

METROPOLITAN AIRPORTS COMMISSION

In re Crystal Airport Airfield and Associated Improvements Final Environmental Assessment/Environmental Assessment Worksheet, Adequacy Determination, and Negative Declaration on the Need for an Environmental Impact Statement

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS, AND ORDER

The above-titled matter came before the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC), the responsible governmental unit (RGU) for the proposed Crystal Airport Airfield and Associated Improvements (the “proposed project” or the “project”), upon completion of a joint Environmental Assessment/Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EA/EAW) for the proposed project. Crystal Airport (the “Airport”) is also known by its three-letter International Air Transport Association airport code as MIC. Based on the MAC’s files and records related to this matter, the MAC finds, concludes, and orders as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The proposed project requires preparation of environmental review documents under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4370h, and the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA), Minn. Stat. ch. 116D, because the proposed project will require approvals by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and by the MAC. A Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) determining that the EA/EAW for the proposed project is adequate under NEPA and there are no significant impacts associated with the proposed project was issued by the FAA on July 31, 2019.

2. Under MEPA and the rules implementing the statute promulgated by the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board and codified at Minn. R. ch. 4410, the MAC is

the RGU for the proposed project. The MAC prepared an EAW for the proposed project because it determined the project may have the potential for significant environmental effects under MEPA. MEPA, Minn. Stat. § 116D.04, subd. 2a(b); Minn. R. 4410.1000, subp. 3.

3. MEPA provides a federal Environmental Assessment (EA) document may be circulated in place of an EAW form if the EA addresses each of the environmental effects identified in the EAW form. Minn. R. 4410.1300. The EA/EAW for the proposed project addresses each of the environmental effects identified in the EAW form, and the MAC circulated the EA/EAW in place of an EAW form.

4. The MAC must determine whether the EA/EAW document is “adequate”—that is, whether it satisfies MEPA’s legal requirements for presenting the information necessary to make a reasoned decision about the potential for or significance of the proposed project’s environmental impacts. In addition, the MAC must determine whether the proposed project has the “potential for significant environmental effects” and requires preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) under MEPA. MEPA, Minn. Stat. § 116D.04, subd. 2a(b); Minn. R. 4410.1700. The MEPA criteria for determining the need for an EIS require a consideration of the type, extent, and reversibility of the project’s environmental effects; the cumulative potential effects of related or anticipated future projects; the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation; and the extent to which the environmental effects may be anticipated or controlled as a result of other available environmental studies. Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7.

5. The MAC’s decision must be in the form of either a negative declaration or a positive declaration. The MAC must base its decision regarding the need for an EIS on

the information gathered during the EAW process and on the comments received on the EAW. Minn. R. 4410.1799, subp. 3.

II. PROJECT BACKGROUND

6. Current facilities at MIC include three paved runways and one turf runway. The main primary runway, 14L/32R, is 3,267 feet long and has paved blast pads on each runway end that are not considered useable pavement when calculating aircraft takeoff or landing distance requirements. The parallel primary runway, Runway 14R/32L, is 3,266 feet long. Both primary runways are 75 feet wide. The paved crosswind runway, 06L/24R, is 2,500 feet long and 75 feet wide. Runway 06R/24L, the turf crosswind, is 2,123 feet long and approximately 137 feet wide. In addition to the runways, the Airport has a taxiway system providing access between the airfield and building areas on the north, south, east, and west sides of the Airport.

7. The existing airfield configuration is complex and may contribute to pilot confusion and runway incursions. Additional runway length and enhanced instrument approach capabilities are necessary to meet required runway length for critical design aircraft¹ and help to mitigate penetrations for both ends of the main primary runway. Furthermore, existing ground vehicle circulation and aircraft parking is inadequate.

8. The MAC recently completed a Long-Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) for the Airport, which the MAC Board approved in October 2017. The LTCP concluded Runway 14R/32L should be decommissioned to better match the current and projected

¹ FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A, *Airport Design*, defines the term “design aircraft” as “an aircraft with characteristics that determine the application of airport design standards for a specific runway, taxiway, taxilane, apron, or other facility. This aircraft can be a specific aircraft model or a composite of several aircraft using, expected, or intended to use the airport or part of the airport.”

activity at the Airport, and that Runway 14L/32R should be extended to a length of 3,750 feet by converting portions of existing blast pads to useable runway. The LTCP also identified undeveloped Airport land suitable for non-aeronautical use and identified the need for a GPS-based non-precision instrument approach procedure for Runway 32.

9. The purpose of the proposed project at the Airport is to address airfield safety concerns through implementation of three goals: (a) aligning the airfield infrastructure to meet existing and forecasted operations; (b) preserving and improving operational capabilities for critical design aircraft; and (c) enhancing safety by simplifying the runway and taxiway layout.

10. Major components of the proposed project include: (a) decommissioning Runway 14R/32L and converting it to a parallel taxiway; (b) converting portions of Runway 14L/32R blast pads to usable runway; (c) reducing the length of Runway 06R/24L (turf) to clear Taxiways D and F from the runway safety area; (d) establishing a straight-in Global Positioning System (GPS) instrument approach to Runway 32R; (e) removing various taxiways and constructing new taxiways and runup pads; (f) constructing perimeter road segments around three runway ends; (g) expanding the fixed base operator (FBO) aircraft parking apron; and (h) developing airport land for non-aeronautical use along 63rd Avenue North.

11. Under the proposed project, the MAC will enhance safety by simplifying the airfield geometry, providing required runway length for critical design aircraft, enhancing instrument approach capabilities, improving Airport ground vehicle circulation and apron parking capacity, diversifying Airport revenue opportunities and reducing incompatible land uses within the Runway Protection Zones (RPZs).

III. EAW PROCESS

12. The FAA and the MAC coordinated with interested agencies and the public throughout preparing the EA/EAW for the proposed project. Coordination began in January 2018 with the MAC briefing the FAA and the community regarding the proposed project, followed by presentations and briefings at the MAC Planning, Development and Environment Committee throughout 2018 and 2019. Additionally, an Airport Community Panel was assembled and met on two occasions to ensure involvement from key stakeholders. The MAC also held one public meeting on October 30, 2018, before completing the draft EA/EAW.

