FEDEX ANCA FACILITY

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND RECORD OF DECISION

FEBRUARY 2024

This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD) (FONSI/ROD) for the proposed FedEx Express (FedEx) ANCA Facility at Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC or Airport) Improvements project, located in Anchorage, Alaska. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for the proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment dated February 2024. This document discusses alternatives considered by FAA in reaching its decision, summarizes the analysis used to evaluate the alternatives, and briefly summarizes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives. This document also identifies applicable and required mitigation.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND RECORD OF DECISION

Introduction

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 United States Code §4321 et seq.) requires federal agencies to consider the potential environmental impacts prior to undertaking a course of action. Within the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), NEPA is implemented through regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ; 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §§1500–1508) with supplemental requirements provided under FAA Order 1050.1F and FAA Order 5050.4B, with additional guidance for environmental impact analysis provided in the FAA Order 1050.1F Desk Reference. In adherence with NEPA, 40 CFR §§1500–1508, and the applicable FAA orders and guidance, the State of Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) prepared an environmental assessment (EA) on behalf of the FAA to assess the potential environmental impacts from the proposed relocation, construction, and operation of the FedEx Express (FedEx) ANCA Facility at Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC or Airport).

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide suitable FedEx air cargo facilities at ANC to accommodate existing and future demand for cargo operations, increase operational efficiencies through new and improved cargo and airline support facilities, and be consistent with the Airport's long-term plans. The purpose and need of the FAA's action is to evaluate the DOT&PF request to update their ALP associated with the proposed FedEx ANCA Facility (Proposed Action) and meet its statutory obligations under 49 U.S.C. 47101 and Section 163 of the 2018 FAA Reauthorization Act.

The existing FedEx ANCA Facility at ANC is inadequate to meet FedEx's requirements for a delivery and sortation support facility. The existing facility does not provide the space needed for existing international and regional FedEx operations to occur efficiently as the facility was not designed to accommodate both operations at the existing level of demand. Simultaneous operations by numerous cargo aircraft, ground support, loading, and surface vehicles must be accommodated within pre-determined time periods that are predicated by next-day delivery schedules.
FedEx has determined that to meet its operational goals, the integration of additional sorting facilities that would separate regional and international operations is required.

FedEx has indicated that simultaneous operations by numerous cargo aircraft, ground support, loading, and surface vehicles must be possible within pre-determined time periods that are predicated by next-day delivery schedules. Current air cargo facilities have historically met this need, but not resourcefully. Regular processing delays require that the proposed separation of facilities is necessary to maintain efficient operation.

The Proposed Action is consistent with community planning as it would not change land uses or zoning at ANC or within the surrounding community and is consistent with the ANC Airport Layout Plan.

Description of Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would relocate regional operations at the FedEx ANCA Facility to an adjacent area south of the existing facility and Taxilane U, on a 21.9-acre parcel that has been leased from the Airport. International operations would remain at the existing facility. The separation of regional and international operations would reduce processing delays and allow FedEx to efficiently meet existing consumer demand.

The Proposed Action would consist of the following components:

- construct two new buildings (an approximately 186,000-square-foot package sorting facility and an associated 2,100-square-foot vehicle wash building);
- construct an automobile parking area (261,403 square feet, including paved area surrounding buildings);
- construct a feeder aircraft parking apron (339,924 square feet), which is also referred to as the new aircraft parking apron, and culvert the existing drainage ditch at this location;
- construct a connection to Postmark Drive;
- construct grassed swales and a detention basin to treat the increase in stormwater runoff;
- install new perimeter security fencing; and
- extend the water, storm drain, and sanitary sewer utilities off-site to connect into existing utilities under Tug Road, Postmark Drive, and Sikorsky Avenue.

Alternatives Considered

In addition to the on-Airport site of the Proposed Action, three off-site alternative sites were considered for the sorting facility. The potential off-Airport sites are located near each other and are approximately 7.5 miles from the proposed feeder ramp location. Option 1 is a 26.62-acre parcel located at 151 West 100th Avenue. Option 2 is a 27.26-acre parcel located at the West 100th Avenue and C Street intersection. Option 3 is a 19.83-acre parcel located at the C Street and Walter J. Hickel Parkway intersection. The proposed sorting facility is directly tied into the feeder ramp and alternative on-Airport ramps or properties adjacent to the FedEx facility are currently unavailable. As such, the location of the feeder ramp is not considered to have any alternatives and any alternatives that would separate feeder ramp from the sorting facility would be inefficient and would not meet the purpose and need. Therefore, the only reasonable alternatives to assess are the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action, which is the preferred alternative.

