his client plans to proceed to the next stage, which is to prepare a legal instrument setting up the bank and its credits. The Corps had only minor comments on the prospectus, and has agreed to the "service area" for the bank, which includes the McCall area. The Corps has also agreed to allow sale of credits immediately after the banking instrument has been signed, based on a phone conversation with Mr. Martinez. His estimate is that the instrument will be finalized and credits available by about March 2011.

Blackhawk Enterprises mitigation site: Mr. Quarterman spoke with Blackhawk Enterprises CEO, Mr. Sima Muroff, about a mitigation site on the west side of the North Fork Payette River approximately 4.5 miles to the south of McCall airport (see location exhibit in Appendix D). The Corps has already approved a 3-acre wetland creation site for a nearby residential subdivision, and approximately 3.5 acres of additional upland are available on the site that could be converted to wetland. The uplands are irregular polygons within a matrix of emergent and shrub wetlands associated with the river floodplain.

Mr. Quarterman viewed the site with Mr. Fronk, who provides engineering, wetland and surveying services to Blackhawk. The 3-acre area (in three units) has already been graded according to the mitigation plan. Under the mitigation plan, shallow grading will be sufficient to establish wetland hydrology: near surface saturation or shallow surface ponding during the spring supported by snowmelt and spring runoff. The remaining 3.5 acres appears very similar, and is adjacent to the 3-acre area. Conversion of the remaining area to wetland by shallow grading would be relatively easy and successful. Some form of planting plan to establish native vegetation would be necessary. At ratio of 1.5:1, approximately 2.1 acres, would need to be converted.

Recommendation: Based on the conversations Mr. Quarterman had with Mr. Fronk and Mr. Martinez, WHPacific previously recommended purchasing mitigation credits equivalent to the 1.39 acres of impact from the Green Ranch mitigation bank. However, WHPacific learned in June 2011 from the Corps that this site is no longer viable, as the mitigation proponent is no longer pursuing the site.

Through continued discussions with Mr. Martinez, WHPacific has learned of a new mitigation bank being pursued by the Wetlands Bank of Idaho in Valley County. The proponent of this site has told the Corps they will be submitting a development proposal in mid-summer, as well as an

amendment to its existing banking agreement with the Corps when a site has been selected and secured. The Corps has relayed once the proposal is submitted the approval process would normally take approximately four months. This proposal is promising as a mitigation site for the McCall Airport Taxiway Relocation project, and WHPacific will continue to contact the Corps to get status updates on the site's development.

Due to this new information, WHPacific recommends pursuit of the Wetlands Bank of Idaho mitigation site. If the bank does not work out in a timely fashion for any reason, WHPacific recommends the Blackhawk Enterprises site as a viable back up.

5.19 Cumulative Impacts

5.19.1 Regulatory Setting

Cumulative Impact is the impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period. Determining whether a Proposed Action will have a significant impact, the EA shall include considerations of whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. This analysis shall include identification and consideration of the cumulative impacts of ongoing, proposed and reasonably foreseeable future actions and may include information garnered from FAA, Port Authority and the NEPA process.

5.19.2 Analysis

The analysis considered the possible impacts of the Proposed Action and other development both on and off the Airport. The analysis identified if any of the following actions are planned to occur within the vicinity of the Proposed Action: development by local government or planning agencies, land development projects, other development or improvements at the Airport, roadway improvements and public infrastructure projects.

5.19.3 Past Projects (3-5 year timeframe)

Past projects at the Airport or in the airport vicinity include pavement maintenance, and hangar construction (with associated taxiway/apron development). In looking at aerial mapping adjacent to the Airport, there has not been any recent off-airport development.

5.19.4 Present Projects

The proposed project is to relocate the parallel taxiway east by 100 feet.

5.19.5 Reasonably Foreseeable Projects (3-5 year horizon)

The only identified project in the airport vicinity is development of lands east of the relocated runway, between the Airport and Highway 55. The land encompasses 64 acres and is currently owned by a private developer. As disclosed in Chapter 2, the City has identified this land as possible acquisition for airport use since the 1980s. If the City were to purchase the property, development would likely occur over many years. Alternatively, another party may purchase the property and develop it more expeditiously.

5.19.6 Cumulative Impacts Summary

The above discussion shows there are no project-related impacts, but for these categories: Biotic Resources, Construction, and Wetlands. There may be some associated incremental growth on and near the Airport, but when combined with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects it is not anticipated that there will be significant impacts.

- Biotic Resources – Increased land development may remove habitat on land currently undeveloped.
- Construction – Temporary impacts from construction will be minimized by utilizing best management practices (BMPs).
- Wetlands – Approximately 1.39 acres of impacts to jurisdictional wetlands will occur and off-site mitigation will be required.

5.20 Coordination and Public Involvement

The City of McCall wanted public participation in the development of this EA. A stakeholder group, the Airport Environmental Assessment Committee (AEAC), was developed to garner public involvement. The following text describes the public involvement undertaken as part of this plan.

5.20.1 Airport Environmental Assessment Committee Meetings

To date, two AEAC meetings have been held to gather input. The meetings consisted of:

- Public Meeting (December 3, 2008) – Public kick-off meeting, presentation of Purpose and Need for the project, and solicitation of AEAC members. A “Frequently Asked Questions” spreadsheet was developed, as requested at this meeting, and posted to the City’s website.
- AEAC Meeting #1 (March 10, 2009) – Review Purpose and Need, discuss alternatives, present preliminary design, and report on the field investigation results.

5.20.2 City Council Briefings

Two City Council Briefings were given (June 5, 2009 and January 28, 2010) to present the project, as well as the alternatives recommendation from the Airport Environmental Assessment

Committee, and for the City Council to pass a motion on the Preferred Alternative. After giving great consideration to the alternatives, the McCall City Council voted that Alternative #3 be the Preferred Alternative for this EA.

5.21 Conclusion

The proposed action, including best management practices and avoidance of environmental impacts where applicable, has been developed in consultation with Federal, state and local officials as appropriate. The project does not appear to be inconsistent with Federal, state or local laws or determinations on environmental issues. Based on written and verbal communication with the permitting agencies, the avoidance and best management practices proposed are satisfactory to meet regulatory requirements, along with the purchase of off-site compensatory wetland mitigation banking credits. There has been no identified controversy on environmental grounds.