Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) Replacement Program

Flying Cloud Airport (FCM) ATCT Final Tiered Environmental Assessment (EA)

Eden Prairie, MN
October 2025

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADO.....Airports District Office
AGL .....Above Ground Level
AMSL.....Above Mean Sea Level
AOA.....Air Operations Area
APE.....Area of Potential Effect
ATCT.....Airport Traffic Control Tower
AVCO .....The Aviation Corporation
BLM.....Bureau of Land Management
BMP .....Best Management Practice
CATEX.....Categorical Exclusion
CEQ .....Council on Environmental Quality
CFR.....Code of Federal Regulations
CZMA.....Coastal Zone Management Act
DOT.....Department of Transportation
EA .....Environmental Assessment
EPA.....U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA.....Endangered Species Act
FAA.....Federal Aviation Administration
FCM.....Flying Cloud Airport
FY.....Fiscal Year
FBO .....Fixed Base Operator
FEMA.....Federal Emergency Management Agency
FONSI.....Finding of No Significant Impact
IIJA .....Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act
LLC .....Limited Liability Company
MAC.....Minneapolis Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission
NAS.....National Airspace System
n.d. .....No Date
NEPA .....National Environmental Policy Act
NFHL.....National Flood Hazard Layer
NOAA.....National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPDES.....National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS.....National Park Service
NRHP.....National Register of Historic Places
NRI .....Nationwide Rivers Inventory
PEA.....Programmatic Environmental Assessment
PM.....Particulate Matter
ROD .....Record of Decision
SHPO.....State Historic Preservation Officer
U.S.....United States of America
U.S.C. .....U.S. Code
USFWS .....U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS .....United States Geological Survey
VISTA.....Virtual Immersive Siting Tower Assessment

SECTION 1 | INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is proposing to replace the existing Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) at Flying Cloud Airport (FCM). The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) Public Law [P.L] 117-58), enacted on November 15, 2021, formerly referred to as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, appropriated $25 billion (B) over a five-year period (Fiscal Year 2022 [FY22] to 2026 [FY26]) for National Airspace System (NAS) improvements, which includes airport traffic control and other airport infrastructure projects. As a result, the FAA Air Traffic Organization established a dedicated ATCT Replacement Program to use the IIJA funding to replace existing FAA-owned ATCTs at mainly non-major airports with modern ATCT facilities (FAA, n.d.). The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] § 4321 et seq.) requires that a federal agency prepare a statement of environmental impacts as part of the development process for projects requiring a federal action, such as funding, approving, or permitting.

The FAA prepared a Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) for the Final ATCT Replacement Program (hereinafter referred to as ATCT Final PEA[1]) (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023) in accordance with NEPA (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.); FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*;[2] the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (Public Law 118-5); and other applicable federal laws and regulations. The ATCT Final PEA provided sufficient evidence and analysis for a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) / Record of Decision (ROD) determination (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023).

This ATCT EA for FCM tiers[3] from the ATCT Final PEA and follows the FAA's updated Order 1050.1G, *FAA National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures,* to evaluate the existing environment and analyzes the reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences of the proposed alternatives at a site-specific level through the framework established by the ATCT Final PEA and FONSI/ROD.

1.2 PROPOSED ACTION

The FAA's Proposed Action is to replace the existing FAA-owned FCM ATCT with a modern ATCT facility. Figure 1-1 provides an aerial image of the airport property boundary, which

[1] The ATCT Final PEA can be found here: https://www.faa.gov/air-traffic/bilatctfinalpea21sept2023signed

[2] On June 30, 2025, the FAA rescinded its NEPA implementation procedures in FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, and issued new NEPA implementing procedures in FAA Order 1050.1G, *FAA National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures*. The FAA ATCT Final PEA (2023) applied FAA Order 1050.1F and provided appropriate citations to that order, where appropriate. There are no material changes to the analysis of environmental effects for the issuance and implementation of the FAA ATCT Final PEA and FONSI/ROD caused by the updated FAA's NEPA implementing procedures.

[3] Tiering in accordance with NEPA is defined in FAA Order 1050.1G, Section 3-1.

includes the Air Operations Area (AOA) and additional property outside of the AOA. The Proposed Action is anticipated to include the following activities:

- Acquisition of a new lease with the airport authority to construct an ATCT in a new location.
- Unconditional approval of portions of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depict those portions of the Proposed Project subject to FAA review and approval pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 47107(a)(16).
- Construction and operation of a replacement ATCT, and other associated facility support features such as a parking area and security fences.
- Extension and/or relocation of access roads and utilities to the replacement ATCT.
- Installation of modern air traffic control electronic equipment in the replacement ATCT.
- Commissioning of the replacement ATCT, cutover of air traffic services to the replacement ATCT, and decommissioning of the existing ATCT.
- Demolition and disposal of the existing ATCT facility and associated infrastructure.
- Relocation of the FAA-owned FCM Surface Weather System automated weather observing facility and other FAA NAS facilities, as necessary to support the proposed relocation of the FCM ATCT.
- Relocation of the airport-owned rotating beacon to atop the proposed new FCM ATCT.

The estimated construction start date to replace the ATCT is in 2026.

1.3 BACKGROUND

1.3.1 Airport Information

The Flying Cloud Airport (FCM) is located in the City of Eden Prairie in southeastern Minnesota and serves as one of six general aviation reliever airports for the Minneapolis Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC). FCM is the busiest reliever airport in the MAC with more than 100,000 operations annually. FCM is located approximately 14 miles southwest of Minneapolis. (Metropolitan Airports Commission, n.d.)

In 1943 FCM began as 135 acres with a grass strip that the Navy used to practice approaches. MAC acquired the airport in 1947 and has since expanded to 860 acres with three paved runways. Runway 18/36 was paved in 1949 and lights were installed in 1952. The ATCT was commissioned in 1963. Runway expansion and lighting projects continued from the 1960s through 2009. The last runway expansion occurred in 2009 with Runway 10L/28R extended from 3,600 feet to 3,900 feet and runway 10R/28L extended to 5,000 feet and widened to 100 feet. (Metropolitan Airports Commission, 2010)

Figure 1-1. Aerial Image of Airport Property

1.3.2 Existing Airport Traffic Control Tower Information

Constructed in 1963, the existing FAA-owned FCM ATCT is a non-standard design type (see Figure 1-2). The ATCT has a cab size of 290 square feet with cab eye level at 55 ft above ground level (AGL). The ATCT operates daily from 0700 to 2200 Central Daylight Time (0700 – 2100 Central Standard Time) (FAA, 2024a). The existing ATCT is located on the southern portion of the airport on Cumulus Road at 44° 49' 18.3" N, 93° 27' 30.1" W.

Figure 1-2. Photo of Existing Non-standard Design FCM Tower

SECTION 2 | PURPOSE AND NEED

This Purpose and Need is tiered from, and consistent with the ATCT Final PEA (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023), but focuses on the specific requirements of the FCM ATCT.

2.1 PURPOSE

The FCM ATCT is an FAA-owned ATCT proposed for replacement under the ATCT Replacement Program. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to replace the FCM ATCT with a modern ATCT providing for uninterrupted air traffic control services.

The Proposed Action at this airport would provide for a modern, operationally efficient ATCT that would meet all applicable FAA requirements. This replacement ATCT would enable the installation of modern and required air traffic control equipment, improve visibility of the airport property, provide adequate space and an enhanced work environment for FAA personnel, lower operating costs, and improve environmental performance, resulting in reduced energy consumption due to an efficient design including energy efficient features, windows, and ventilation/heating systems while meeting applicable FAA requirements.

2.2 NEED

The FAA recognizes the need to provide continual air traffic control services at FCM. The existing FCM ATCT does not have the ability to accommodate upgrades to the latest air traffic control technologies, does not meet personnel space requirements, and lacks modern amenities. The existing FCM ATCT has current line-of-sight issues in the area between the two runways and hold short areas northeast of the ATCT.

SECTION 3 | ALTERNATIVES

In compliance with FAA Order 6480.4C, *Siting of Airport Traffic Control Towers*, the FAA adheres to a siting process to provide the lowest cost ATCT that meets all siting criteria for the establishment or replacement of an ATCT facility (FAA, 2025a). This siting process takes into consideration multiple technical criteria, as prescribed in Order 6480.4C.

Representatives from the FAA and FCM airport conducted siting for this project in conjunction with FAA's Virtual Immersive Siting Tower Assessment (VISTA) process. FAA and FCM airport representatives met virtually to participate in siting activities to determine viable and preferred ATCT sites for a potential new ATCT. (FAA, 2023)

This tiered EA evaluates the selected site alternative (as determined by the ATCT siting process) and no action alternative for the proposed replacement of the FCM ATCT. Other alternatives considered in the siting report did not meet the technical siting criteria as outlined in FAA Order 6480.4C and were not carried forward (FAA, 2025a). Figure 3-1. provides an aerial image of the proposed new replacement tower at the selected project site alternative.

3.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: PROPOSED ACTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE)

The Proposed Action, as determined by the siting process governed by FAA Order 6480.4C, *Siting Airport Traffic Control Towers,* is the construction and operation of a replacement ATCT at a site referred to in the siting report as 1B. Site 1B, hereinafter referred to as the proposed new ATCT site, is located at a latitude of 44°49'30.35" N and a longitude of 93°27'29.6"W, approximately 0.23 miles north from the existing ATCT. This location was deemed most technically feasible of the siting alternatives considered based on the siting criteria referenced in Chapter 3 of the PEA (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023).

The proposed new ATCT site, located approximately 700 feet southwest of the intersection of Taxiways B and E, is an approximately 3.0 acre site providing the most optimal visibility of the locations necessary for air traffic control. The proposed new ATCT site is an undeveloped area with maintained grass and vegetation. The proposed tower cab eye-level elevation is 85 ft AGL and 979 ft above mean sea level (AMSL). This is the minimum height that would meet all siting criteria under the Safety Management System. At this height, controllers would have unobstructed views of all airport controlled areas and all airborne traffic. The tower would have an 8-sided, 440 square foot cab. The proposed design includes space for five air traffic controller positions: Ground Control, Local Control, Local Control 2, Flight Data, and Supervisor. Stairs would be located opposite the Flight Data position (FAA, 2023). New utilities and an access road would need to be routed to the proposed new ATCT site. The Proposed Action also includes the demolition of the existing FCM ATCT.