Summary of Anticipated Environmental Impacts

Environmental effects of the Proposed Action are discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EA which discloses the impacts to resource categories defined in FAA Order 1050.1F. The Proposed Action would not result in a significant impact to any of the FAA-defined resource categories, including those resources that are protected under special purposes laws and requirements such as Executive Order 13690, Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input; Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands; Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act; or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The environmental impact categories considered but found to have no impact from the Proposed Action are discussed in Section 3.2 of the Final EA and include: Coastal Resources; U.S. Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f); Farmlands; Historical, Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources; Land Use; Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks; Transportation and Traffic; and Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Tables 2-1 and 5-1 of the Final EA compare both the environmental impacts by alternative and provide a summary table of environmental impacts, respectively.

Air Quality: The Proposed Action is not expected to result in an exceedance of any air quality pollutants based on NAAQS standards and is not considered a major source of air pollutants. There would be temporary air quality impacts, but due to the nature of construction and the size of the Proposed Action, the Proposed Action would not result in significant air quality impacts.

Biological Resources: The Proposed Action would not affect any endangered or threatened species and there's no removal of any trees or structures that may be used as nesting habitat for migratory birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Climate:
Based on the USEPA diesel fuel emissions factor, the estimated CO_2 emissions from construction of the Proposed Action would be 2,474 metric tons over the duration of construction which is approximately two years. This is equivalent to the energy use of 156 homes for each year, or 312 homes total. Based on the facility's estimated energy usage, it would produce 1,144 metric tons of CO_2 per year. The global social cost from the increase in GHG emissions related to construction of the Proposed Action ranges from $19,932 to $100,995 in a given year, depending on year and discount rate used. The global social cost from the increase in GHG emissions related to operation of the Proposed Action ranges from $16,217 to $91,745 in a given year, depending on year and discount rate used.

Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention: The site is being developed in a manner that inhibits stormwater from interacting with potentially contaminated groundwater. As the PFAS plume does not originate within the project study area or within the FedEx operations area, it was determined that the most effective remediation of the site would be to reduce the future migration of the PFAS plume in the groundwater. To minimize excavations, the structures would be supported by piers that would be advanced to 15 to 20 feet below ground surface and the peat within the project study area would be surcharged with non frost susceptible (NFS) fill materials. Any potentially contaminated material and excavated soil would temporarily be stockpiled approximately 1,000 feet north of the project study area at the FedEx snow disposal site. The onsite excavated material would be used as fill material in areas outside the footprint of the package sorting facility and to backfill the drainage ditches located on the FedEx site.

During the initial fill, excavation, and surcharging activities, there is potential for the Proposed Action to temporarily impact and displace PFAS-contaminated groundwater. As documented in the EMP, the displaced water would be treated at the eastern FedEx property boundary with permeable filter barriers amended with a site-specific blend of activated carbon, mixed with

imported NFS fill material. This mixture of Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) and Colloidal Activated Carbon (CAC) would be used due to the increased adsorption efficiency gained from the smaller particle size of the activated carbon when compared to Granular Activated Carbon (GAC). Implementation of these Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce and avoid impacts to hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention.

The proposed grassed swales and detention basin would continue to treat stormwater onsite, reducing interaction with the contaminated groundwater. Annual water quality monitoring is currently conducted and would continue to be done in accordance with the Alaska Pollution Discharge Elimination System (APDES) permit issued to ANC and would continue to occur beyond construction of the Proposed Action. Groundwater sampling in the Postmark Bog is conducted annually by DOT&PF. The number of samples and frequency of sampling may increase as more information is gathered about the extent of contamination within the area. The samples are analyzed for PFAS compounds and petroleum hydrocarbons. ADEC is notified if any samples exceed maximum contaminant levels for the targeted analytes. Samples are also collected by DOT&PF from the stormwater system to monitor for potential contamination.

Natural Resources and Energy: Construction and operation would not require the use of any rare materials that are in short supply. Construction would temporarily increase the consumption of energy and natural resources in the form of fuel, lubricants, and other construction materials necessary to build the proposed facility; however, all materials needed are readily available and could be met by existing resources. The temporary increase in demand for these resources would not represent a significant impact to natural resources or energy supply.

Noise: Construction would result in varying levels of noise generation subject to change based on the construction intensity and distance to a given receptor. However, due to distance from sensitive receptors, the noise level would not likely be perceptible over typical ambient noise levels of the Airport. The Proposed Action would not change airfield configurations, runway uses, flight patterns, or aircraft operations at the Airport. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not result in changes to local traffic patterns or result in additional traffic. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Action would have no effect on noise setting at the Airport.

Visual Resources: The Proposed Action would not create annoyance or interfere with normal activities from light emissions or affect the visual character of the area due to the light emissions. Lighting installed would be consistent with that of an airport and would not create annoyance or interfere with normal activities from light emissions or affect the visual character of the area due to the light emissions. The proposed facility would be in character with the surrounding Airport uses and would not result in viewshed changes for residents or a community off-Airport property.