13. The FAA and the MAC released the draft EA/EAW for public comment on April 22, 2019. The MAC held one public hearing on the draft EA/EAW on May 29, 2019, at the Crystal City Hall during which the MAC received public comments. The public comment period on the draft EA/EAW closed on June 10, 2019.

14. In developing the final EA/EAW, the MAC considered the oral and written public and agency comments received during the public comment period on the draft EA/EAW. The MAC, in coordination with the FAA, also responded to all oral and written comments received on the draft EA/EAW during the public comment period. *See Final EA/EAW, Appendix M, Draft EA/EAW Comments and Responses.*

IV. THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND PREPARATION OF THE EA/EAW

15. The MAC has determined the proposed project is not exempt from environmental review and “may have the potential for significant environmental effects.” MEPA, Minn. Stat. § 116D.04, subd. 2a(b); Minn. R. 4410.1000, subp. 3. Therefore, the MAC prepared the EA/EAW for the project.

16. The EA/EAW addresses the impact categories discussed in the EAW form under MEPA, and all the FAA impact categories. Therefore, the MAC circulated the EA/EAW document in place of the EAW form. Minn. R. 4410.1300.

V. CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING WHETHER THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAS THE POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND REQUIRES AN EIS UNDER MEPA

17. MEPA requires that the MAC prepare an EIS for the proposed project if the project has the potential for significant environmental effects. Minn. Stat. § 116D.04, subd. 2a(b); Minn. R. 4410.1000, subp. 3. The Minnesota Environmental Quality Board rules establish four criteria that a responsible governmental unit must use in considering whether a project has the potential for significant environmental effects. Those factors are:

- A. type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects;
- B. cumulative potential effects of related or anticipated future projects;
- C. the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority; and
- D. the extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, including other EISs.

Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7.

A. The Type, Extent, and Reversibility of the Proposed Project's Environmental Effects

(i) Air Quality

18. The FAA and the MAC conducted an air quality assessment in the EA/EAW that complies with United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and FAA guidance. The EA/EAW includes an aviation operational emissions inventory developed

using the FAA Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) model under the same scenarios that the EA/EAW analyzed for aircraft noise. In addition, the EA/EAW includes a construction emissions inventory using the Airport Construction Emissions Inventory Tool (ACEIT), which uses general assumptions for runway and taxiway construction based on the MAC's latest capital improvement plan for the Airport.

19. As of March 2019, Hennepin County, including the area surrounding Airport, is in a "maintenance area" for National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for sulfur dioxide and carbon monoxide but now attains NAAQS for those pollutants. Hennepin County is in attainment for all other criteria pollutants. The EA/EAW calculates air emissions for the 2017 baseline (existing conditions) and 2025 forecast (proposed project and no-action alternative) scenarios for the Airport. The AEDT model estimates an overall increase in pollutant emissions from the Airport between the 2017 baseline estimate and 2025 forecast scenarios, which results from the forecasted increase in aircraft operations anticipated by both the 2025 no-action and proposed project scenarios. Although there are slight emissions increases from the Airport in 2025 under both the no-action and proposed action scenarios, changes are below the *de minimis* thresholds for maintenance areas identified by the FAA Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook Version 3, Update 1 (January 2015).

(ii) Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

20. The EA/EAW considers greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by evaluating the potential incremental change in carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_{2e}) emissions for the Airport resulting from the proposed action as compared with the no-action alternative. Carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) are the primary contributors to

CO_{2e}. The EA/EAW found the proposed project will cause temporary increases in direct on-site CO_{2e} emissions from the Airport attributable to construction equipment. Total construction CO_{2e} emissions are estimated at approximately 2,483 tons over a two-year period. On-site operational CO_{2e} emissions attributable to aircraft operations in 2025 under the proposed project are expected to increase by approximately 59 tons, from approximately 699 tons per year in 2017 to approximately 758 tons per year in 2025. Aircraft operations are expected to slightly increase emissions in the years after 2025 compared to the no-action alternative.

21. The EA/EAW referenced the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) biennial GHG report to the state legislature dated January 2019. That report estimated statewide CO_{2e} emissions in 2014 at 165.6 million tons, while the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimated nationwide CO_{2e} emissions in 2014 at 6,870 million tons. Based on these estimates of CO_{2e} emissions, the potential for the proposed project to affect future climate conditions is limited.

22. There are no analytical or modeling tools available that reliably evaluate the incremental effect of a proposed action's discrete GHG emissions on the global and regional climate. In addition, there are no analytical or modeling tools available that reliably evaluate any cascading effects, or cumulative effects, from a proposed action's GHG emissions on natural ecosystems and human economic systems in each state or region. Future negative impacts on climate conditions are unlikely to affect the Airport in the foreseeable future. The consequences of warming temperatures in Minnesota include increased rainfall and increased chance of flooding. However, all Airport infrastructure is

located outside of 100-year floodplains, and there are no major bodies of water close to Airport facilities.

(iii) Construction Impacts

23. The EA/EAW uses the Airport Construction Emissions Inventory Tool (ACEIT) to model air emissions from construction activities at the Airport associated with the proposed project. Total emissions associated with all years of construction are not expected to exceed the *de minimis* thresholds for those pollutants with *de minimis* thresholds in the FAA's Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook Version 3, Update 1 (January 2015). Increased emissions associated with the proposed project's construction will be mitigated through voluntary best management practices (BMPs), such as engine idling restrictions and maintenance requirements, and other control strategies identified in the *United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emission Restriction Checklist*.

24. Construction may cause temporary impacts to water quality. The MAC will employ BMPs to protect against these temporary impacts, including implementation of stormwater management, erosion, and sediment control practices such as installation of silt fences, temporary sediment basins, inlet protection, and erosion control blankets. An erosion and sediment control plan will specify temporary and permanent erosion control measures in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations.