Figure 3-1. Proposed Layout of Replacement ATCT

Source: (PAU and Atkins Realis, 2025)

3.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: NO ACTION

A No Action Alternative is required to be included in this EA is consistent with FAA Order 1050.1G. The No Action Alternative is defined as maintaining the status quo (baseline conditions) without federal agency involvement. The No Action Alternative is used to evaluate the effects of not replacing the ATCT and provides a benchmark against which other alternatives may be evaluated. Therefore, for purposes of comparative analysis in this EA, the No Action Alternative represents the conditions that would be reasonably foreseeable if Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) were not implemented.

SECTION 4 | AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This Section describes the existing environmental resource conditions or affected environment at FCM and surrounding areas. This Section also analyzes the reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences from each alternative for each resource category.

As detailed in the ATCT Final PEA and FONSI/ROD, the FAA identified and analyzed reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts for the broad scope of actions planned for ATCT replacement activities (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023). This programmatic approach allows the FAA to review project-specific details and reasonably foreseeable impacts during the site selection, planning, and construction processes for those ATCT projects within the scope of the PEA analysis.

4.1 RESOURCE CATEGORIES PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED BY THE ATCT FINAL PEA

The ATCT Final PEA and FONSI/ROD identified eight resource categories as having "no significant impact" (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023). The following resource categories were reviewed for project specific impacts and determined to be consistent with the PEA in that no significant impacts are reasonably foreseeable from implementation of the Proposed Action.

☒ Air Quality

☒ Climate[4]

☒ Farmlands

☒ Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention

☒ Land Use

☒ Natural Resources and Energy Supply

☒ Noise

☒ Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice,[5] and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks

[4] Executive Order 13990, *Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis,* was revoked as well as the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) implementing regulations for NEPA. As a result of the revocation of Executive Order 13990 and the CEQ regulations, all references to climate and any qualitative climate evaluation are no longer included in NEPA evaluations.

[5] On January 21, 2025, President Trump issued Executive Order 14173, *Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity.* Due to the rescission of prior Executive Orders regarding environmental justice and the recent action by the CEQ to rescind the NEPA implementing regulations, it is no longer a legal requirement or the policy of the federal government to conduct an environmental justice analysis. Any

4.2 RESOURCE CATEGORIES REQUIRING SITE-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS PER THE ATCT FINAL PEA

The ATCT Final PEA and FONSI/ROD also identified six resource categories that were unlikely to be significantly impacted but would require a site-specific analysis (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023). In accordance with the ATCT Final PEA, this EA reviews the following resource categories:

- Biological Resources –Section 4.2.1 includes a description of the existing environment and reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences for biological resources.
- Coastal Resources – There are no coastal resources near FCM; therefore, the resource is not analyzed in this EA.
- Historical Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources – Section 4.2.2 includes a description of the existing environment and reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences for historic and cultural resources.
- Department of Transportation (DOT) Act, Section 4(f) – Section 4.2.3 includes a description of the existing environment and reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences for Section 4(f) properties on or near FCM.
- Visual Effects – Section 4.2.4 includes a description of the existing environment and reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences for visual effects.
- Water Resources – Section 4.2.5 includes a description of the existing environment and reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences for water resources.

Regulatory requirements for these resource categories can be reviewed in more detail in the ATCT PEA (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023).

4.2.1 Biological Resources (including Fish, Wildlife, and Plants)

Biological resources include native plants, animals, and their habitats. Protected and sensitive biological resources include federally listed (endangered[6] or threatened[7]), and candidate[8] species designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Marine Fisheries Service, or a State. Sensitive habitats described in this Section include those

prior data gathering, analysis, or discussion regarding environmental justice is not relevant for purposes of evaluating the NEPA significance of this project, nor did it play any role in agency decision-making.

[6] Endangered species are "any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range" (ESA, Section 3(6))

[7] Threatened species are "any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range" (ESA, Section 3(20))

[8] Candidate species are any species whose status is under review "to determine whether it warrants listing under the ESA" (ESA, Section 4)

areas designated by the USFWS as critical habitat[9] protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA; 16 U.S.C. Chapter 35 § 1531 et seq.)

4.2.1.1 Affected Environment

Vegetation

The FCM airport is located in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Level III Ecoregion 51 classified as Northern Central Hardwood Forests (EPA, 2013). The airport is bordered by Flying Cloud Drive to the south with Minnesota Valley Wildlife Refuge beginning immediately south of that (Bureau of Land Management, 2024). Residential houses are present to the north and west of the airport, and a landfill is located east of the airport. The existing ATCT is located in the southernmost portion of the airport approximately 550 feet north of Flying Cloud Drive. The existing ATCT is located at a paved site surrounded by a mowed grassy area consisting of non-native bluegrass (*Poa* spp.) and Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*). The proposed new ATCT site is located centrally at the airport on an unimproved grassy area approximately 0.23 miles north of the existing ATCT. Vegetation at the proposed new ATCT site is comprised of primarily non-native species, including birds-foot trefoil (*Lotus corniculatus*), Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*), floating sweet-grass (*Glyceria notata*), fescue grass (*Festuca sp.*), smooth brome (*Bromus inermis*), wood sorrel (*Oxalis acetosella*), and red clover (*Trifolium pratense*). While not widespread, two native common milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*) plants were observed on site.

Wildlife and Fish

Due to the proposed ATCT site being located on airport property, surrounded by airport facilities, and on a previously disturbed area (mowed grass), high-quality habitat for wildlife species is not present. The proposed ATCT site is located adjacent to Taxiways B and E and developed areas on the airport property. No aquatic or other native critical habitat is present within or adjacent to the proposed ATCT site. Highly mobile species such as birds, bats, or flying insects could be transiently present, but it is unlikely most wildlife would use the proposed site and existing ATCT as permanent habitat. During the site visit personnel observed dragonflies, white moths, a bumblebee, and a wasp. The site visit team was unable to identify the species of bumblebee. MAC also provided a strike incident log that noted incidents involving gulls, killdeer, horned lark, tree swallow, barn swallow, sparrow, nighthawk, wild turkeys, ospreys, and red-tailed hawks in the last two years (FAA, 2024b).

Special Status Species

Special status species generally occupy unique or specific habitat, such as riparian forests, wetlands, or native ecosystems. Due to the developed nature of the airport, it is highly unlikely any federal or state-listed threatened, endangered, or candidate species would be

[9] Critical habitat refers to "(i) the specific areas within the geographical area occupied by the species, at the time it is listed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this Act, on which are found those physical or biological features (I) essential to the conservation of the species and (II) which may require special management considerations or protection; and (ii) specific areas outside the geographical area occupied by the species at the time it is listed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this Act, upon a determination by the Secretary that such areas are essential for the conservation of the species." (ESA, Section 3(5)(A))

present within the airport study area. No federal or state-listed endangered or threatened have been positively identified, documented, or observed within the airport study area (Figure 1-1).

Table 4-1 displays the federally listed species within Hennepin County, where FCM is located. According to the USFWS Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS), there are 12 species known to occur within Hennepin County. A more focused search of the proposed and existing tower locations and surrounding areas using the USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) identified species included in the county list, with other species from the county list not occurring, which are noted Not Applicable (NA) in the table below. No critical habitat is located within the study area. Both of the USFWS lists are provided in Appendix A.

Table 4-1. Federally Listed Species

Common Name	Scientific Name	County Listed Status	Study Area Status
Whooping crane	*Grus americana*	Experimental population, non-essential	Experimental population, non-essential
Northern Long-eared Bat	*Myotis septentrionalis*	Endangered	Endangered
Tricolored Bat	*Perimyotis subflavus*	Proposed Endangered	Proposed Endangered
Western Regal Fritillary	*Argynnis idalia occidentalis*	Proposed Threatened	Proposed Threatened
Rusty Patched Bumble Bee	*Bombus affinis*	Endangered	Endangered
Spectaclecase Mussel	*Cumberlandia monodonta*	Endangered	NA
Monarch Butterfly	*Danaus plexippus*	Proposed Threatened	Proposed Threatened
Snuffbox Mussel	*Epioblasma triquetra*	Endangered	NA
Whooping Crane	*Grus americana*	Experimental Population, Non-Essential	Experimental Population, Non-Essential
Higgins Eye (pearlymussel)	*Lamsilis higginsii*	Endangered	NA
Little brown bat	*Myotis lucifugus*	Under Review	NA
Northern Long-eared Bat	*Myotis septentrionalis*	Endangered	Endangered
Tricolored Bat	*Perimyotis subflavus*	Proposed Endangered	Proposed Endangered
Winged Mapleleaf	*Quadrula fragosa*	Endangered	NA
Regal Fritillary	*Speyeria idalia*	Proposed Threatened	NA

Source: (USFWS, 2025a) (USFWS, 2025b)

Due to the absence of aquatic habitat, no mussel or species that use aquatic habitat are expected to be present within the study area, as indicated in Table 4-1.

During the June 2024 site visit, an unidentified bumble bee was observed flying through the proposed new ATCT site. The rusty patched bumble bee (*Bombus affinus*) is an endangered bumble bee identified as potentially present within the study area. There is no critical habitat designated for the species, but the study area is within the bee's high potential zone of presence. Rusty patched bumble bee habitat is classified as nesting and overwintering.

Overwintering habitat includes mainly forests and woodlands in shaded areas with loose soil and leaf litter. Ideal overwintering habitat is not present at FCM. Nesting habitat includes grassland and shrubland with abundant and diverse floral foraging resources. Nests are built mainly underground in abandoned animal burrows or holes. Only a small diversity of flowers was observed on the proposed new ATCT site. The disturbed and consistently mowed field at the proposed new ATCT site and the existing ATCT could provide low quality nesting habitat for the rusty patched bumble bee. In 2020, the USFWS determined that the availability of habitat for the rusty patched bumble bee is not a primary threat to the species and does not limit the species' conservation. (USFWS, 2020) (USFWS, n.d. a)

Roosting habitat and hibernacula (places for bats to hibernate) could be present at the proposed new ATCT site for the northern long eared bat. Roosting habitat for the tricolored bat and little brown bat could be present in the existing tower. These species were not observed during the June 2024 site survey and the open space is not ideal foraging habitat for bats as it is regularly mowed and maintained which prohibits an accumulation of prey (insects). No critical habitat for either bat species is present within the study area. Additionally, these bat species prefer forested habitat (USFWS, 2024a) (USFWS, 2022) (USFWS, n.d. b).

The monarch butterfly is a federally listed proposed threatened species that could use habitat within the study area (USFWS, 2025a). Proposed species are those likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout their range. Proposed species do not have associated critical habitat designated until they are formally listed under the ESA. Adult monarch butterflies feed on the nectar of flowering plants and their larva requires milkweed plants to develop. Monarch butterflies only reproduce where milkweed plants are located (USDA, n.d.). The species could use airport habitat for resting or feeding if flowering plants were present. Two milkweed plants were identified during the June site visit, which could provide required habitat for monarchs. No larvae or adult monarch were observed during the site visit.