Wetlands: The Proposed Action would affect 14.32 acres of depressional wetlands, which would be mitigated with the purchase of wetland compensatory mitigation credits. A culvert would be constructed at the existing drainage ditch along the north side of the project study area to continue to allow uninterrupted drainage flow under the proposed new aircraft parking apron.

Floodplains: The Proposed Action would not occur within any existing floodplain.

Surface Water: There are no surface waters within the project study area or on Airport property. The Proposed Action would increase the amount of impervious surfaces within the project study area by about 18.7 acres and increase the amount and rate of stormwater runoff within the project study area. Soil handling during construction would be conducted in a manner that prevents the release of contaminants to surface water and is protective of the water quality standards presented in the ADEC's 18 AAC 70 Water Quality Standards regulations. Stormwater management procedures would be outlined in the project Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) prepared by the Contractor. Additionally, the Proposed Action includes grassed swales and a detention basin in order to reduce stormwater runoff and reduce any potential effects to stormwater.

Groundwater*:* Construction of the Proposed Action would entail ground disturbing activities that may affect groundwater resources. The EMP (see Appendix E of the EA) outlines management practices that would be taken while handling groundwater. Groundwater generated during construction would be managed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the ADEC Excavation Dewatering Permit, AKG002000. A dewatering and best practices plan would be prepared by the Contractor and submitted to ADEC for approval prior to the start of dewatering. Groundwater from Postmark Bog would continue to be monitored annually.

Summary of Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative study area was determined by evaluating the logical physical limits to potential indirect effects of the Proposed Action and then identifying the logical existing boundaries (i.e., water bodies, roadways) that can be used to present those boundaries. Only environmental categories in which effects could occur through construction or implementation of the Proposed Acton are considered when evaluating cumulative impacts. These include Air Quality; Climate; Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; Natural Resources and Energy; Noise (construction only); and Water Resources. Resources that would not be affected by the Proposed Action are not included in the cumulative analysis as the Proposed Action would not contribute to any cumulative impact of these resources. The resources not affected include Biological Resources, operational Noise, and Visual Resources.

Air Quality:

For foreseeable on-Airport cumulative projects, the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project at ANC is located adjacent to the project study area and is anticipated to be under construction at the same time as the Proposed Action. While these projects would be under construction at the same time, the Proposed Action's contribution to cumulative air quality effects is not expected to be cumulatively considerable. This is because construction would occur in an area that is in attainment for all NAAQS pollutants and because the temporary, periodic impacts associated with construction would be minimized through the use of environmental controls (i.e., BMPs) that would reduce construction emissions. As such, emissions associated with construction of the Proposed Action would not cumulatively cause an exceedance of the NAAQS or contribute to an increase in frequency or severity of an existing NAAQS violation.

Operation of the Proposed Action would not be considered a "major source of air pollutants" and would not cause or create a reasonably foreseeable emission increase

because the increase in operational efficiency would offset the limited increase in emissions due to the natural gas boiler in the new facility, so there would be no contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. ANC currently has a permit and reporting requirements with ADEC. Because there is a threshold for emissions at ANC, cumulative impacts are capped at an approved ADEC rate. Emissions associated with operation of the Proposed Action would not cumulatively cause an exceedance of the NAAQS or contribute to an increase in frequency or severity of an existing NAAQS violation. Cumulative impacts resulting from this project are negligible.

Climate: The adjacent Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project estimates that construction would result in 969 metric tons of CO_2 emissions over the two-year construction period, which is equivalent to the energy use of 122 homes for one year. The Proposed Action has estimated 2,473.74 metric tons of CO_2 emissions over the two-year construction period, which is equivalent to the energy use of 312 homes for one year. Combined the two projects would result in 3,442.74 CO_2 emissions over two years, which is equivalent to the energy use of 434 homes for one year.

Relating to operational GHG emissions, the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project has identified GHG emissions related to jet emissions, which would not increase as a result of the Proposed Action, and refrigeration emissions, which would not occur under the Proposed Action. Therefore, the Proposed Action's contribution to GHG impacts is not cumulatively considerable.

Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention: Construction and operation of the Proposed Action and other projects would adhere to all applicable federal, State, and local environmental laws and regulations. It is assumed that past projects complied with the relevant laws and regulations and no release of hazardous materials, pollution, or solid waste occurred. Reasonably foreseeable projects would also be required to adhere to all applicable federal, State, and local environmental laws. Compliance with the environmental mitigation plan (EMP) (Appendix E of the Final EA) and existing federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and human health and safety would ensure that there would be no impacts as a result of the Proposed Action. Because the site is contaminated with PFAS/PFOS, the EMP details the plan to treat contaminated water and materials before it is allowed to move offsite. The Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project also has an approved EMP that includes treating contaminated soil and water at the site. Annual water quality monitoring is currently conducted and would continue to be done in accordance with the APDES permit issued to ANC and would continue to occur beyond construction of the Proposed Action. Groundwater sampling in the Postmark Bog is conducted annually by DOT&PF. The number of samples and frequency of sampling may increase as more information is gathered about the extent of contamination within the area. The samples are analyzed for PFAS compounds and petroleum hydrocarbons. ADEC is notified if any samples exceed maximum contaminant levels for the targeted analytes. Samples are also collected from the stormwater system to gauge the efficiency of the GAC treatments used in the bog to reduce PFAS contamination. Therefore, as both the Proposed Action and the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project would comply with their respective EMPs and the Proposed Action would reduce the