25. The MAC will design construction activities in a manner that minimizes overall soil disturbance. Sediment control measures will be installed on all down gradient land disturbing activities before beginning construction. Construction practices will take necessary precautions to address stormwater runoff of fuels, oils, bitumen, chemicals, and other harmful materials, and to reduce air pollution from particulate and gaseous matter. A

variety of erosion prevention and sediment control practices may be necessary to stabilize slopes and drainage ways, protect inlets to the stormwater conveyance system, limit gully formation, and capture sediment. Several practices can be used as temporary erosion control and sediment control, and to meet municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) requirements. Temporary sediment control practices may include use of vegetated buffers, silt fences, inlet protection, temporary sediment basins, fiber logs, or erosion control blankets, as appropriate.

26. Construction equipment noise will be temporary. The MAC will mitigate construction noise by implementing construction practices specified in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5370- 10E, *Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports*. The MAC will also include contract provisions requiring construction noise mitigation.

27. The MAC will minimize the introduction and spread of invasive species at the Airport prior to, during, and after construction of the proposed project through many BMPs. Prior to construction, standard cleaning procedures of equipment used on-site will minimize the introduction of exotic invasive species from outside the Airport. Storage and cleaning of equipment and materials in established staging areas during construction will also minimize the spread of invasive plant seeds to off-site areas or other areas on-site. Areas disturbed during construction will be seeded with many turf grasses.

(iv) Aircraft Noise and Compatible Land Use

28. The proposed project reduces aircraft noise impacts. The EA/EAW employed FAA's Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) software to model aircraft noise and create noise contours based upon the 2017 baseline and 2025 forecast aircraft operations for the Airport under the no action alternative and the proposed project.

29. The FAA, the EPA, and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) established the 65 DNL as the threshold indicating significant cumulative noise impacts. The FAA considers noise impacts to be significant if “the action would increase noise by DNL 1.5 dB or more for a noise sensitive area that is exposed to noise at or above the DNL 65 dB noise exposure level, or that will be exposed at or above the DNL 65 dB level due to a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase, when compared to the no action alternative for the same timeframe.” Currently, the 65 DNL 2017 baseline contour is mostly contained on Airport property, except for a small area south of the Airport off the Runway 32L end. Eleven residential parcels are in or partially within the 65 DNL contour in the current condition. The 70 and 75 DNL contours are contained on the Airport property.

30. Under the 2025 no action alternative, the 65 DNL contour is still mostly contained on Airport property, except for twelve residential parcels on the south side of the airport. The 70 and 75 DNL contours for the no action alternative remain contained on the Airport property. The 2025 proposed project scenario shows a reduction of residential parcels in the 65 DNL contour from twelve to four because of closing Runway 14R/32L. The 65 DNL and greater contours for 2025 under the proposed project are otherwise all contained on Airport property. Furthermore, under the proposed project there are no areas within the 65 DNL contour that will experience an increase of 1.5 dB DNL or more. Therefore, there will be no significant noise impacts under the proposed project.

(v) Socioeconomic Impacts

31. The proposed project is not expected to influence economic activity in the area or cause any relocation or disruption of the established community. Proposed non-

aeronautical development on the north side of the Airport will increase the City of Brooklyn Park tax base, resulting in some new economic activity and generating some traffic in the area. However, these impacts are insignificant within the context of the activity already occurring in this fully developed urban area.

**(vi) Environmental Justice and Children’s Environmental
Health and Safety**

32. No significant off-Airport impacts associated with the proposed project affect environmental justice populations. Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center are home to minority populations that, in aggregate, make up more than 50 percent of city residents. Crystal has fewer minority residents, but the percentage of the minority population in the city is higher than in the Twin Cities metro area.

33. The concentration of low-income residents near the Airport is not as high as the nearby concentrations of minority populations. A large low-income population lives in Brooklyn Park one-half mile north of the Airport, but this area is separated from the Airport by Interstate Highway 94/694 and is not directly within the runway approach or departure paths. Most census block groups directly adjacent to the Airport have 17 percent or fewer residents falling into a low-income category. One block group on the east side of the Airport is home to 34 percent low-income residents, but this area is largely separated from the Airport by the Crystal MAC Conservation Area and Upper Twin Lake.

34. Expected socioeconomic conditions under both the no-action and proposed project are comparable to existing conditions. Resource categories do not have off-Airport impacts in most cases. Off-Airport residential parcels affected by noise are not located in areas with high proportions of minority or low-income populations. Up to 49 trees located

on private properties and public rights-of-way, and up to 32 trees within a city park, will need to be trimmed or removed for the proposed action. The 32 trees within a city park are in the Runway 14 approach and within a census block group with 76 percent minorities. This is considered an environmental justice population because it exceeds the 50 percent minority threshold established by CEQ guidance. Because removal of these trees will not substantially change the wooded character of the park and the MAC will replace them with other shorter and more suitable species for the park environment, tree removal in the park will not have a disproportionately high and adverse impact to environmental justice populations. Of the 49 trees located on private properties and public rights-of-way, twenty-three are in the Runway 14 approach and within a census block group with 76 percent minorities, four are in the Runway 32 approach and within a census block group with 50 percent minorities, four are in the Runway 6L approach and within a census block group with 34 percent minorities, and eighteen are in the Runway 24R approach and within a census block group with 68 percent minorities. Because tree removal on private properties will be carefully targeted individual trees, the MAC will compensate homeowners for tree removal on private properties, and suitable low-growing species will be planted in their place, tree removal on these properties will not have a disproportionately high and adverse impact to environmental justice populations. No significant off-Airport impacts associated with the proposed project affect environmental justice populations.

35. Expected socioeconomic conditions under the no-action and proposed project are comparable to existing conditions, and most resource categories do not have off-Airport impacts. Off-Airport parcels affected by noise do not include schools or playgrounds, or facilities that would otherwise be primarily accessed by children. Under

the proposed project, there are no significant impacts to air quality or water resources that may influence the health of the surrounding population, including children. There are no disproportionate safety risks associated with the proposed project, which will occur entirely on fenced Airport property. Although there is a larger than average proportion of children near the ultimate Runway 14 end, impacts in other resource categories in this area are not significant. No disproportionate health or safety risks to children are expected.