Migratory Birds

Minnesota is located within the Mississippi Flyway for migratory birds. The USFWS lists twenty-two (22) migratory birds as potentially using or passing through the project area. At FCM, the probability of presence for these species is highest mainly between May and October (Appendix A). None of the migratory bird species listed by the USFWS are noted in the FAA's Wildlife Strike Database for FCM (FAA, 2024b). Bald eagles have a high probability of presence throughout the year. The bald eagle is not a Bird of Conservation Concern in the study area; however, it warrants additional attention due to its inclusion in the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d). Bald eagles could migrate or breed in the area; bald eagle management guidelines would apply if any nests were observed in the study area. (USFWS, 2024b)

Invasive Species

Invasive terrestrial plant species could be present within or surrounding the proposed new ATCT site and the existing ATCT location. The Minnesota Department of Agriculture maintains a list of noxious weeds in the state listed in Table 4-2 below. There are currently 16 listed noxious weeds for the state of Minnesota.

Table 4-2. Minnesota Noxious Weed List

Common Name	Scientific Name	Common Name	Scientific Name
Black swallow-wort	*Cynanchum louiseae*	Japanese honeysuckle	*Lonicera japonica*
Brown knapweed	*Centaurea jacea*	Japanese hops	*Humulus japonicus*
Common teasel	*Dipsacus fullonum*	Johnsongrass	*Sorghum halepense*
Cutleaf teasel	*Dipsacus laciniatus*	Pale swallow-wort	*Cyanchum rossicum*
Dalmatian toadflax	*Linaria dalmatica*	Palmer amaranth	*Amaranthus palmeri*
Diffuse knapweed	*Centaurea diffusa*	Red hailstone	*Thladiantha dubia*
Giant hogweed	*Heracleum mantegazzianum*	Tree of heaven	*Ailanthus altissma*
Grecian foxglove	*Digitalis lanata*	Yellow starthistle	*Centaurea solstitialis*

Source: (Minnesota Department of Agriculture, 2023)

Noxious and invasive plant species can be spread by vehicles, machinery, wildlife, and by natural forces such as by wind or water. Areas that are disturbed through construction, by vehicles, or fire may be vulnerable to the introduction and spread of noxious weeds. None of these invasive species were observed at the existing or proposed tower sites during the site visit conducted in June 2024.

4.2.1.2 Environmental Consequences

Detailed guidance on significance thresholds and effects determinations and/or factors to consider when evaluating context and intensity for biological resource impacts can be found in the ATCT Final PEA (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023) and FAA Order 1050.1G, Appendix A (FAA, 2025b).

Alternative 1: Proposed Action

The proposed new ATCT site (Proposed Action) would involve construction on an undeveloped, maintained grassy portion of the FCM property. None of the vegetation identified during the June 2024 site visit was determined to be protected species. There are no reasonably foreseeable impacts to vegetative species of concern at the proposed new ATCT site.

The proposed new ATCT site is adjacent to a developed area on the FCM property with existing exterior lighting. Although the new tower would require additional lighting at the proposed new ATCT site, the new exterior lighting is unlikely to result in any new effects on wildlife species, including birds and bats. The increased lighting at the proposed new ATCT site is not expected to increase the overall effect of lighting on wildlife at the existing airport. Several common insects were the only wildlife species observed at the proposed new ATCT site. Overall, construction activities would be conducted during daylight hours and are not likely to impact wildlife and migratory birds.

Constructing the new ATCT would remove a grassy area of low-quality habitat potentially available for use as nesting habitat by the rusty patched bumble bee. The previously disturbed and consistently mowed area is unlikely to provide the diversity of flowering plants required for sufficient forage needed to support long-term nesting habitat for the

bumble bee. Applying best management practices (BMP) to protect rusty patched bumble bee nests, if present, would reduce or prevent impacts to the species. The disturbed nature of the land and consistent mowing at the proposed new ATCT site provide little desirable habitat and food sources are limited. The lack of feeding, roosting, and other habitat features suitable for bat species currently within the study area would result in minimal impacts to bat species from the Proposed Action. The presence of two milkweed plants could provide habitat for monarch occurrence within the project area. Applying BMPs for the monarch's preferred plant species, milkweed, could reduce or prevent any possible effects to the butterfly species. Based on the overall lack of suitable habitat, presence of existing development, and aviation operations within the study area, the effect determination under the ESA would be 'No effect.' No significant impacts to biological resources are expected in the preferred alternative.

The increase of human foot traffic, vehicle traffic, and heavy equipment usage during construction and demolition could introduce noxious weeds and invasive plant species to the construction and demolition sites; however, these impacts are not reasonably foreseeable. If landscaping is planned at the proposed new ATCT site, plant species native to the Eden Prairie area would be used.

The Proposed Action would also involve the demolition of the existing tower. The area of the existing tower would be converted to land similar to the surrounding area. The demolition of the existing tower would not cause impacts to biological resources.

Alternative 2: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing ATCT would not be removed and replaced, and activities associated with the ATCT would remain the same. No impacts to existing biological resources would occur.

4.2.1.3 Best Management Practices

To lessen the potential to impact rusty patched bumble bees, it is recommended that ground disturbance occurs before nesting season begins in early spring or a survey for nests is conducted prior to excavation to reduce the likelihood of impacting an established rusty patched bumble bee nest. To lessen the potential impact to the northern long-eared bat or the tricolored bat, it is recommended that the existing ATCT building structure be visually inspected for bats prior to demolition. To lessen the potential impact to monarch butterfly habitat, it is recommended to relocate the milkweed plants to a location on the property where disturbance will not occur.

Vehicle and equipment cleaning prior to accessing construction and demolition sites would be required to reduce the potential introduction and spread of noxious weeds.

4.2.2 Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources

Historic and cultural resources are sites, structures, buildings, districts, or objects associated with important historic events or people, demonstrating design or construction associated with a historically significant movement, or with the potential to yield historic or prehistoric data, that are considered important to a culture, a subculture, or a community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons (NPS, 1997). Historic and cultural resources may be

subdivided into the following categories: Archaeological resources, Architectural resources, Native resources, and Traditional Cultural Properties.

4.2.2.1 Affected Environment

In accordance with applicable federal laws and regulations, the FAA evaluated the proposed alternatives and Area of Potential Effects (APE) for historic and cultural resources. The APE is "the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist" (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] § 800.16(d)). The FAA assessed previously identified cultural resources within the APE and the potential for unidentified resources for each alternative.

Actions that have the potential to affect historic and cultural resources typically involve construction, ground disturbance, or modification of a historic property or a property in the viewshed of a historic property or district. Other effects to consider include noise, vibration, lighting, and increased traffic. Because all actions with the potential to affect historic and cultural resources would occur within the project area, the APE is defined as the area shown on Figure 4-1. The archaeological APE includes all areas of proposed construction activities or other potential ground disturbing activities associated with the replacement of the existing ATCT, and the architectural history APE for the proposed undertaking includes the extents of the airport property.

The existing ATCT on the property, constructed in 1963, is of a non-standard design type, Tier 3 facility, Facility Security Level 6 (Figure 1-2).

In December 2024 and January 2025, cultural and historic resource consultants the 106 Group prepared a report, *Archaeological Literature Review and Assessment for the Flying Cloud Airport Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) Project* (106 Group, 2024a). The report evaluated the proposed undertaking's archaeological APE. Due to previous ground disturbance and the negative findings of previous surveys within the project area, no additional archaeological work was recommended. Research, however, indicated that the Palmer Mounds, Group 2, may have previously existed within the archaeological APE. It appears that surface evidence of these mounds no longer exists. A cultural resources survey conducted in 1999 by Harrison et al. did not record any new archaeological sites within the archaeological APE, nor were the previously documented Palmer Mounds identified within the archaeological APE. Based on the potential for encountering disturbed human remains and/or funerary objects within the archaeological APE related to the Palmer Mounds, Group 2, consultation with the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council (MIAC) and the Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA), in accordance with the Minnesota Private Cemeteries Act (MS 307.08), was recommended prior to any ground disturbing activities. The FAA provided permit documentation to both of these parties on June 5, 2025 for their review.

Figure 4-1. Aerial Image of Study Area and Area of Potential Effects

In addition, the 106 Group also prepared a report, *Reconnaissance Architectural History Study for the Flying Cloud Airport Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) Project* (106 Group, 2024b). The report evaluated the proposed undertaking's architectural history APE. The 106 Group identified two properties within the APE that had not been previously evaluated, the Flying Cloud Airport (FCM) Airport Traffic Control Tower (HE-EPC-00331) and the Flying Cloud Airport (HE-EPC-00330). Both properties were recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) due to a lack of historical significance, and no further architectural history work was recommended for the project. The FAA initiated Section 106 consultation under the NHPA with the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office and the MIAC through notification of the FAA's Finding of No Historic Properties Affected on June 5, 2025. The FAA also initiated Section 106 consultation with federally recognized tribes with known interests or affiliations within the project area and notified them of the FAA's finding on June 5, 2025. The following tribes were consulted: Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes, Oklahoma, Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, Fort Belknap Indian Community of the Fort Belknap Reservation of Montana, Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska, Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Prairie Island Indian Community in the State of Minnesota, Santee Sioux Nation, Nebraska, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation, South Dakota, Spirit Lake Tribe, North Dakota, and the Upper Sioux Community, Minnesota.

4.2.2.2 Environmental Consequences

Detailed guidance on significance thresholds and effects determinations for historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural resources impacts can be found in the ATCT Final PEA (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023) and FAA Order 1050.1G, Appendix A (FAA, 2025b).

Alternative 1: Proposed Action

The FAA initiated an NHPA Section 106 consultation to develop and evaluate strategies to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties, should there be any within the APE, with identified consulting parties, including the Minnesota SHPO; Flying Cloud Airport; Apache Tribe of Oklahoma; Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes, Oklahoma; Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota; Fort Belknap Indian Community of the Fort Belknap Reservation of Montana; Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska; Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota; Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin; Prairie Island Indian Community in the State of Minnesota; Santee Sioux Nation, Nebraska; Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation, South Dakota; Spirit Lake Tribe, North Dakota; Upper Sioux Community, Minnesota; and the MIAC. Based on the results of the recent cultural resources surveys, no historic properties are located within the archaeological or architectural history APE and, therefore, no historic properties would be affected by the proposed undertaking. In June 2025, the FAA determined a Finding of No Historic Properties Affected. Due to the boundary of the Palmer Mounds, Group 2, extending into the project area, as detailed in Section 4.2.21, the FAA requested review of the proposed action on July 17, 2025 by the OSA and the MIAC in accordance with the Minnesota Private Cemeteries Act (MS 307.08). The FAA did not receive a response from either of these agencies. Due to the lack of responsiveness, the FAA sent additional correspondence to both agencies on September 30, 2025 to close out the consultation.