existing contamination through the treatment of onsite groundwater, no cumulative impacts would occur regarding hazardous materials, pollution prevention, and solid waste. **Natural Resources and Energy:** The Proposed Action would use commonly available natural resources during construction. None of the building materials that would be employed by the Proposed Action or any of the cumulative projects is considered to be unusual or in short supply. The Proposed Action would not generate excessive demands on local energy supplies. The demands for natural resources and use of the local energy supply, when considered with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development projects, are not expected to have substantial cumulative natural resource and energy supply-related impacts.

Noise (Construction): The Proposed Action would not result in an increase in operational activity and the proposed facility is located adjacent to the existing facility. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not contribute to a cumulative operational noise impact.

Because construction of the Proposed Action would occur at the same time as construction of the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project, there is potential for cumulative construction noise to reach levels above those level associated with construction of the Proposed Action. However, construction noise is temporary in nature and is subject to the Anchorage Noise Control Ordinance (AMC 15.70), which identifies a construction sound level limit of 80 decibel (dB) within a residential property boundary or within a noise-sensitive zone during any one hour of the identified daily period, depending on season. If construction noise levels are higher than anticipated or occur outside of identified daily periods, AMC 15.70 requires a Noise Permit that could include conditions that the Municipality of Anchorage determines to be appropriate. Therefore, due to the distance to the closest noise-sensitive land use (residential use approximately 0.9 mile or 4,616 feet away), even with both projects running construction equipment at the same time (refer to Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the Final EA for a discussion on noise attenuation), it is unlikely that construction noise would reach 80 dB within a residential property boundary and cumulative impacts related to construction noise would not be cumulatively considerable.

Wetlands: The Proposed Action would affect 14.32 acres of depressional wetlands, which will be mitigated through the purchase of compensatory mitigation bank credits. The Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project at ANC would affect approximately 21.6 acres of wetlands within the Postmark Bog. An Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Individual Permit was obtained for the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project and requires the project sponsor to obtain 23.965 wetland credits.

USACE identified the geographic scope for the wetlands cumulative effects assessment is within the city of Anchorage, specifically the area immediately surrounding the Proposed Action, including the Airport and the Turnagain Arm residential neighborhood, commercial, and institutional developments to the west of the Airport which are encompassed by a portion the Knik Arm-Frontal Cook Inlet Watershed. These areas all drain to the same area of Cook Inlet. The geographic scope was not chosen to be the entire Knik Arm-Frontal Cook Inlet Watershed, as that watershed is over 200,000 acres in

size and includes all of Cook Inlet and lands across Cook Inlet. Assessing cumulative impacts at such a large scope would serve to dilute the Proposed Action's cumulative impacts. Combined, the Proposed Action and the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project would permanently fill in 36.02 acres of wetlands, which constitutes the majority of the subject wetland.
The Proposed Action would add cumulatively to the area of developed land and impervious surface within the city of Anchorage. Increases in impervious surface would directly increase urban runoff pollutant contribution, and without the wetland's ability to store runoff, such runoff could potentially reach Cook Inlet faster. However, the Proposed Action would not be expected to result in an increase in development of the area, as the directly surrounding area has almost been maximally developed.

While the cumulative loss of Postmark Bog wetlands could be considered cumulatively considerable, as previously mentioned, the wetland investigation concluded the following: (1) the wetlands can no longer be considered in an "undisturbed" state and past permitted dredging, contamination of the water, and surrounding developments have not only reduced system connectivity but also severely affected the value to wildlife and the surrounding ecosystems; (2) the contamination and location of the Postmark Bog at the Airport both severely reduces the safety of preserving the area for migratory bird habitat; (3) the area is actively managed to reduce bird activity in the area; and (4) the water quality has been significantly reduced as it is considered part of a large area-wide PFAS plume. Additionally, the Proposed Action includes remediation of the PFAS contamination on the site as well as grassed swales and a detention basin in order to reduce stormwater runoff. Further, USACE, as the jurisdictional regulatory agency, has determined that the purchase of mitigation credits would offset the impact and that the incremental contribution of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts is not significant. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the Proposed Action on wetlands would not be cumulatively considerable.