(vii) Biological Resources

36. The proposed project area contains potential habitat at or near the Airport for one endangered species, one threatened species, and one protected species: (a) the rusty-patched bumble bee, a federally-listed endangered species; (b) the northern long-eared bat, a federally-listed threatened species; and (c) the bald eagle, a federal protected species. Bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) have also been documented near the Airport. According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Airport is in a low potential habitat zone for the rusty-patched bumble bee. The FAA determined the proposed project will have no effect on the rusty-patched bumble bee because the proposed project is in a developed area with a low potential habitat zone for the bee and does not affect any prairie habitat. The USFWS concurred in the FAA's determination.

37. The proposed project is within a mostly developed area and does not include documented suitable or designated critical habitat; therefore, the proposed project is not likely to adversely impact the northern long-eared bat. To avoid and minimize potential unforeseen impacts on the bat, the MAC will complete tree clearing between October 1 and April 30, which is the dormant season for the bat at the Airport's latitude. Additionally,

the MAC will ensure tree removal is limited to those trees specified on project plans. The FAA determined the proposed project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, the bat, and the USFWS concurred in the FAA's determination.

38. The bald eagle and seven bird species protected by the MBTA have been documented by USFWS survey sources within approximately six miles of the Airport over the past ten years. The breeding season for the bald eagle extends from December to August, but eagles typically nest near bodies of water and away from developed areas. The other listed birds nest outside the project area or have not been observed in the project area during nesting season. The eagles and migratory birds are not likely to be affected by the proposed project's ground disturbances, which will be limited to regularly mowed airfield areas. However, off-Airport tree removal has the potential to disturb some wooded wetland habitat, which could impact the eagles and migratory birds during nesting season. Before any construction activity during the nesting season, the MAC will complete an MBTA nesting bird survey. Tree removal will occur outside of nesting months. The USFWS concurred in these conservation measures.

39. An obstruction analysis conducted in 2018 identified several areas where trees currently or are projected to penetrate airspace approach surfaces within five years of project implementation. Although some of these trees will need to be trimmed or removed for the no-action alternative, there is an increase in the number of projected tree obstructions under the proposed project. The proposed project also includes approximately 32 trees to be removed within a city park. Any tree removals will be carefully targeted and will not involve clear-cutting stands of trees. Off-Airport tree removal will not target stands

or large groupings of trees that will significantly disrupt habitats. Identification of specific trees to be removed or trimmed will be determined during the detailed project design phase.

40. Vegetation management practices at the Airport include mowing of all areas within the perimeter fence regularly. Vegetation management after construction of the proposed project will continue as before, with regular mowing to minimize wildlife hazards and the introduction and establishment of invasive species.

(viii) United States Department of Transportation, Section 4f

41. Two sites bordering the Airport and one site under the extended centerline for Runway 14L/32R fit the definition of a Section 4(f) property. A 4(f) property to the west side of the Airport is the Crystal Lakes Regional Trail, which is operated by the Three Rivers Park District and governed by the Metropolitan Council's *2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan*. The eastern portion of the MAC-owned property is used as the Crystal MAC Conservation Area and is also a 4(f) property. The proposed project will not constitute a use of these two 4(f) properties. The settings of the parklands are projected to remain in the same condition regarding land cover, visual environment, and noise levels as they would with the no-action alternative. The proposed project will not impair the usefulness or accessibility of the Crystal Lakes Trail or the Crystal MAC Conservation Area and will not be detrimental to the public interest.

42. Approximately 32 cottonwood trees need to be removed in Edgewood Park, a Section 4(f) property under the extended centerline for Runway 14L/32R. A Section 4(f) Evaluation report was developed as part of the EA/EAW and made available for public review and comment concurrent with the Draft EA/EAW document. The MAC met on several occasions with the City of Brooklyn Park, which has jurisdiction over the Section

4(f) property, to discuss the property's significance, primary use, avoidance alternatives, impacts to the property, and mitigation measures. The FAA issued a Preliminary Finding on February 11, 2019, that the proposed action will not significantly affect Edgewood Park and issued a *de minimis* Section 4(f) action. The City of Brooklyn Park concurred in this finding.

43. Removal of the cottonwood trees will not substantially change the wooded character of the park or the available habitat types, nor will it change the wetland type or substantially alter its tree cover. Tree removal will be carefully targeted, clear-cutting stands of trees will not be required, all available measures will be taken to minimize impacts to other trees, and the MAC will replace trees with other shorter and more suitable species for the park environment. For these reasons, the use of Edgewood Park as a neighborhood park and as a natural resource is not expected to be impaired by the proposed project.

(ix) Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention

44. The proposed project area has been an airfield since the late 1940s. The MAC used the MPCA "What's in my Neighborhood" search tool to search for sites containing hazardous materials in the proposed project area. Several active and closed sites were identified on and adjacent to the Airport. Most active users or generators of hazardous materials in the area are small generators related to Airport use, automobile-oriented businesses, and medical facilities adjacent to the Airport.

45. The Airport has a Spill Prevention, Control & Countermeasure Plan (SPCC) that applies to its storage tanks. The MAC maintains above-ground storage tanks on the

property containing motor oil, hydraulic fluid, and transmission fluid, as well as a 2,500-gallon underground diesel tank. Above-ground tanks are inspected for leaks monthly, and the underground tank has an electrical leak detection system.

46. Thunderbird Aviation fueling facilities are located next to the proposed apron expansion. Design and construction of the apron expansion will carefully consider its location to avoid any potential disturbance to these facilities. Other tank sites on Airport property will not be disturbed by the proposed project.