Alternative 2: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing ATCT would not be removed and replaced, and activities associated with the ATCT would remain the same. No impacts to existing historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural resources would occur.

4.2.2.3 Unanticipated Discovery

The FAA consulted with the MIAC and OSA, in accordance with the Minnesota Private Cemeteries Act, prior to any ground disturbing activities.

If during construction, demolition, and/or maintenance activities any unanticipated cultural resources are discovered, activity would cease in the area of the resource and the appropriate state, federal, and tribal officials would be notified and given the opportunity to review (FAA, 2025b). The uncovered resources would be protected. In compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, the FAA would consult with the SHPO, OSA, MIAC, and tribes on the discovery. The FAA would consider their recommendations, conduct appropriate actions, and then provide a report of those actions after they are completed (36 CFR 800.13).

4.2.3 Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f)

Section 4(f) of the U.S. DOT Act of 1966 (codified in 49 U.S.C. § 303 and 23 U.S.C. § 138) applies to projects that receive funding from or require approval by agencies within the DOT and provides for the consideration of certain properties of national, state, and/or local significance during transportation project development, such as: publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and public and private historic sites.

Before approving a transportation project requiring the use of these properties, the DOT agency must determine that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to using that land and the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm resulting from the use (FAA, 2025b).

4.2.3.1 Affected Environment

In general, actions that have the potential to affect Section 4(f) properties involve a physical or constructive use. Further detail on what constitutes a physical or constructive occupation of the property may be found in the ATCT Final PEA.

According to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) National Data Viewer, the airport property is located adjacent north of Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge; however, there are no listed recreational sites or wildlife refuges listed within the airport project area (Bureau of Land Management, 2024). The existing ATCT is located approximately 650 feet north of the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge boundary.

The Minnesota River Vista Outlook is located approximately 0.20 miles southwest of the existing ATCT. The outlook is a public park with seating that overlooks the Minnesota River. Approximately 0.53 miles northwest of the proposed new ATCT site is Grill Park East and Grill Park West which are public baseball fields. Staring Lake Park is located approximately 0.57 miles north of the proposed new ATCT site and comprises tennis courts, soccer fields, a disc golf course, and playground. Staring Park Archery Range is a free, public archery range located approximately 0.64 miles northwest of the proposed new ATCT site. Staring Lake

Park Off-leash Dog Exercise Area is a public dog park located adjacent to the Staring Park Archery Range. Flying Cloud Fields is an athletic field located 0.75 miles northwest of the proposed new ATCT site. Flying Cloud Airport Viewing Area is a public space for viewing aircraft that is visited by an estimated 50 people weekly (Booz Allen Hamilton, 2024). Prairie Bluff Conservation Area is a park and hiking area located approximately 0.95 miles southwest of the proposed new ATCT site.

As described above, no historic sites are located either within the archaeological or architectural history APE.

4.2.3.2 Environmental Consequences

Detailed guidance on significance thresholds and effects determinations for Section 4(f) resources impacts can be found in the ATCT Final PEA (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023) and FAA Order 1050.1G, Appendix A (FAA, 2025b).

Alternative 1: Proposed Action

The construction of a replacement ATCT within the proposed new ATCT site and demolition of the existing ATCT would not have a physical or constructive use impact on any Section 4(f) resources. The Section 4(f) resources in the vicinity of the project area are far enough away from the construction area that there would be no physical impacts or takings, and there would be no constructive use due to this distance and the lack of visual impacts. Any temporary increase in construction traffic to complete the Proposed Action would not affect recreational uses of the Section 4(f) resources mentioned above.

Alternative 2: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing ATCT would not be removed and replaced, and activities associated with the ATCT would remain the same. No impacts to existing DOT 4(f) resources would occur.

4.2.4 Visual Effects

Visual effects are considered under two categories: light emissions and visual resources/character. Light emissions from outdoor lighting in parking lots, streets, and within businesses or homes affect the darkness of the night sky, particularly in rural areas where fewer light sources are present. Visual character is the overall description of an area, such as rural, farmland, urban, coastal, or mountainous. (FAA, 2020)

4.2.4.1 Affected Environment

The proposed new ATCT site is located within approximately 0.23 miles north of the existing ATCT and is positioned centrally within the study area shown on Figure 1-1. The surrounding area is characterized by residential land to the north and west; office buildings, a river and wildlife area to the south; and a landfill to the east. The nearest sensitive receptor is a small residential neighborhood located approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the airport. Light emissions are a highly subjective resource due to the difference in perception and value that a user associates with the specific feature and surrounding landscape.

Light Emissions

The existing ATCT operates from 0700 to 2200 CDT (0700 – 2100 CST) with associated facility lighting. Light emissions from the airport include lighting on runways, taxiways, navigational aids, apron area, parking lots, and hangar buildings. Light emission has the potential to impact residential areas and other land uses. The nearest sensitive receptors include the Minnesota River Vista Outlook approximately 0.2 miles southwest of the existing ATCT and a residential neighborhood located approximately 0.43 miles west of the existing ATCT. Adjacent south of the airport is County Route 61 and Minnesota Valley Wildlife Refuge further south of that. As described in Section 4.2.3, Grill Park East and Grill Park West are located approximately 0.53 miles northwest of the proposed new ATCT site. Staring Lake Park is located approximately 0.57 miles north of the proposed new ATCT and Staring Park Archery Range is located approximately 0.64 miles northwest of the proposed new ATCT site. Staring Lake Park Off-leash Dog Exercise Area located adjacent to the Staring Park Archery Range. Flying Cloud Fields are located 0.75 miles northwest of the proposed new ATCT site. Flying Cloud Airport Viewing Area is a public space for viewing aircraft that is visited by an estimated 50 people weekly (Booz Allen Hamilton, 2024). Prairie Bluff Conservation Area is a park and hiking area located approximately 0.95 miles southwest of the proposed new ATCT site.

Wildlife, especially nocturnal species, may be sensitive to nighttime light sources which may disrupt migratory or breeding cycles.

Visual Resources and Visual Character

Visual resources around the proposed new ATCT site are consistent with those of the existing ATCT at FCM. The area of the existing airport is characterized as suburban with housing developments and a wildlife area to the south. Visual resources surrounding the airport property include Staring Lake to the north and Grass Lake to the south of the airport within Minnesota Valley Wildlife Refuge. The nearest residential area is located 0.43 miles west of the existing ATCT and the existing ATCT is visible from Charlson Road leading to the residential complex. Other visual resources within the existing airport environment include active runways and taxiways, a terminal building, a maintenance building, fuel storage building, air cargo facilities, and aircraft storage hangars.

4.2.4.2 Environmental Consequences

Detailed guidance on significance thresholds and effects determinations for visual resource impacts can be found in the ATCT Final PEA (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023) and FAA Order 1050.1G, Appendix A (FAA, 2025b).

Alternative 1: Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would involve construction of the new ATCT on previously cleared airport property. The proposed new ATCT site is located centrally within FCM approximately 700 feet southwest of the intersection of Taxiways B and E. This site is adjacent to lit runways and hangar space and would not impose any change to the light emissions in the immediate area. The proposed new ATCT site provides an unobstructed view of all areas of responsibility for the FCM ATCT, including approach and departure paths and all movement areas.

The proposed tower cab floor eye level elevation is 85 ft AGL and 979 ft AMSL. The top of tower height for the proposed ATCT is 110 ft AGL. The reflective surfaces of the new ATCT and support building could alter the visual character of the airport area due to the tower height and change to the viewshed. However, the change in location of light emission from the existing tower to the new tower is unlikely to create additional light emissions once the existing tower is decommissioned. The addition of a newly lit parking area for the proposed ATCT could result in new light emissions as there is no existing lighting at the proposed new ATCT site. However, existing lighting is present across the runways and airport; therefore, the addition of lighting at the proposed new ATCT site would not change the general character of the area. The closest visual receptors, the residential area southwest of the proposed new ATCT site would receive minimal to no effects from the minor changes in lighting. The changes in lighting are not expected to affect the visual nature of the existing developed area and the existing lighting present.

Wildlife, especially nocturnal species, may be sensitive to nighttime light sources which may disrupt migratory or breeding cycles. As mentioned in Section 4.2.1.1, the light-sensitive tricolored bat, Northern long-eared bat, and little brown bat were identified as species of concern within the study area. Due to the lack of suitable habitat within the study area, it is not likely that these species would be present at FCM or affected by the change in lighting from the Proposed Action.

Changes to visual resources and visual character from construction of the new tower and removal of the existing tower would not affect or obstruct visually important resources. Although the new proposed ATCT would be 30 ft taller than the existing FCM ATCT, it would not contrast with the area's visual character upon completion due to the study area being an existing and active airport. The Proposed Action is consistent with the visual character of the airport and would not contrast or obstruct the visual character or resources of the area. The new ATCT would replace the existing ATCT on the airport's property once the existing tower is decommissioned.

Alternative 2: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing ATCT would not be removed and replaced, and activities associated with the ATCT would remain the same. No impacts to existing visual effects would occur.

4.2.5 Water Resources

Water resources include wetlands, floodplains, surface water, groundwater, and Wild and Scenic rivers. These resources provide drinking water, irrigation, and other water uses for communities, in addition to recreation and transportation opportunities, and habitat for vegetation, fish, and wildlife species.

4.2.5.1 Affected Environment

Wetlands

The USFWS shows the nearest wetland as a 0.95-acre freshwater emergent wetland located approximately 500 feet northwest of the proposed new ATCT site and approximately 0.25 miles northwest of the existing ATCT. No wetland species or characteristics were observed

during the site visit. Multiple wetland areas are located within one mile of the proposed new ATCT site including Staring Lake and its surrounding land to the north (beginning 0.57 miles north) and the entirety of Minnesota Valley Wildlife Refuge (0.50 miles south). (USFWS, 2024c). Multiple smaller wetland areas indicated in and around FCM are shown on Figure 4-2.

Floodplains

The existing ATCT and the proposed new ATCT site are located within flood Zone X which is an area of minimal flood hazard. The Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge is listed as flood zone AE approximately 0.24 miles south of the existing ATCT. Flood zone AE indicates a 100-year floodplain with a 1% annual change of flooding (FEMA, 2024).