Other regional projects may also affect wetland resources in the region. However, until specific project plans are known, it is not possible to quantify the specific cumulative effects on wetlands from the Proposed Action combined with the other projects in the cumulative project list. USACE requires mitigation for unavoidable impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and would require any of the projects in the cumulative project list to offset the loss of wetlands.

Surface Water and Groundwater: Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would have the potential for water quality issues such as increased surface runoff, downstream erosion, and potential discharges of pollutants, such as accidental spills. However, as identified in the EMP prepared for the Proposed Action, soil handling during construction would be conducted in a manner that prevents the release of contaminants to surface water and is protective of the water quality standards presented in the ADEC's 18 AAC 70 Water Quality Standards regulations. Stormwater management procedures would be outlined in the project SWPPP and ESCP prepared by the Contractor. Groundwater generated during construction would be managed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the ADEC Excavation Dewatering Permit, AKG002000. A

dewatering and best practices plan would be prepared by the Contractor and submitted to ADEC for approval prior to the start of dewatering. The plan would include details of the treatment system design and processes. The plan would also provide details regarding the collection of periodic sampling of post-treated water, which will include the collection of at least two performance monitoring samples of effluent water during the active dewatering portions of the project. The Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project also has an approved EMP that includes soil handling, stormwater management, and groundwater management procedures at the site.

In terms of long-term groundwater contamination management, annual water quality monitoring is done in accordance with the APDES permit issued to ANC and will continue to occur beyond construction of the Proposed Action. Groundwater sampling in the Postmark Bog is conducted annually by DOT&PF. The number of samples and frequency of sampling may increase as more information is gathered about the extent of contamination within the area. The samples are analyzed for PFAS compounds and petroleum hydrocarbons. ADEC is notified if any samples exceed maximum contaminant levels for the targeted analytes. Samples are also collected by DOT&PF from the stormwater system to monitor for potential contamination.

Additionally, required water quality and stormwater BMPs were followed for past projects, and reasonably foreseeable projects would implement the same practices to minimize potential for water quality impacts; therefore, no cumulative impacts would occur.

Determination that the proposed action will have no significant impact

The attached Final EA examines each of the various environmental resources that were determined to be present at the project location or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action. Considerable analysis was focused on the cumulative impacts of both the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project and the Proposed Action based on the resources impacted.

The Proposed Action would not cause any environmental impacts that exceed any thresholds of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B. Based on the information contained in the Final EA, the FAA has determined that the Proposed Action meets the purpose and need for the Proposed Action, would not cause any significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated, and is the most reasonable, feasible, and prudent alternative. Following is a discussion of significance related to resources impacted by the proposed action.

Air Quality Construction would temporarily result in a minor increase in air pollutant emissions. However, the Proposed Action is in an area that is in attainment for all air pollutants and, therefore, a construction emissions inventory is not required (FAA, 2015a). Additionally, construction would be temporary and dust during construction would be regulated using BMPs and through compliance with the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit. Therefore, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in an exceedance of any

air quality pollutants based on NAAQS standards, and therefore does not exceed the threshold of significance. Due to the temporary nature of construction and the size of the Proposed Action, the Proposed Action would not result in significant air quality impacts.

Because the Proposed Action would relocate partial operations from the existing FedEx facility to the new facility and would not result in an increase in operations, the Proposed Action would not increase emissions from any mobile sources, including aircraft and surface vehicles. The Proposed Action includes the construction of a new building that would introduce a new stationary source of emissions due to the use of natural gas boilers. However, regional operations at the existing FedEx facility would be relocated from the existing facility to the new facility in order to increase operational efficiency. This would minimize any increase in stationary source emissions to a negligible level due to the increased operational efficiencies. In addition, the Proposed Action does not include any changes in aircraft operations and does not include an expansion in landside operations, so the Proposed Action would not be considered a "major source of air pollutants." Therefore, the Proposed Action would not cause or create a reasonably foreseeable emission increase and as identified in the FAA's Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook, an emissions inventory is not required (FAA, 2015a). Cumulative impacts resulting from this project are negligible. ANC currently has a permit and reporting requirements with ADEC. Because there is a threshold for emissions at ANC, cumulative impacts are capped at an approved ADEC rate. Emissions associated with operation of the Proposed Action would not cumulatively cause an exceedance of the NAAQS or contribute to an increase in frequency or severity of an existing NAAQS violation.

Climate Construction of the Proposed Action would result in a temporary, but not significant, increase in CO_2 emissions. Operation of the Proposed Action would not increase the amount of surface vehicle activity does not include any changes in aircraft operations, and does not include an expansion in landside operations. Therefore, there are no significant climate change impacts. The Proposed Action has estimated 2,473.74 metric tons of CO_2 emissions over the two-year construction period, which is equivalent to the energy use of 312 homes for one year. Combined, the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project and the Proposed Action would result in 3,442.74 CO_2 emissions over two years, which is equivalent to the energy use of 434 homes for one year. The Proposed Action would relocate partial (regional) operations from the existing FedEx facility to the new facility. CO_2 emissions of the proposed new FedEx facility were estimated to produce 1,144 metric tons of CO_2 per year, which is equivalent to the energy use of 144 homes for one year. This is not expected to be a significant effect to climate.