47. The proposed project will not generate hazardous waste, but will produce construction debris such as dirt, concrete, and asphalt. Construction materials and other solid waste will be disposed of at a commercial landfill capable of handling disposal as required by Minn. R. 7035.0805. Local disposal facilities are expected to have capacity to accept solid waste volumes that will be produced by construction and operation of the proposed project. Recycling of asphalt and fill material will be considered during project design, as practicable.

48. There are no hazardous materials or solid waste impacts expected for the proposed project, nor will the proposed project interfere with any ongoing remediation of existing contaminated sites in the immediate vicinity of the project area.

(x) Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources

49. The MAC's consultant conducted a Phase II Historic and Architectural property inventory at the Airport in 2018. Buildings and Airport facilities were evaluated as potential examples of post-World War II general aviation architecture. Historians did not identify the Airport as having unusual or significant airport design. The evaluation also

found that post 1970s buildings are located throughout the Airport, and many buildings have been altered from their historic appearance.

50. On May 31, 2018, archeologists from the Mississippi Valley Archeology Center (MVAC) performed fieldwork for a Phase I archeological survey for the proposed action at the Airport. MVAC performed a pre-field investigation to identify known archeological sites, reviewing records on file with the Minnesota Office of the State Archeologist. The area of potential effect consists of mowed grass on the existing airfield, and wooded areas in the future non-aeronautical development areas. The Phase I survey was completed with shovel surveys, which yielded no cultural materials other than modern asphalt, nails, glass, and shreds of fabric. No pre-contact cultural materials were discovered as a result of the survey. Much of the project area consists of disturbed and wetland soils, making the presence of surviving cultural materials unlikely.

51. The FAA has determined that a Section 106 finding of No Historic Properties Affected applies for the proposed project and submitted this finding to the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). In June 2018, the SHPO concurred with the FAA finding. In June 2018, the FAA reaffirmed their finding of No Historic Properties Affected based upon the finding of the Phase I archeological survey. In July 2018, the SHPO concurred with the FAA finding.

(xi) Light Emissions and Visual Effects

52. The proposed project will result in changes to airfield lighting from the relocation and extension of Runway 14L/32R and the associated parallel taxiway. The proposed project will extend existing medium intensity runway edge lighting (MIRL) systems along the edges of the relocated and extended runway pavement. New taxiway

edge lighting will be installed on the parallel taxiway and associated connections to the primary runway. The proposed project will shift the runway end identifier lights (REIL) along with the Runway 14L/32R extension. But the REIL will remain near existing locations. The visual approach slope indicator (VASI) on Runway 32R end will be replaced with a precision approach path indicator (PAPI).

53. The new Runway 14L end will be approximately 300 feet closer to the neighboring community, and most residences have little visual screening. When the tower is closed, the MIRL, PAPI/VASI, and REIL can be remotely activated, so these systems need only be in full effect when aircraft are approaching and departing during low visibility conditions or at night. Methods for visual screening will be considered during project design for the residential properties near the new runway end points.

54. New airport lighting systems will be similar in type and location to the existing airport lighting systems. The new lighting systems will only be in full effect when in use by approaching and departing aircraft and during low visibility conditions or at night. Based on the information above, there are no significant visual effects associated with the proposed project.

(xii) Natural Resources and Energy Supply

55. The proposed project will include the addition of approximately 75 runway and taxiway lights. If light units to be added are incandescent, the annual electricity requirements of airfield lighting systems are expected to increase approximately 35 percent. If LED fixtures are installed, the annual electricity needs are expected to decrease

approximately 70 percent. This difference in electricity consumption will inform consideration of specific light systems at the time of project design.

56. Consumption of energy and natural resources during the construction phase of the proposed project will consist mainly of construction machinery fuel and construction materials. This consumption will not exceed locally available supplies, and efforts will be made during design to identify opportunities for recycling pavements and underlying base material.

57. Operation and maintenance of the proposed project is expected to require minor increases in energy demand. No significant increase in aircraft or ground vehicle fuel usage is expected under the proposed project. In addition, the minor increase in utility demand for airfield lighting and maintenance equipment under the proposed project is not expected to have a negative impact on local energy or natural resource supplies.

(xiii) Water Resources

58. The proposed project will add approximately 292,300 square feet (6.7 acres) of impervious surface associated with the runway, taxiways, run-up pads, perimeter roads, and aircraft parking apron. However, approximately 232,550 square feet (5.3 acres) of existing impervious surface will also be removed, for a net increase of approximately 59,750 square feet (1.4 acres) of impervious surface.

59. The proposed project will alter the existing stormwater management system at the Airport. The new taxiway system will fill approximately 0.8 acres of land that is currently a stormwater infiltration area located north of the existing Runway 14L end. Stormwater management practices will be investigated during final design to replace the associated stormwater storage volume. A drainage plan will be developed, including

investigation of stormwater management practices such as natural infiltration on site, flow attenuation by use of vegetated swales, and natural depressions and stormwater retention/detention.

60. The proposed project will not alter the course of any public waters or adversely impact the designated beneficial use of the surface waters in the watershed. Changes to impervious surfaces will result in increased runoff into the watershed, which will not be discharged directly into wetlands. A protective buffer strip at least 20 feet wide will be provided around wetlands.

61. The Airport is located within and subject to the stormwater management requirements of the Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission (SCWMC). The Airport's current stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be revised to reflect the changes in impervious surface on the airfield and any associated new mitigation practices. To comply with national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) stormwater permit requirements, MAC will create and SCWMC will review a separate construction SWPPP that describes the best management practices to be used during construction to control stormwater runoff will be created.

62. Most areas on and near the Airport are in an area of minimal flood hazard, according to FEMA's flood map service center. There is one Zone A special flood hazard area (SFHA) listed on the Airport and described in the EA/EAW. This area is subject to flooding by the one-percent-annual-chance flood event generally determined using approximate methodologies, with no base flood elevations or flood depths determined. The northeast side of the Airport has Zone A SFHA areas that are mostly aligned with Twin Creek, which flows through this location to the MAC conservation area. A small area of

floodplain extends south from the creek and then west toward the run-up pad near the intersection of Taxiways C and D near the Runway 24 end.