Surface Water

There are no man-made or naturally occurring ponds or lakes within the study area at FCM airport. The nearest surface water features to FCM are Staring Lake approximately 0.60 miles north of the proposed new ATCT site and Grass Lake approximately 0.70 miles south of the proposed new ATCT site. While there are no streams located within the study area, there is a catchment located east to west across the northern portion of the airport property. This catchment drains to Riley Creek and Grass Lake approximately 1.0 miles southeast of the proposed new ATCT site. The nearest stream, Purgatory Creek, is located 0.71 miles northeast of the proposed new ATCT site. Purgatory Creek flows south-southeast and discharges to the Minnesota River approximately 2.7 miles southwest of the FCM. Surface water features around FCM are shown on Figure 4-2 (EPA, 2024).

Groundwater

Groundwater in the Twin Cities metropolitan area is provided by the Quaternary, Prairie Du-Chien-Jordan, Tunnel City-Wonewoc, and Mt. Simon-Hinckley aquifers. The study area is located within the Quaternary, Tunnel City-Wonewoc, and Mt. Simon-Hinckley aquifer systems. The Quaternary Aquifer is composed of discontinuous deposits of silts, sand, and gravel; the Tunnel City-Wonewoc Aquifer is composed of sandstone and carbonate; and the Mt. Simon Hinckley aquifer is composed of sandstone (Metropolitan Council, n.d.). The flow of groundwater in the study area is south toward the Minnesota River (Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, 2021).

Wild and Scenic Rivers

There are no wild or scenic rivers located at or adjacent to FCM. Minnesota has 226 miles of the St. Croix River designated as wild and scenic along the Wisconsin border (National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 2024a). The closest portion of St. Croix River is located approximately 32 miles west of FCM.

Rivers inventoried for inclusion under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act but have not been designated under the Act may have segments included in the Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) (National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 2024b). These river segments meet at least one of the “outstandingly remarkable values” and are afforded some protections from impacts of federal actions, but do not receive the same protection and management as the designated Wild and Scenic Rivers (National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 2024b).



Figure 4-2. Aerial Image of Wetlands and Surface Water Features near FCM Airport

The nearest NRI segment is approximately 7.5 miles southwest of FCM along the Minnesota River (NPS, 2024). Two other NRI segments are within 15 miles of FCM, a segment of Minnehaha Creek is approximately 8.05 miles north of FCM and a segment of the Mississippi River is located approximately 14 miles northeast of FCM (NPS, 2024).

4.2.5.2 Environmental Consequences

Detailed guidance on significance thresholds and effects determinations for water resources impacts can be found in the ATCT Final PEA (FAA ATCT Final PEA, 2023) and FAA Order 1050.1G, Appendix A (FAA, 2025b).

Alternative 1: Proposed Action

Construction of the proposed new ATCT would cause temporary, short term surface disturbing activities within approximately four acres involving increased vehicle traffic and use of machinery. No direct impacts to wetlands would occur due to the absence of these areas within the proposed new ATCT site. Indirect impacts to wetlands are unlikely to occur given the nearest wetland area is approximately 500 feet northwest of the proposed new ATCT site and groundwater flows to the south, away from the nearest wetland. Implementing BMPs that include erosion and sedimentation controls would reduce or prevent possible direct or indirect impacts to wetlands or downstream waters.

As stated above, FCM is not in a flood hazard area and no impacts to floodplains are likely to result from the Proposed Action.

Disruption of soil surfaces, introduction of non-native plant species through transfer of seeds, and contamination of soils from chemicals such as hydraulic fluids or petroleum leaks, could occur during ground disturbing activities. Runoff containing contaminated soil could result in offsite interface with surface waters downstream from the proposed new ATCT site and the existing ATCT, such as Grass Lake, but is unlikely. Soil, sediment, or chemical runoff could directly or indirectly damage water quality, alter habitat from sediment build-up, or cause changes to the ecosystems from the introduction of non-native species. The increased presence of heavy construction equipment, fuels, chemicals, or solvents during construction/demolition activities could affect groundwater if spills or leaks were to occur. The severity would depend on the volume or duration of the spill or leak and ability to respond appropriately. Applying BMPs such as spill/leak monitoring and runoff prevention could reduce or prevent impacts to surface water, wetlands, and groundwater from surface disturbance, erosion, and runoff.

Excavation volume and depth for foundation structural components is unknown at this time. Groundwater could be encountered during excavation and construction activities. If this were to occur and pumping was required to extract water and continue construction, the excess water may be discharged offsite through the FCM stormwater system. Discharging this water could result in sediment and chemical runoff where outflow occurs. Disturbance of groundwater or disruption of groundwater flow could occur at excavation sites and placement of structural components; however, these reasonably foreseeable impacts would be temporary in nature. Applying runoff and contamination prevention BMPs could reduce or prevent impacts to groundwater from excavation and construction.

Wild or Scenic Rivers and NRI segments are not within or adjacent to the study area; there would be no direct or indirect impacts to these resources from the Proposed Action.

Alternative 2: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing ATCT would not be removed and replaced, and activities associated with the ATCT would remain the same. No impacts to existing water resources would occur.

4.2.5.3 Best Management Practices

BMPs to offset unavoidable impacts to water resources allow for onsite absorption of rainwater such as permeable surfaces, allowing natural drainage processes, and erosion prevention measures. Descriptions of mitigation examples for wetlands, surface water, and groundwater are below.

As the proposed new ATCT site exceeds 1 acre, and the project has potential to discharge to the wetland located approximately 500 feet northwest from the site, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater general permit would be required. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency is the NPDES permitting authority for the state of Minnesota. Key requirements of this construction general permit would include the development of a stormwater pollution prevention plan, a Notice of Intent to be submitted to EPA, erosion and sedimentation controls implemented on site, stormwater inspections conducted, routine discharge elimination measures conducted, dewatering procedures completed, and stormwater monitoring performed (EPA, 2022; Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 2023). The MAC maintains a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for FCM that outlines reasonably foreseeable pollutant sources, spill prevention, spill response, stormwater monitoring requirements, facility inspections, trainings, and control measures. The proposed new ATCT site would likely be incorporated into the SWPPP (MAC, 2022).

Measures for reducing runoff and erosion, as described below, would prevent or reduce sediment and the introduction of non-native plant species from degrading nearby wetlands. These measures should be implemented within the study area to avoid the potential for temporary construction impacts to Grass Lake and its associated wetlands.

- Use pervious surfaces where practicable.
- Control runoff, while ensuring the runoff control measures do not attract wildlife hazardous to aviation.
- Control waste and spoils disposal to prevent contaminating ground and surface water, while not attracting wildlife hazardous to aviation (e.g., control the use of pesticides and herbicides, maintain vegetative buffers to reduce sedimentation and delivery of chemical pollutants to the waterbody).
- Limit ground disturbance to the areas necessary for project-related construction.
- Employ erosion control measures to minimize sedimentation of surface waters.
- Restore vegetation on disturbed areas to prevent soil erosion following project completion.

BMPs to reduce direct impacts to groundwater include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Protect water quality of surface water runoff that may infiltrate into the ground.
- Restore vegetation on disturbed areas to prevent soil erosion following project completion.
- Limit the area of new impervious surfaces to the areas necessary for project-related construction.

4.3 CONCLUSION

This site-specific EA evaluates the existing environment at FCM and analyzes the reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences of the Proposed Action. Implementation of the Proposed Action as presented in this EA would not result in reasonably foreseeable significant impacts to the environment.

SECTION 5 | PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The FAA provided a 508-compliant electronic copy of the Draft EA for review by the public on the following website: https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/atf. No comments were submitted to the FAA during the public comment period. On June 5, 2025, the FAA published a Notice of Availability advertisement in the Eden Prairie Sun Current to advertise the availability of the to allow the public to view the document electronically and how to submit comments. The FAA did not receive any comments on the Draft EA during the public comment period ending July 8, 2025.

SECTION 6 | LIST OF PREPARERS

This EA was prepared by:

FAA

Aaron Comrov
FAA Air Traffic Organization
Environmental Team Lead (AJW-2C16E)
CSA Engineering Services Environmental and Occupational Safety & Health Center

Booz Allen Hamilton

Jennifer Salerno – NEPA Program Manager
M.S., Environmental Studies, American University
B.S., Biology, University of Maryland at College Park

Marissa Carvalho – Resource Specialist
M.N.R.S., Ecological Restoration, Colorado State University
B.S., Environmental Science, Northeastern University

Pamela Middleton – Resource Specialist
M.A.S., Environmental Policy and Management, University of Denver
B.A., Biology, Sonoma State University

Joseph Naughton – Resource Specialist
B.S., Environment and Sustainability, Cornell University

Emily Pelesky – Resource Specialist
M.A., Cultural Heritage Management, Johns Hopkins University
B.A., Anthropology, University of Pittsburgh

Rebecca Steely – Resource Specialist
B.A., Anthropology – Physical sub-discipline
B.A., Earth, Environment, and Planetary Sciences,
M.S., Earth, Environment, and Planetary Sciences

Joseph Tomberlin – Resource Specialist
M.H.P., Historic Preservation, Georgia State University
B.A., History, Oglethorpe University

SECTION 7 | REFERENCES

106 Group. (2024a). *Archaeological Literature Review and Assessment for the Flying Cloud Airport Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) Project.* St. Paul: 106 Group.

106 Group. (2024b). *Reconnaissance Architecturl History Study for the Flying Cloud Airport Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) Project.* St Paul: 106 Group.

Booz Allen Hamilton. (2024). *FCM Airport Traffic Control Tower Site Visit.*

Bureau of Land Management. (2024). *BLM National Data*. Retrieved from https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=6f0da4c7931440a8a80bfe20eddd7550%20&extent=-125,%2031.0,%20-114,%2043.0

EPA. (2013). *Level III Ecoregions of the Continental United States.* National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

EPA. (2022, February 17). *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)*. Retrieved from 2022 Construction General Permit (CGP): https://www.epa.gov/npdes/2022-construction-general-permit-cgp

EPA. (2024). *WATERS*. Retrieved from The National Hydrography Dataset: https://www.epa.gov/waterdata/geography-waters#:~:text=WATERS%20and%20the%20National%20Hydrography%20Dataset&text=The%20National%20Hydrography%20Dataset%20(NHD,blue%20lines%20on%20a%20map%27.