Relating to operational GHG emissions, the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project has identified GHG emissions related to jet emissions, which would not increase as a result of the Proposed Action, and refrigeration emissions, which would not occur under the Proposed Action. Therefore, the Proposed Action's contribution to GHG impacts is not cumulatively considerable.

Hazardous Materials During the initial fill, excavation, and surcharging activities, there is potential for the Proposed Action to temporarily impact and displace PFAS-contaminated groundwater. As required by ADEC, a plan has been prepared that consists of a construction mitigation plan outlining guidelines and BMPs relating to the handling of potentially contaminated soil, groundwater, and surface water that could be encountered during

construction (see Appendix E of the Final EA). Implementation of these BMPs would reduce and avoid impacts to hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention and does not exceed significance thresholds. The Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project also has an approved EMP that includes soil handling, stormwater management, and groundwater management procedures at the site. Annual water quality monitoring is currently conducted and would continue to be done in accordance with the APDES permit issued to ANC and would continue to occur beyond construction of the Proposed Action. Groundwater sampling in the Postmark Bog is conducted annually by DOT&PF. The number of samples and frequency of sampling may increase as more information is gathered about the extent of contamination within the area. The samples are analyzed for PFAS compounds and petroleum hydrocarbons. ADEC is notified if any samples exceed maximum contaminant levels for the targeted analytes. Samples are also collected by DOT&PF from the stormwater system to monitor for potential contamination.

Required water quality and stormwater BMPs were followed for past projects, and reasonably foreseeable projects would implement the same practices to minimize potential for water quality impacts; therefore, no cumulative impacts would occur.

Natural Resources and Energy Energy demands of the Proposed Action would not exceed available or future energy supplies and therefore would not be significant. Cumulative impacts related to energy and natural resource supplies would also not be significant.

Noise The Proposed Action does not exceed significance thresholds for noise defined as an increase in noise by Day-Night Average Sound Level (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 or greater increase, when compared to the no action alternative for the same timeframe. As the nearest residences are approximately 0.9 mile (4,616 feet) east of the project study area, construction noise would attenuate and reduce the sound level of an 88 dB piece of equipment by approximately 39 dB to about 49 dB. With two pieces of 88 dB equipment operating at the same time the construction noise would be approximately 52 dB at the nearest residence, and with three pieces of 88 dB equipment operating at the same time it would be 55 dB. As reported in the Airport's FAR Part 150 Compatibility Study Update, a semi-permanent noise monitor was set up at 3190 Bridle Lane, which is at the approximate location of the nearest residential land use to the project study area (FAA, 2015b). The ambient noise at this monitoring site was recorded at 59.3 dB in the winter and at 64.9 dB in the summer. Therefore, due to the distance from the closest sensitive noise receptor, noise attenuation from the project study area, and typical ambient noise levels, construction noise would not likely be perceptible at the nearest residence to the project study area.

Because construction of the Proposed Action would occur at the same time as construction of the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project, there is potential for cumulative construction noise to reach levels above those level associated with construction of the Proposed Action. However, construction noise is temporary in nature and is subject to the Anchorage Noise Control Ordinance (AMC 15.70), which identifies a construction sound level limit of 80 dB within a residential property boundary or within a noise-sensitive zone during any one hour of the identified daily period, depending on season. If construction noise levels are higher than

anticipated or occur outside of identified daily periods, AMC 15.70 requires a Noise Permit that could include conditions that the Municipality of Anchorage determines to be appropriate. Therefore, due to the distance to the closest noise-sensitive land use (residential use approximately 0.9 mile or 4,616 feet away), even with both projects running construction equipment at the same time (refer to the Final EA for a discussion on noise attenuation), it is unlikely that construction noise would reach 80 dB within a residential property boundary and cumulative impacts related to construction noise would not be cumulatively considerable.

Operation of the Proposed Action would not result in an increase in aircraft operations or cargo operations at the Airport. Regional operations would be relocated from the existing facility to the new facility with no increase in operations. Additionally, the proposed facility and aircraft parking apron would be located adjacent to the existing FedEx operations area, with the proposed aircraft parking apron located approximately 375 feet south from the existing apron, so any change in noise due to operations is not anticipated to be perceptible. The Proposed Action would not change airfield configurations, runway uses, flight patterns, or aircraft operations at the Airport. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not result in changes to local traffic patterns or result in additional traffic. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Action would have no effect on the noise setting at the Airport.

Visual Resources The Proposed Action would not result in viewshed changes for residents or a community off-Airport property, therefore there are no significant impacts or cumulative impacts associated with visual resources and character of the proposed project.

Floodplain The Proposed Action would not occur within any existing floodplain and, therefore, would not impact any floodplain resource.

Wetlands The Proposed Action would affect 14.32 acres of depressional wetlands within the project study area. Therefore, the Proposed Action requires mitigation measures to be implemented to reduce impacts to wetland resources. An individual permit with USACE considered both direct and indirect impacts, and the Proposed Action would result in a total of 9.74 debits. The Airport currently holds 8.563 compensatory mitigation credits within the Airport's Klatt Bog wetland band and proposes using the available credits as mitigation for the Proposed Action. As determined through consultation and coordination with USACE and ADEC, an additional 4.092 wetland compensatory mitigation credits will be purchased from Portage Reserve Mitigation Bank (Alaska Railroad). Wetland mitigation reduces significance below significance threshold for wetlands. Cumulatively, with other area projects, the USACE in their environmental document associated with this project states that "When considering the direct and indirect impacts that will result from the proposed activity, in relation to the overall direct and indirect impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities, the incremental contribution of the proposed activity to cumulative impacts in the area described in Section 9.2, are not significant. Compensatory mitigation will be required to offset the impacts of the proposed activity to eliminate or minimize its incremental contribution to cumulative effects within the geographic area described in Section 9.2."

Surface Water The Proposed Action would increase the amount of impervious surfaces within the project study area by about 18.7 acres for the construction of the proposed FedEx facility and

increase the amount and rate of stormwater runoff within the project study area. As identified in the EMP prepared for the Proposed Action (Appendix E of the EA), soil handling during construction would be conducted in a manner that prevents the release of contaminants to surface water and is protective of the water quality standards presented in the ADEC's 18 AAC 70 Water Quality Standards regulations. Stormwater management procedures would be outlined in the project SWPPP and ESCP prepared by the Contractor. Additionally, the Proposed Action includes grassed swales and a detention basin in order to reduce stormwater runoff and reduce any potential effects to stormwater. By complying with required BMPs and the guidelines outlined in the SWPPP and ESCP, the Proposed Action is unlikely to cause significant impacts to surface water resources. Therefore, formal mitigation measures pertaining to surface water resources are not proposed.

Groundwater Groundwater generated during construction would be managed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the ADEC Excavation Dewatering Permit, AKG002000. A dewatering and best practices plan would be prepared by the Contractor and submitted to ADEC for approval prior to the start of dewatering. The plan would include details of the treatment system design and processes. The plan would also provide details regarding the collection of periodic sampling of post-treated water, which will include the collection of at least two performance monitoring samples of effluent water during the active dewatering portions of the project. By complying with the required terms and conditions of the ADEC Excavation Dewatering Permit and dewatering and best practices plan, the Proposed Action is unlikely to cause significant impacts to groundwater resources. Therefore, mitigation measures pertaining to groundwater resources are not proposed. Surface and groundwater impacts, when analyzed cumulatively are not significant; The Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project also has an approved EMP that includes soil handling, stormwater management, and groundwater management procedures at the site.

Environmental Commitments

The Proposed Action will adhere to all federal, state, and local laws. In addition, construction of the Proposed Action will include measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential environmental impacts through standard operating procedures and BMPs. The following are proposed environmental commitments that arose from coordination with regulatory agencies. In addition to the environmental commitments, the Proposed Action will adhere to all permit stipulations that may arise during the permitting process.

Required Permits and/or Approvals

- ADEC Excavation Dewatering Permit, AKG002000
- ADEC, Section 401 Clean Water Act Certificate of Reasonable Assurance; APDES General Permit for Discharges from Large and Small Construction Activities
- ADEC SWPPP and ESCP
- ADEC Transport, Treatment, Disposal Form for Contaminated Media
- ANC Building Permit
- Anchorage Noise Control Ordinance (AMC 15.70)

- Approvals through consultation with the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and local Indian Tribes, and Alaskan Native Villages, under the National Historic Preservation Act
- USACE, Section 404 Clean Water Act Individual Permit

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigations are required for compliance and will be incorporated and formalized in a mitigation monitoring plan:

- The following mitigation measure will be implemented to account for the loss of 14.32 acres of depressional wetlands due to the construction and implementation of the Proposed Action: The Airport currently holds 8.563 compensatory mitigation credits within the Airport's Klatt Bog wetland band and proposes using the available credits as mitigation for the Proposed Action. An additional 4.092 wetland compensatory mitigation credits will be purchased from Portage Reserve Mitigation Bank (Alaska Railroad).

- As required by ADEC, an EMP has been prepared that consists of a construction mitigation plan outlining guidelines and BMPs relating to the handling of potentially contaminated soil, groundwater, and surface water that could be encountered during construction (see Appendix E of the Final EA). Implementation of these BMPs would reduce and avoid impacts to hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention and no additional mitigation measures are proposed. The sponsor's consultation with ADEC is documented in the Final EA and appendices. Actions related to contaminated materials have been reviewed and accepted by the ADEC. Therefore, the authority having jurisdiction has defined and recognized a state of conditional compliance under which the project has the legal authority to proceed. The FAA recognizes and accepts that authority.