63. The flood insurance rate maps do not indicate any potential hazard zones near any proposed airfield improvements. The northeastern corner of the Airport includes a Zone A SFHA; however, this zone is outside the proposed non-aeronautical use area. Therefore, there are no impacts to floodplains associated with the proposed project.

64. Based on wetland boundary data collected during 2018 delineation and described in the EA/EAW, there are seven wetlands in and near the Airport. Two components of the proposed project potentially affect delineated wetlands: (1) the non-aeronautical development area; and (2) the southern perimeter road segment. The non-aeronautical development area contains three small wetlands. Two are located on the east side of the development area, and the other is located west of the Airport access road. The MAC will require site developers to comply with any wetland rules and buffer requirements set by the SCWMC.

65. The proposed perimeter road segment on the south side of the Airport will pass between the delineated boundaries of two small wetlands (referred to as Wetlands 1 and 3 in the EA/EAW), each approximately 0.03 acres. Preliminary estimates of grading limits for the proposed perimeter road segment indicate that fill activities will be required in both wetlands. Because of this impact, additional wetland survey efforts were conducted to determine if a perimeter road alignment exists that would avoid all wetland boundaries and meet FAA offset and safety requirements. These were ruled out by the larger potential fill of adjacent wetlands (referred to as Wetlands 6 and 7 in the EA/EAW), noise impacts to residential areas to the west, and proximity to runway safety areas.

66. Required fill within Wetlands 1 and 2 are estimated to be less than 1,000 square feet, which would not require a replacement plan according to Minnesota Statute 103G.2241, Subd. 9(d)(2). Because the disturbance to the wetlands for the proposed project is likely below this *de minimis* threshold, impacts will be minimal, and replacement of these wetlands is not expected to be required. If during detailed design it is determined that more than 1,000 square feet of wetlands will be affected, a replacement plan will be developed and implemented.

(xiv) Coastal Resources

67. The Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972 ensures the effective management and protection of the coastal zone. Under the statute, states prepare Coastal Zone Management Programs to implement protection of coastal areas. Minnesota approved the Lake Superior Coastal Program under the CZMA in 1999. The Airport is not within the coastal boundary as defined by the Lake Superior Coastal Program, so the EA/EAW does not analyze coastal impacts under the CZMA.

68. The Coast Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 prohibits federal financing for development of undeveloped coast barriers along the shores of the Great Lakes, including the Minnesota Point unit in Lake Superior, Minnesota. The proposed project will affect no coastal barrier resources.

(xv) Farmland

69. Farmland is defined by the FAA as those agricultural areas considered important and protected by federal, state, and local regulations. Important farmlands include all pasturelands, croplands, and forests (even if zoned for development) considered to be prime, unique, or of statewide or local importance. As there are no agricultural areas

within the area of study, farmlands are not applicable to nor affected by the proposed project.

(xvi) Land Use

70. The proposed project will shift Runway 14L/32R northwest approximately 115 feet and decommission Runway 14R/32L. This will not significantly change flight traffic patterns and impacts to surrounding land uses.

71. The proposed project will result in changes in incompatible uses in the runway protection zones (RPZs) off Airport property. Shifting Runway 14/32 approximately 115 feet to the northwest and designating it as a utility runway will result in relocating the Runway 32 RPZ entirely onto Airport property. The proposed Runway 14 RPZ will contain approximately 280 feet of Douglas Drive, but no residential parcels. Decommissioning Runway 14R/32L and converting it to a parallel taxiway will eliminate its RPZs. In addition, Runway 6R/24L will be shortened as part of the proposed project, which will result in the elimination of its RPZ conflicts with Bottineau Boulevard and Lakeland Avenue. However, the timing of the proposed project will result in the RPZ temporarily including a portion of the existing apron containing three aircraft tie-downs until the apron is expanded and aircraft parking is relocated outside of the RPZ. The proposed project will remove a total of three residential parcels from the RPZs and reduce the length of public roadways within these zones.

72. The MAC submitted an RPZ Alternatives Analysis to the FAA addressing the portion of Douglas Drive North in the Runway 14 RPZ and the aircraft tie-downs on the apron in the Runway 6R RPZ. In a letter dated May 8, 2018, the FAA concurred in the findings and approved these uses in the ultimate RPZs. This concurrence is subject to the

MAC working with the City of Brooklyn Park to consider installation of “Low Flying Aircraft/No Parking” signage on Douglas Drive North where it is located within the RPZ.

73. The proposed project will also result in changes to the number of private properties that fall within the forecast joint airport zoning board (JAZB) safety zones. Existing zoning is based upon the current location of the runways. The MAC will convene a JAZB comprised of representatives from local jurisdictions affected by the proposed zoning changes. As described in the EA/EAW, there are currently many privately-owned parcels within these zones, most of which are exempt from JAZB zoning because they are in Established Residential Neighborhoods. The extent of the off-Airport safety zones will be reduced by decommissioning Runway 14R/32L and shortening 06R/24L, as well as re-categorizing all runways as utility runways, which will result in narrower future zones. However, because of the lengthened and shifted Runway 14L/32R, the zones will include new parcels to the northwest and southeast of the existing zones.

74. There are expected to be fewer privately-owned parcels within the safety zones with the proposed project than under the existing ordinance. Under the no-action alternative, approximately 125 privately-owned parcels are in or partially within Safety Zone A and 277 are in or partially within Safety Zone B. Under the proposed project, the number of privately-owned parcels within or partially within these zones is expected to be

changed to approximately 143 within forecast Safety Zone A and 204 within forecast Safety Zone B.

75. The proposed project includes the development of an area on the north side of Airport property for non-aeronautical use.

76. The proposed project is not expected to generate significant additional vehicle traffic when compared to the no-action alternative. The proposed non-aeronautical development on the north side of the Airport will likely contribute minor additional traffic. The EQB EAW Guidelines published October 2013 indicate that for projects with only minor traffic impacts, generation of a maximum peak hour traffic estimate is not necessary. Therefore, such an estimate was not developed for the EA/EAW.