FAA. (2015, July 16). *FAA Order 1050.1F.* Retrieved from https://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/Order/FAA_Order_1050_1F.pdf

FAA. (2020, February). *1050.1F Desk Reference (v2) - Visual Effects.* Retrieved from https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/apl/13-visual-effects.pdf

FAA. (2023). *FCM Airport Traffic Control Tower Siting Report.* Eden Prairie, MN: FAA.

FAA. (2024a). *Digital Terminal Resource Book.* Eden Prarie, MN: FAA.

FAA. (2024b). *Wildlife Strike Database*. Retrieved from Federal Aviation Administration: https://wildlife.faa.gov/home

FAA. (2025a). *Order 6480.4C: Siting Airport Traffic Control Towers.* FAA.

FAA. (2025b). *FAA Order 1050.1G.* Retrieved from https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/orders_notices/index.cfm/go/document.current/documentNumber/1050.1

FAA ATCT Final PEA. (2023). *Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision for the Airport Traffic Control Tower Replacement Program.* Washington, DC: FAA. Retrieved from https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic_atf

FAA ATCT Final PEA. (2023). *Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision for the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law-funded Airport Traffice Control Tower Replacement Program.* Washington, DC: FAA. Retrieved from https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic_atf

FAA. (n.d.). *Bipartisan Infrastructure Law - Air Traffic Facilities*. Retrieved from Federal Aviation Administration: www.faa.gov/bil/air-traffic-facilities

FEMA. (2024, January). *National Flood Hazard Layer*. Retrieved from FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer: https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd

MAC. (2022). *Flying Coud Airport Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.*

Metropolitan Airports Commission. (2010). *Flying Cloud Airport (FCM) Long Term Comprehensive Plan.* Retrieved from https://metroairports.org/sites/default/files/2022-03/FCM-LTCP-Doc-October-Final_2010.pdf

Metropolitan Airports Commission. (n.d.). *Flying Cloud Airport*. Retrieved from Minneapolis Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission: https://metroairports.org/our-airports/flying-cloud-airport

Metropolitan Council. (n.d.). *Regional Groundwater and Aquifers*. Retrieved June 27, 2024, from Metropolitan Council: https://metrocouncil.org/Wastewater-Water/Planning/Water-Supply-Planning/Basics/Groundwater.aspx#:~:text=The%20groundwater%20used%20in%20the,Simon%2DHinckley%20aquifer.

Minnesota Department of Agriculture. (2023, January). *Minnesota Noxious Weed List*. Retrieved July 31, 2024, from Minnesota Department of Agriculture: https://www.mda.state.mn.us/plants-insects/minnesota-noxious-weed-list

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. (2021). *Groundwater Atlas of Hennepin County, Minnesota.* St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/groundwater_section/mapping/cga/c45_hennepin/hennepin_report.pdf

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. (2023). *Construction Stormwater Permit Overview.*

National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. (2024a, January). *Find a River*. Retrieved from National Wild and Scenic Rivers System: https://www.rivers.gov/map

National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. (2024b). *Nationwide Rivers Inventory*. Retrieved August 27, 2025, from National Wild and Scenic Rivers System: https://rivers.gov/nri

NPS. (1997). *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.* Retrieved January 18, 2023, from NPS: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB-15_web508.pdf

NPS. (2024). *Nationwide Rivers Inventory Interactive Map*. Retrieved September 4, 2025, from Nationwide Rivers Inventory: https://www.nps.gov/maps/stories/nationwide-rivers-inventory-interactive-map.html

PAU and Atkins Realis. (2025). *FAA ATCT Standard 45% Civil Submittal, Flying Cloud Airport Eden Prairie, MN.* Washington, DC: DOT, FAA.

USDA. (n.d.). *Monarch Butterfly Habitat Needs*. Retrieved October 3, 2023, from United States Department of Agriculture, US Forest Service: https://www.fs.usda.gov/wildflowers/pollinators/Monarch_Butterfly/habitat/

USFWS. (2020). *Determination That Designation of Critical Habitat is Not Prudent for the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee.* Retrieved from https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2020-09-01/pdf/2020-17093.pdf#page=1

USFWS. (2022). *Tricolored Bat*. Retrieved from USFWS: https://www.fws.gov/species/tricolored-bat-perimyotis-subflavus

USFWS. (2024a). *Northern Long-eared Bat*. Retrieved from USFWS: https://www.fws.gov/species/northern-long-eared-bat-myotis-septentrionalis

USFWS. (2024b, April 12). *Eagle Rule*. Retrieved from https://www.fws.gov/regulations/eagle

USFWS. (2024c). *National Wetlands Inventory*. Retrieved June 25, 2024, from National Wetlands Inventory Surface Waters and Wetlands: https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/

USFWS. (2025a, June). *List of Threatened and Endangered Species for Project Area.* Retrieved from IPaC: https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/

USFWS. (2025b, January 28). *ECOS*. Retrieved October 8, 2024, from Environmental Conservation Online System: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/report/species-listings-by-current-range-county?fips=27053

USFWS. (n.d. a). *Rusty Patched Bumble Bee*. Retrieved August 23, 2024, from U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service: https://www.fws.gov/species/rusty-patched-bumble-bee-bombus-affinis

USFWS. (n.d. b). *Little Brown Bat*. Retrieved from USFWS: https://www.fws.gov/species/little-brown-bat-myotis-lucifugus

APPENDIX A | FEDERALLY LISTED SPECIES REPORTS FOR HENNEPIN COUNTY AND THE STUDY AREA

This appendix contains the lists of threatened, endangered, candidate, or species under review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for Hennepin County, Minnesota. Appendix A also provides site-specific species list, critical habitat, migratory birds, and other information.

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office
3815 American Blvd East
Bloomington, MN 55425-1659
Phone: (952) 858-0793

In Reply Refer To:
Project Code: 2025-0048432
Project Name: FCM ATCT EA

01/28/2025 19:00:20 UTC

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

This response has been generated by the Information, Planning, and Conservation (IPaC) system to provide information on natural resources that could be affected by your project. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) provides this response under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543), the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-712), and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 *et seq.*).

Threatened and Endangered Species
The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirement for obtaining a Technical Assistance Letter from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

Consultation Technical Assistance
Please refer to refer to our Section 7 website for guidance and technical assistance, including step-by-step instructions for making effects determinations for each species that might be present and for specific guidance on the following types of projects: projects in developed areas, HUD, CDBG, EDA, USDA Rural Development projects, pipelines, buried utilities, telecommunications, and requests for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) from FEMA.

We recommend running the project (if it qualifies) through our **Minnesota-Wisconsin Federal Endangered Species Determination Key (Minnesota-Wisconsin ("D-key"))**. A demonstration video showing how-to access and use the determination key is available. Please note that the Minnesota-Wisconsin D-key is the third option of 3 available d-keys. D-keys are tools to help Federal agencies and other project proponents determine if their proposed action has the potential to adversely affect federally listed species and designated critical habitat. The Minnesota-Wisconsin D-key includes a structured set of questions that assists a project proponent in determining whether a proposed project qualifies for a certain predetermined consultation outcome for all federally listed species found in Minnesota and Wisconsin (except for the northern long-eared bat- see below), which includes determinations of "no effect" or "may affect, not likely to adversely affect." In each case, the Service has compiled and analyzed the best available information on the species' biology and the impacts of certain activities to support these determinations.

If your completed d-key output letter shows a "No Effect" (NE) determination for all listed species, print your IPaC output letter for your files to document your compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

For Federal projects with a "Not Likely to Adversely Affect" (NLAA) determination, our concurrence becomes valid if you do not hear otherwise from us after a 30-day review period, as indicated in your letter.

If your d-key output letter indicates additional coordination with the Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office is necessary (i.e., you get a "May Affect" determination), you will be provided additional guidance on contacting the Service to continue ESA coordination outside of the key; ESA compliance cannot be concluded using the key for "May Affect" determinations unless otherwise indicated in your output letter.

Note: Once you obtain your official species list, you are not required to continue in IPaC with d-keys, although in most cases these tools should expedite your review. If you choose to make an effects determination on your own, you may do so. If the project is a Federal Action, you may want to review our section 7 step-by-step instructions before making your determinations.

Using the IPaC Official Species List to Make No Effect and May Affect Determinations for Listed Species

1. If IPaC returns a result of "There are no listed species found within the vicinity of the project," then project proponents can conclude the proposed activities will have **no effect** on any federally listed species under Service jurisdiction. Concurrence from the Service is not required for **no effect** determinations. No further consultation or coordination is required. Attach this letter to the dated IPaC species list report for your records.
2. If IPaC returns one or more federally listed, proposed, or candidate species as potentially present in the action area of the proposed project – other than bats (see below) – then project proponents must determine if proposed activities will have **no effect** on or **may affect** those species. For assistance in determining if suitable habitat for listed, candidate, or proposed species occurs within your project area or if species may be affected by project activities, you can obtain Life History Information for Listed and Candidate Species on our office website. If no impacts will occur to a species on the IPaC species list (e.g., there is no habitat present in the project area), the appropriate determination is **no effect**. No further consultation or coordination is required. Attach this letter to the dated IPaC species list report for your records.

3. Should you determine that project activities **may affect** any federally listed, please contact our office for further coordination. Letters with requests for consultation or correspondence about your project should include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header. Electronic submission is preferred.

Northern Long-Eared Bats
Northern long-eared bats occur throughout Minnesota and Wisconsin and the information below may help in determining if your project may affect these species.

Suitable summer habitat for northern long-eared bats consists of a wide variety of forested/wooded habitats where they roost, forage, and travel and may also include some adjacent and interspersed non-forested habitats such as emergent wetlands and adjacent edges of agricultural fields, old fields and pastures. This includes forests and woodlots containing potential roosts (i.e., live trees and/or snags ≥3 inches dbh for northern long-eared bat that have exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, and/or hollows), as well as linear features such as fencerows, riparian forests, and other wooded corridors. These wooded areas may be dense or loose aggregates of trees with variable amounts of canopy closure. Individual trees may be considered suitable habitat when they exhibit the characteristics of a potential roost tree and are located within 1,000 feet (305 meters) of forested/wooded habitat. Northern long-eared bats have also been observed roosting in human-made structures, such as buildings, barns, bridges, and bat houses; therefore, these structures should also be considered potential summer habitat and evaluated for use by bats. If your project will impact caves or mines or will involve clearing forest or woodland habitat containing suitable roosting habitat, northern long-eared bats could be affected. For bat activity dates, please review Appendix L in the Range-wide Indiana Bat and Northern Long-Eared Bat Survey Guidelines.