Public and Agency Involvement and Cooperation

FedEx published a public notice with the Anchorage Daily News on January 23, 2023, announcing that it was holding a public scoping meeting on February 16, 2023, for the Proposed Action. The public scoping meeting was held in person on February 16, 2023, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Alaska Standard Time (AKST) at the Coast Inn at Lake Hood in Anchorage. There were five attendees at the public scoping meeting. The format of the public scoping meeting was an open house with poster boards for the public to walk through and ask questions at their own pace. The poster boards covered a brief overview of NEPA and the NEPA process, the purpose and need for the project, and the proposed scope for the environmental analysis of potentially affected resource categories, along with how to provide comments during the 30-day scoping period. Members of the public had an opportunity to ask questions and converse with FedEx staff and the EA consultant team. In addition, members of the public were given the opportunity to submit written comments during the scoping meeting. FedEx received no written comments during the public scoping meeting. A total of two comments, one from an agency and one from a community-based organization, were received during the 30-day comment period that ended on March 20, 2023, at 5:00p.m. AKST. Appendix A of the Final EA includes materials from the public scoping meeting and all comments received.

As part of initial scoping coordination efforts, on January 23, 2023, FedEx submitted, via email, invitations to comment on the scope of the EA and attend a scoping meeting on February 16, 2023. In total, eight federal, state, or local agencies and nine community-based organizations were contacted. The comments received were incorporated into the environmental studies where applicable. Appendix A of the EA includes the requests for comments sent to the agencies and organizations, confirmation of electronic delivery, and copies of responses received.

Letters initiating tribal consultation were sent to the Chickaloon Native Village, the Knik Tribal Council, and the Eklutna Native Village on July 19, 2023 (see Appendix C of the Final EA). No response was received.

The Draft EA was available for review by the general public, government agencies, and interested parties for a period of 47 days. The Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EA and information on the scheduled public open house was published in the Anchorage Daily News, notification on the State of Alaska Online Public Notification System and through the State of Alaska GovDelivery, and emailed to parties who had requested notification during the scoping period. The Draft EA was available electronically on the project website (https://bit.ly/ANCA-EA) and on the Airport's website (https://dot.alaska.gov/anc/). Hard copies of the Draft EA were available for public review at the DOT&PF offices (4111 Aviation Avenue, Anchorage, AK 99519) and at the Z.J. Loussac Library (3600 Denali Street, Anchorage, AK 99503).

A public open house was held during the Draft EA comment period on Tuesday, October 17, 2023, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Alaska Daylight Time (AKDT) at the Coast Inn at Lake Hood in Anchorage (3450 Aviation Ave, Anchorage, AK 99502).

Comments on the Draft EA could be submitted during the comment period in writing at the public open house, electronically to Karin.Bouler@rsandh.com, or via mail to RS&H, Attn: Karin Bouler, 311 California Street, Suite 720, San Francisco, CA 94104. Written comments were accepted until 5:00 PM AKDT on Tuesday, October 31, 2023. The public was advised that before including their address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in their comment, that their entire comment – including their personal identifying information – may be made publicly available at any time.
Copies of the materials from the public open house, comments received during the comment period, and responses to those comments are provided in Appendix A of the Final EA.

Two comments, one from the Turnagain Community Council and one from a member of the public, were received during the public comment period for the Draft EA. Comments received were related to air quality, hazardous materials (specifically PFAS), noise, wetlands, and groundwater. Comments received during the public outreach efforts and responses to those comments are provided in Appendix A of the Final EA.

There were no official cooperating or participating federal agencies for this EA. There was coordination with the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Alaska Department of Environmental Quality for the wetland impacts, permitting, and contaminated materials.

Federal Finding and Approval

After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained herein, the undersigned finds that the proposed Federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101 of NEPA and other applicable environmental requirements and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or otherwise include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the selected alternatives have been adopted. As a result, FAA will not prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for this action.

Based on the information in this FONSI/ROD and supported by detailed discussion in the Final EA, the FAA has selected and approved the Proposed Action as the Selected Alternative. Approval signifies that applicable federal requirements relating to the proposed airport rehabilitation and planning have been met. Approval would allow Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport to amend its Airport Layout Plan and allow Federal Express to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Action.

For further information contact Kristi Ponozzo at kristi.m.ponozzo@faa.gov

KRISTI A WARDEN Digitally signed by KRISTI A WARDEN Date: 2024.02.01 10:17:58 -09'00'

KRISTI WARDEN
Director, Alaskan Region Airports Division **Date**

RIGHT OF APPEAL

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