B. Cumulative Environmental Effects

77. Cumulative potential effects are effects on the environment that result from the incremental effects of the project under review in addition to other projects in the “environmentally relevant area” that might “reasonably be expected to affect the same environmental resources.” In other words, the cumulative potential effects analysis examines whether the incremental effects of a proposed project, combined with other projects in the same geographic area and taking place over the same period, will have a significant effect on the same environmental resources.

78. The recent and planned actions described in the EA/EAW, when combined with the proposed project at the Airport, do not have significant cumulative effects on environmental impact categories in the vicinity of Crystal Airport. Many of the past and planned projects near the Airport are related to transportation along the Bottineau

Boulevard corridor and could in combination have an impact on the land use adjacent to the Airport. However, the proposed action does not contribute to these impacts.

79. Impacts of the proposed project when considered with past or future actions do not constitute a significant impact that cannot be mitigated. All future actions will be subject to avoidance and minimization studies and will undergo agency permitting as required. Every effort will be made to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. No significant cumulative impacts or cumulative potential effects are associated with the proposed action.

C. Mitigation of Environmental Effects by Ongoing Public Regulatory Authority

80. Environmental effects of the proposed project are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority.

81. The EA/EAW describes that the MAC will mitigate increased emissions associated with the proposed project's construction by using voluntary best management practices (BMPs) such as engine idling restrictions and maintenance requirements, and other control strategies identified in the *United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emission Restriction Checklist*.

82. The MAC will mitigate any temporary impacts to water quality during construction by implementing BMPs, including stormwater erosion and sediment control practices such as installation of silt fences, temporary sediment basins, inlet protection, and erosion control blankets. An erosion and sediment control plan will specify temporary and permanent erosion control measures in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations.

83. The MAC will mitigate construction noise through implementation of construction practices specified in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5370-10E, *Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports*. The MAC will also include contract provisions requiring construction noise mitigation.

84. Introduction and spread of invasive species at the Airport will be minimized prior to, during, and after construction of the proposed project through many BMPs. Prior to construction, standard cleaning procedures of equipment used on-site will minimize the introduction of exotic invasive species from outside the Airport. Storage and cleaning of equipment and materials in established staging areas during construction will also minimize the spread of invasive plant seeds to off-site areas or other areas on-site. Areas disturbed during construction will be seeded with many turf grasses.

85. To avoid and minimize impacts on potential habitat for the northern long-eared bat and migratory birds, the MAC will complete tree clearing between October 1 and April 30. Additionally, USFWS/USDOT avoidance and minimization measures will be implemented.

86. The proposed project will result in changes to certain existing lighting systems, including the existing medium intensity runway edge lighting (MIRL) systems, precision approach path indicator (PAPI) lights, and runway end identifier lights (REIL). Lighting systems at the Airport may be remotely activated by pilots by radio, so the systems need only be in full effect when in use by approaching and departing aircraft. Methods for visual screening and use of energy-efficient LED lights will be considered during project design.

87. The MAC will conduct noise level reduction testing of four residential structures within the 65 DNL noise contour to determine eligibility for federal residential noise mitigation funding.

88. The MAC will revise the Airport's current SWPPP to reflect changes in impervious surface on the airfield and any new associated new mitigation practices. On-site best management practices will be established for the ongoing stormwater monitoring and management activities at the Airport. Additionally, a separate construction SWPPP will be created by the MAC and reviewed by the Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission (SCWMC). Mitigation requirements will be implemented in accordance with permits or approvals for the NPDES multi sector general permit or SCWMC permits.

89. The MAC will convene the Joint Airport Zoning Board to revise the existing airport zoning ordinance and work with the City of Brooklyn Park to address any necessary land use zoning changes for non-aeronautical development.

90. The MAC must obtain required permits or approvals in compliance with the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) and will implement the mitigation requirements of those permits or approvals. In addition, the MAC will follow the rules and regulations of the SCWMC, including upland buffer vegetation requirements for wetlands, streams, and lakes.

D. Other Available Environmental Studies

91. There are no other available environmental studies evaluating the extent to which the environmental effects of the proposed project can be anticipated and controlled.

CONCLUSIONS

1. A FONSI/ROD determining that the EA/EAW for the proposed project is adequate under NEPA and there are no significant impacts associated with the proposed project was issued by the FAA on July 31, 2019.

2. The MAC has the authority to determine whether the proposed project is exempt from environmental review under MEPA.

3. The MAC has the authority to determine whether the proposed project “may have the potential for significant environmental effects.” Minn. R. 4410.1000, subp. 3(B).

4. The MAC has the authority to determine whether the proposed project “has the potential for significant environmental effects” and requires preparation of an EIS under MEPA. Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7. The four criteria for determining whether the proposed project has the potential for significant environmental effects are: (a) the type, extent, and reversibility of the project’s environmental effects; (b) the cumulative potential effects of related or anticipated future project; (c) the extent to which the project’s environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority; and (d) the extent to which the project’s environmental effects may be anticipated and controlled because of other available environmental studies. *Id.*

5. The proposed project is not exempt from environmental review under MEPA.

6. The proposed project may have the potential for significant environmental effects.

7. The FAA has prepared a federal EA under NEPA for the proposed project because the project will require federal approval. The MAC has the authority to circulate the federal EA in place of an EAW form under MEPA because the federal EA for the

proposed project addresses the impact categories discussed in the EAW form. Minn. R. 4410.1300.

8. Application of the four criteria to determine whether MEPA requires preparation of an EIS for the proposed project reveals that the project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects and that preparation of an EIS is unnecessary.

9. The type, extent, and reversibility of the proposed project's environmental effects demonstrate that an EIS is unnecessary.

10. Under the proposed project, there will be slight emissions increases in 2025 but changes are below the *de minimis* thresholds for maintenance areas identified by the FAA Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook Version 3, Update 1 (January 2015). The proposed project's air emissions do not have the potential for significant environmental effects.

11. Construction impacts from the proposed project will be temporary, *de minimis*, and subject to mitigation by best management practices. Therefore, the proposed project's construction impacts do not have the potential for significant environmental effects.

12. Construction of the proposed project will cause an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, as expressed as CO₂e, of only 2,483 tons over a two-year period. On-site operational CO₂e emissions attributable to aircraft operations in 2025 under the proposed project are expected to increase by approximately 59 tons. The proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions do not have the potential for significant environmental effects and are not expected to have an adverse effect on climate change.

13. Aircraft noise impacts are improved under the proposed project. Twelve residential parcels are in or partially within the 65 DNL contour in the 2025 no action alternative. The proposed project 2025 forecast shows a reduction from twelve to four residential parcels in or partially within the 65 DNL contour because of closing Runway 14R/32L. The 65 DNL and greater contours are otherwise all contained on Airport property. Furthermore, there are no areas within the 65 DNL contour that will experience an increase of 1.5 dB DNL or more; therefore, there will be no significant noise impacts under the proposed project.

14. The proposed project is not expected to influence economic activity in the area, and will it not cause any relocation or disruption of the established community. Proposed non-aeronautical development on the north side of the Airport will increase the City of Brooklyn Park tax base, resulting in some new economic activity, and generate some traffic in the area. However, these impacts are not significant within the context of the activity already occurring in this fully developed urban area. Therefore, the proposed project will not produce significant induced or secondary socioeconomic impacts.

15. No significant off-Airport impacts associated with the proposed project affect environmental justice populations. No potential health or safety risks to children are expected. Therefore, the proposed project's environmental justice impacts do not have the potential for significant environmental effects.

16. The FAA and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service have determined that the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect the rusty-patched bumble bee, a federally-listed endangered species, the northern long-eared bat, a federally-listed threatened species, or the bald eagle, a federal protected species. Additionally, bird species

protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) were documented within six miles of the Airport in USFWS surveys conducted in the past ten years. Prior to any construction, an MBTA nesting bird survey will be completed. The MAC will carefully target the removal of on-Airport and off-Airport trees in the approaches to Airport runways under the proposed project. Additionally, the MAC will maintain current vegetation management practices at the Airport to minimize wildlife hazards and invasive species under the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts to biological resources do not have the potential for significant environmental effects.

17. There are two Section 4(f) properties (publicly owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or public and private historic properties) bordering the Airport. The proposed project will not constitute a use of these two Section 4(f) properties because the settings of the parklands are projected to remain in the same condition regarding land cover, visual environment, and noise levels as they would with the no-action alternative. There is one Section 4(f) property under the extended centerline for Runway 14L/32R with proposed tree removal. Therefore, a Section 4(f) Evaluation report was developed as part of the EA/EAW and made available for public review and comment concurrent with the Draft EA/EAW document. The FAA issued a Preliminary Finding on February 11, 2019, that the proposed action will not significantly affect Edgewood Park and issued a *de minimis* Section 4(f) finding. The City of Brooklyn Park concurred in this finding. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects on such resources.

18. There are no hazardous materials or solid waste impacts expected for the proposed project, and the proposed project will not interfere with any ongoing remediation

of existing contaminated sites in the immediate vicinity of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project has no potential for significant effects associated with hazardous waste or solid waste disposal, or pollution prevention.

19. The proposed project will not adversely affect any properties eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The FAA has determined there are no historic properties affected by the proposed project, and the SHPO concurred in the FAA finding. The proposed project does not have the potential for significant effects on historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural resources.

20. New airport lighting systems will be similar in type and location to the existing airport lighting systems and will be in full effect only when in use by approaching and departing aircraft and during low visibility conditions or at night. The proposed project's light emissions and visual effects do not have the potential for significant environmental effects.

21. The proposed project's increased electrical consumption will not exceed existing supply, and the proposed project will use no unusual raw materials or natural resources, or any materials in short supply. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts on natural resources and energy supply do not have the potential for significant environmental effects.

22. The proposed project will have a net increase of approximately 1.4 acres of impervious surface. The proposed project will not alter the course of any public waters, nor will it adversely impact the designated beneficial use of the surface waters in the watershed. FEMA flood insurance rate maps do not indicate any potential hazard zones near any proposed airfield improvements. The northeastern corner of the Airport includes a Zone A

SFHA; however, this zone is outside the proposed non-aeronautical use area. Therefore, there are no impacts to floodplains associated with the proposed project. The proposed project will directly affect two wetlands, totaling approximately 0.06 acres in size. Required fill within these wetlands is estimated to be less than 1,000 square feet, which would not require a replacement plan according to Minnesota Statute 103G.2241, Subd. 9(d)(2). Because the disturbance to the wetlands for the proposed development is likely below this de minimis threshold, impacts will be minimal, and replacement of these wetlands is not expected to be required. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects on water resources.

23. The proposed project is not within any defined coastal boundary, will affect no coastal barrier resources, and as a result does not have the potential for significant environmental effects.

24. The proposed project is not within any farmland areas. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects on farmland.

25. Cumulative effects, or impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the action when added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in the area not directly associated with the proposed development, do not constitute a significant impact that cannot be mitigated. All future actions will be subject to avoidance and minimization studies and will undergo agency permitting as required. Every effort will be made to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. No significant cumulative impacts or cumulative potential effects are associated with the proposed project.

26. Certain environmental effects of the proposed project are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority.

27. Any finding more properly considered a conclusion shall be considered a conclusion. Any conclusion more properly considered a finding shall be considered a finding.

ORDER

Based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions, and the entire administrative record of the proceeding, the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) determines and declares that the Final Environmental Assessment/Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the proposed project is adequate under the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA), that the proposed project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects, and that preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed project is not required. The MAC is issuing a negative declaration on the need for an EIS under MEPA.

DATED: 8-19-19 METROPOLITAN AIRPORTS COMMISSION



Rick King
Chair