Examples of unsuitable habitat include:

- Individual trees that are greater than 1,000 feet from forested or wooded areas,
- Trees found in highly developed urban areas (e.g., street trees, downtown areas),
- A pure stand of less than 3-inch dbh trees that are not mixed with larger trees, and
- A monoculture stand of shrubby vegetation with no potential roost trees.

If IPaC returns a result that northern long-eared bats are potentially present in the action area of the proposed project, project proponents can conclude the proposed activities **may affect** this species **IF** one or more of the following activities are proposed:

- Clearing or disturbing suitable roosting habitat, as defined above, at any time of year,
- Any activity in or near the entrance to a cave or mine,
- Mining, deep excavation, or underground work within 0.25 miles of a cave or mine,
- Construction of one or more wind turbines, or
- Demolition or reconstruction of human-made structures that are known to be used by bats based on observations of roosting bats, bats emerging at dusk, or guano deposits or stains.

If none of the above activities are proposed, project proponents can conclude the proposed activities will have **no effect** on the northern long-eared bat. Concurrence from the Service is not required for **No Effect** determinations. No further consultation or coordination is required. Attach this letter to the dated IPaC

species list report for your records.

If any of the above activities are proposed, and the northern long-eared bat appears on the user's species list, the federal project user will be directed to either the northern long-eared bat and tricolored bat range-wide D-key or the Federal Highways Administration, Federal Railways Administration, and Federal Transit Administration Indiana bat/Northern long-eared bat D-key, depending on the type of project and federal agency involvement. Similar to the Minnesota-Wisconsin D-key, these d-keys helps to determine if prohibited take might occur and, if not, will generate an automated verification letter. Additional information about available tools can be found on the Service's northern long-eared bat website.

Whooping Crane
Whooping crane is designated as a non-essential experimental population in Wisconsin and consultation under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act is only required if project activities will occur within a National Wildlife Refuge or National Park. If project activities are proposed on lands outside of a National Wildlife Refuge or National Park, then you are not required to consult. For additional information on this designation and consultation requirements, please review "Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Whooping Cranes in the Eastern United States."

Other Trust Resources and Activities
Bald and Golden Eagles - Although the bald eagle has been removed from the endangered species list, this species and the golden eagle are protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to survey the area for any migratory bird nests. If there is an eagle nest on-site while work is on-going, eagles may be disturbed. We recommend avoiding and minimizing disturbance to eagles whenever practicable. If you cannot avoid eagle disturbance, you may seek a permit. A nest take permit is always required for removal, relocation, or obstruction of an eagle nest. For communication and wind energy projects, please refer to additional guidelines below.

Migratory Birds - The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) prohibits the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests, except when specifically authorized by the Service. The Service has the responsibility under the MBTA to proactively prevent the mortality of migratory birds whenever possible and we encourage implementation of recommendations that minimize potential impacts to migratory birds. Such measures include clearing forested habitat outside the nesting season (generally March 1 to August 31) or conducting nest surveys prior to clearing to avoid injury to eggs or nestlings.

Communication Towers - Construction of new communications towers (including radio, television, cellular, and microwave) creates a potentially significant impact on migratory birds, especially some 350 species of night-migrating birds. However, the Service has developed voluntary guidelines for minimizing impacts.

Transmission Lines - Migratory birds, especially large species with long wingspans, heavy bodies, and poor maneuverability can also collide with power lines. In addition, mortality can occur when birds, particularly hawks, eagles, kites, falcons, and owls, attempt to perch on uninsulated or unguarded power poles. To minimize these risks, please refer to guidelines developed by the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee and the Service. Implementation of these measures is especially important along sections of lines adjacent to wetlands or other areas that support large numbers of raptors and migratory birds.

Wind Energy - To minimize impacts to migratory birds and bats, wind energy projects should follow the Service's Wind Energy Guidelines. In addition, please refer to the Service's Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance, which provides guidance for conserving bald and golden eagles in the course of siting, constructing, and operating wind energy facilities.

State Department of Natural Resources Coordination
While it is not required for your Federal section 7 consultation, please note that additional state endangered or threatened species may also have the potential to be impacted. **Please contact the Minnesota or Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources for information on state listed species that may be present in your proposed project area.**

Minnesota
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - Endangered Resources Review Homepage
Email: Review.NHIS@state.mn.us

Wisconsin
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources - Endangered Resources Review Homepage
Email: DNRERReview@wi.gov

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. Please feel free to contact our office with questions or for additional information.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
- USFWS National Wildlife Refuges and Fish Hatcheries
- Bald & Golden Eagles
- Migratory Birds
- Wetlands

OFFICIAL SPECIES LIST

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office
3815 American Blvd East
Bloomington, MN 55425-1659
(952) 858-0793

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Code: 2025-0048432
Project Name: FCM ATCT EA
Project Type: Airport - New Construction
Project Description: Environmental Assessment for a proposed replacement ATCT project.
Project Location:

The approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@44.823524,-93.45896763327117,14z

Counties: Hennepin County, Minnesota

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SPECIES

There is a total of 6 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries[1], as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

MAMMALS

NAME	STATUS
Northern Long-eared Bat *Myotis septentrionalis* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045	Endangered
Tricolored Bat *Perimyotis subflavus* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10515	Proposed Endangered

BIRDS

NAME	STATUS
Whooping Crane *Grus americana* Population: U.S.A. (AL, AR, CO, FL, GA, ID, IL, IN, IA, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MO, NC, NM, OH, SC, TN, UT, VA, WI, WV, western half of WY) No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/758	Experimental Population, Non-Essential

INSECTS

NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly *Danaus plexippus* There is **proposed** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	Proposed Threatened
Rusty Patched Bumble Bee *Bombus affinis* There is **proposed** critical habitat for this species. Your location overlaps the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9383 General project design guidelines: https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/project/T63BOC32GRASBHPBVJVBK3ZHFM/documents/generated/5967.pdf	Endangered
Western Regal Fritillary *Argynnis idalia occidentalis* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/12017	Proposed Threatened

CRITICAL HABITATS

There is 1 critical habitat wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction.

NAME	STATUS
Rusty Patched Bumble Bee *Bombus affinis* https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9383#crithab	Proposed

USFWS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE LANDS AND FISH HATCHERIES

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the National Wildlife Refuge system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

THERE ARE NO REFUGE LANDS OR FISH HATCHERIES WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA.

BALD & GOLDEN EAGLES

Bald and Golden Eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act [2] and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) [1]. Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to Bald or Golden Eagles, or their habitats, should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate avoidance and minimization measures, as described in the various links on this page.

---

1. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.
2. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

There are Bald Eagles and/or Golden Eagles in your project area.

Measures for Proactively Minimizing Eagle Impacts
For information on how to best avoid and minimize disturbance to nesting bald eagles, please review the National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines. You may employ the timing and activity-specific distance recommendations in this document when designing your project/ activity to avoid and minimize eagle impacts. For bald eagle information specific to Alaska, please refer to Bald Eagle Nesting and Sensitivity to Human Activity.

The FWS does not currently have guidelines for avoiding and minimizing disturbance to nesting Golden Eagles. For site-specific recommendations regarding nesting Golden Eagles, please consult with the appropriate Regional Migratory Bird Office or Ecological Services Field Office.

If disturbance or take of eagles cannot be avoided, an incidental take permit may be available to authorize any take that results from, but is not the purpose of, an otherwise lawful activity. For assistance making this determination for Bald Eagles, visit the Do I Need A Permit Tool. For assistance making this determination for golden eagles, please consult with the appropriate Regional Migratory Bird Office or Ecological Services Field Office.

Ensure Your Eagle List is Accurate and Complete
If your project area is in a poorly surveyed area in IPaC, your list may not be complete and you may need to rely on other resources to determine what species may be present (e.g. your local FWS field office, state surveys, your own surveys). Please review the Supplemental Information

on Migratory Birds and Eagles, to help you properly interpret the report for your specified location, including determining if there is sufficient data to ensure your list is accurate.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to bald or golden eagles on your list, see the "Probability of Presence Summary" below to see when these bald or golden eagles are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Bald Eagle *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31

PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read "Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles", specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (▪)

Green bars; the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during that week of the year.

Breeding Season (▪)
Yellow bars; liberal estimate of the timeframe inside which the bird breeds across its entire range.

Survey Effort (|)
Vertical black lines; the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps.

No Data (–)
A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.



Non-BCC
Vulnerable

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds
- Nationwide avoidance and minimization measures for birds https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action

MIGRATORY BIRDS

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) [1] prohibits the take (including killing, capturing, selling, trading, and transport) of protected migratory bird species without prior authorization by the Department of Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). The incidental take of migratory birds is the injury or death of birds that results from, but is not the purpose, of an activity. The Service interprets the MBTA to prohibit incidental take.

1. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
2. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.
3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, see the "Probability of Presence Summary" below to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
American Golden-plover *Pluvialis dominica* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10561	Breeds elsewhere
Bald Eagle *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Black Tern *Chlidonias niger surinamenisis* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3093	Breeds May 15 to Aug 20
Black-billed Cuckoo *Coccyzus erythropthalmus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9399	Breeds May 15 to Oct 10
Bobolink *Dolichonyx oryzivorus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9454	Breeds May 20 to Jul 31
Canada Warbler *Cardellina canadensis* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9643	Breeds May 20 to Aug 10
Cerulean Warbler *Setophaga cerulea* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2974	Breeds Apr 22 to Jul 20
Chimney Swift *Chaetura pelagica* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9406	Breeds Mar 15 to Aug 25
Eastern Whip-poor-will *Antrostomus vociferus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10678	Breeds May 1 to Aug 20
Golden-winged Warbler *Vermivora chrysoptera* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8745	Breeds May 1 to Jul 20
Grasshopper Sparrow *Ammodramus savannarum perpallidus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8329	Breeds Jun 1 to Aug 20
Henslow's Sparrow *Centronyx henslowii* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3941	Breeds May 1 to Aug 31

Project code: 2025-0048432 01/28/2025 19:00:20 UTC

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Lesser Yellowlegs *Tringa flavipes* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9679	Breeds elsewhere
Long-eared Owl *asio otus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3631	Breeds Mar 1 to Jul 15
Marbled Godwit *Limosa fedoa* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9481	Breeds May 1 to Jul 31
Pectoral Sandpiper *Calidris melanotos* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9561	Breeds elsewhere
Red-headed Woodpecker *Melanerpes erythrocephalus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9398	Breeds May 10 to Sep 10
Ruddy Turnstone *Arenaria interpres morinella* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10633	Breeds elsewhere
Rusty Blackbird *Euphagus carolinus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9478	Breeds elsewhere
Semipalmated Sandpiper *Calidris pusilla* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9603	Breeds elsewhere
Short-billed Dowitcher *Limnodromus griseus* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9480	Breeds elsewhere
Wood Thrush *Hylocichla mustelina* This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9431	Breeds May 10 to Aug 31

13 of 17

Project code: 2025-0048432 01/28/2025 19:00:20 UTC

PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read "Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles", specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (▪)

Green bars; the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during that week of the year.

Breeding Season (▪)
Yellow bars; liberal estimate of the timeframe inside which the bird breeds across its entire range.

Survey Effort (|)
Vertical black lines; the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps.

No Data (–)
A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.



14 of 17


Project code: 2025-0048432
01/28/2025 19:00:20 UTC
BCC Rangewide (CON)
Cerulean Warbler BCC Rangewide (CON)
Chimney Swift BCC Rangewide (CON)
Eastern Whip-poor-will BCC Rangewide (CON)
Golden-winged Warbler BCC Rangewide (CON)
Grasshopper Sparrow BCC - BCR
Henslow's Sparrow BCC Rangewide (CON)
SPECIES
JAN FEB MAR APR MAY JUN JUL AUG SEP OCT NOV DEC
Lesser Yellowlegs BCC Rangewide (CON)
Long-eared Owl BCC Rangewide (CON)
Marbled Godwit BCC Rangewide (CON)
Pectoral Sandpiper BCC Rangewide (CON)
Red-headed Woodpecker BCC Rangewide (CON)
Ruddy Turnstone BCC - BCR
Rusty Blackbird BCC - BCR
Semipalmated Sandpiper BCC - BCR
15 of 17



Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds
- Nationwide avoidance and minimization measures for birds
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action

WETLANDS

Impacts to NWI wetlands and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District.

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

THERE ARE NO WETLANDS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA.



Project code: 2025-0048432 01/28/2025 19:00:20 UTC

IPAC USER CONTACT INFORMATION

Agency:	Federal Aviation Administration
Name:	Joe Naughton
Address:	901 15th St NW
Address Line 2:	Washington, DC, 20005
City:	Washington
State:	DC
Zip:	20005
Email	[redacted]
Phone:	[redacted]

17 of 17

USFWS Environmental Conservation Online System list of species known or believed to occur in Hennepin County.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Search ECOS

ECOS Environmental Conservation Online System

Conserving the Nature of America

ECOS / Species Reports / Species County Report

Listed species believed to or known to occur in Hennepin, Minnesota

This report includes species only if they have a **Spatial Current Range** in ECOS.

The following report contains species that are known to or are believed to occur in this county, based on the species current range, as defined by the USFWS. The definition of current range that the FWS uses is the general geographic area where we know or suspect that a species currently occurs.

This list of species by county cannot be used for consultation purposes. To obtain an official list of species that should be considered during consultation, please visit IPaC.

CSV

Show 25 entries Search:

12 Species Listings

Group	Name	Population		Status	Lead Region
Insects	Western regal fritillary (Argynnis idalia occidentalis)	Wherever found	Proposed Threatened	6	South Dakota Ecological Services Field Office
Mammals	Tricolored bat (Perimyotis subflavus)	Wherever found	Proposed Endangered	5	Pennsylvania Ecological Services Field Office
Birds	Whooping crane (Grus americana)	U.S.A. (AL, AR, CO, FL, GA, ID, IL, IN, IA, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MO, NC, NM, OH, SC, TN, UT, VA, WI, WV, western half of WY)	Experimental Population, Non-Essential	2	Assistant Regional Director-Ecological Services
Clams	Spectaclecase (mussel) (Cumberlandia monodonta)	Wherever found	Endangered	3	Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office

Insects	Monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus)	Wherever found	Proposed Threatened	3	Assistant Regional Director-Ecological Services
Mammals	Little brown bat (Myotis lucifugus)	Wherever found	Under Review	3	Indiana Ecological Services Field Office
Insects	Regal fritillary (Speyeria idalia)	Wherever found	Proposed Threatened	6	South Dakota Ecological Services Field Office
Clams	Winged Mapleleaf (Quadrula fragosa)	Wherever found, except where listed as an experimental population	Endangered	3	Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office
Clams	Snuffbox mussel (Epioblasma triquetra)	Wherever found	Endangered	3	Ohio Ecological Services Field Office
Mammals	Northern Long-Eared Bat (Myotis septentrionalis)	Wherever found	Endangered	3	Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office
Clams	Higgins eye (pearlymussel) (Lampsilis higginsii)	Wherever found	Endangered	3	Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office
Insects	Rusty patched bumble bee (Bombus affinis)	Wherever found	Endangered	3	Minnesota-Wisconsin Ecological Services Field Office

Showing 1 to 12 of 12 entries Previous 1 Next

APPENDIX B | SHPO CONCURRENCE LETTER

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

July 14, 2025

Aaron Comrov
Environmental Team Lead
CSA ES EOSH Center
Federal Aviation Administration
aaron.comrov@faa.gov

RE: Airport Traffic Control Tower Replacement, Flying Cloud Airport
Eden Prairie, Hennepin County
SHPO Number: 2025-1297

Dear Aaron Comrov:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced project. Information received on June 5, 2025, has been reviewed pursuant to the responsibilities given the State Historic Preservation Officer by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 306108) and its implementing federal regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800).

Undertaking and Area of Potential Effect
According to your letter, the Federal Aviation Administration is proposing to demolish the existing Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) and construct a new ATCT at Flying Cloud Airport. We have completed our review of the documentation provided regarding your agency's determination of the area of potential effect (APE) for the Federal undertaking. We agree that this APE determination is generally appropriate to consider the potential effects of the proposed undertaking as we currently understand it.

Architectural History Properties
We have reviewed the submitted report, *Reconnaissance Architectural History Study for the Flying Cloud Airport ATCT Project, Eden Prairie, Hennepin County, Minnesota* (April 2025) as prepared by 106 Group. According to the report, twenty-four (24) previously inventoried architectural history properties and one historic district are/were located within the APE for this project.

The **Flying Cloud Airport Building Area No. 1 Historic District (HE-EPC-00127)** was previously determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The historic district encompassed the following nineteen (19) properties:

- **Hangar I 3A/Naas Air Service (HE-EPC-00108)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 13B/Ray L. Chapman (HE-EPC-00109)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar I 3C/Kenneth Muxlow (HE-EPC-00110)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 6E/C Kent Olson (HE-EPC-00111)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic

MINNESOTA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
50 Sherburne Avenue ▪ Administration Building 203 ▪ Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155 ▪ 651-201-3287
mn.gov/admin/shpo ▪ mnshpo@state.mn.us
AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND SERVICE PROVIDER

district)
- **Hangar 13O/Murray B. Waters (HE-EPC-00112)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 6G/Shedd-Brown Co. (HE-EPC-00113)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 7B (Hangar 7/Fair Hills Co) (HE-EPC-00114)** (Contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 7A (Hangar 7/Lee Fairbrother) (HE-EPC-00115)** (Contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 5A/Shedd-Brown Manufacturing Co. (HE-EPC-00116)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 8B/Russell Gerde (HE-EPC-00117)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 5C/George Hill (HE-EPC-00118)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 8D/Waco Manufacturing Co. (HE-EPC-00119)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 11B/Tonka Flying Club (HE-EPC-00120)** (Contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 13/Norman J. Stens (HE-EPC-00121)** (Contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 15/Northwest Automatic Penel Co. (HE-EPC-00122)** (Non-contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 5/Naas Air Service (HE-EPC-00123)** (Contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 5/Far Hills Co. (HE-EPC-00124)** (Contributing to historic district)
- **American Aviation Hangar (HE-EPC-00125)** (Contributing to historic district)
- **Hangar 6A/T.E. Ibberson (HE-EPC-00126)** (No longer extant; previously contributing to historic district)

We agree with the report's recommendation that the **Flying Cloud Airport Building No. 1 Historic District** no longer retains sufficient integrity to convey its historical significance and is **not eligible** for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Five additional hangars were inventoried and evaluated in 2023 and were determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP:
- **Hangar 56A (HE-EPC-00321)**
- **Hangar 54A (HE-EPC-00322)**
- **Hangar 52A (HE-EPC-00323)**
- **Hangar 46A (HE-EPC-00324)**
- **Hangar 38A (HE-EPC-00325)**

Two new, previously unevaluated properties were identified within the APE for the proposed ATCT project, the **Flying Cloud Airport (HE-EPC-00330)** and the **Flying Cloud Airport – Airport Traffic Control Tower (HE-EPC-00331)**. We agree that these two properties are **not eligible** for listing in NRHP.

Archaeological Resources
Based on a review of the report, *Archaeological Literature Review and Assessment for the Flying Cloud Airport ATCT Project, Eden Prairie, Hennepin County, Minnesota*, prepared by 106 Group in April 2025 we understand that archaeological site **21HE0018**, which has not been evaluated to determine its eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), overlaps the project APE, specifically the location of the existing ATCT. This archaeological site is the approximate location of a

Native American cemetery. Although previous survey efforts did not find evidence of this site within the project APE, we recommend consultation with the Office of the State Archaeologist and the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council regarding any proposed ground disturbance in this location under Minnesota Statute 307.08, the Private Cemeteries Act.

Based on the presence of archaeological site 21HE0018, which is a Native American cemetery, we recommend that your agency review and consider the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Policy Statement on Burial Sites, Human Remains, and Funerary Objects published March 1, 2023. Based on similar projects we have consulted on that are within burial sites, we recommend archaeological monitoring of all ground disturbing activities within the site boundaries under an archaeological monitoring plan. If the interested Tribes and/or the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council recommend Tribal monitoring, we agree that is also appropriate.

Assessment and Finding of Effect
Provided that archaeological monitoring (and tribal monitoring if recommended) is conducted during ground disturbing activities, we concur with your agency's finding of **no historic properties affected** for this undertaking.

Tribal Consultation
It is our understanding that your agency is concurrently consulting with Native American tribes who may have a current or ancestral interest in this area of the state. Therefore, your agency will need to reopen consultation with our office if any tribes express concerns or disagreement with agency efforts to identify historic properties and/or the assessment of adverse effects. In your letter you asked our office if there are additional consulting parties that may be interested in this undertaking. We recommend you also reach out to Leonard Wabasha of the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community.

If you have any questions regarding our review of this project, please contact Kelly Gragg-Johnson, Environmental Review Specialist, at 651-201-3285 or kelly.graggjohnson@state.mn.us.

Sincerely,

Amy Spong
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer