

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL AVIATION
ADMINISTRATION
ALASKA REGION

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/
RECORD OF DECISION**

Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage
Project



Kristi A. Warden
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
Alaska Region
Office of Airports



222 West 7th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7587
907.271.5443

April 30 2024

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

WHAT IS IN THIS DOCUMENT? This document is the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD) (FONSI/ROD) for the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project, in Anchorage, Alaska. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for the proposed federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) dated November 2023. This document discusses alternatives considered by the FAA in reaching its decision, summarizes the analysis used to evaluate the alternatives, and briefly summarizes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives. This document also identifies applicable and required mitigation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND RECORD OF DECISION

**ALASKA CARGO AND COLD STORAGE PROJECT,
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA**

1. INTRODUCTION

This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD) (FONSI/ROD) of the proposed Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project (project) at the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) in Anchorage, Alaska. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for the proposed federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) dated November 2023. The Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF) is the sponsor for ANC. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before being able to take the proposed federal actions. The federal action taken by the FAA is an approval of the proposed improvements in an ANC Airport Layout Plan (ALP) amendment.

2. PURPOSE AND NEED OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The purpose of the proposed project is to construct an energy-efficient, climate-controlled air cargo warehouse facility and hardstand parking for cargo jets at ANC. The purpose of the cargo facilities is to help improve cargo deplaning and enplaning efficiency, provide parking locations for cargo jets where they can power down, and build Alaska's economy. The project would provide a facility for storing goods prior to enplaning on another carrier, or prior to distribution (primarily aircraft to aircraft) in the state. The project would help grow Alaska's economy by providing a much-needed climate-controlled facility for goods being transferred to- and exported from the state. The proposed project would be the only leasable large-scale air cargo warehouse facility with aircraft parking at ANC in close proximity to the bulk of current ANC cargo aircraft parking and operations. The project would increase operational efficiencies through new and improved cargo and airline support facilities, offer climate-controlled warehousing, and meet airport safety requirements.

Transpacific Efficiency Need: The Covid 19 pandemic created significant challenges and disruptions to global trade flows, leading to high prices, significant delays, and congestion for Transpacific air and marine cargo operations. While the effects of the pandemic have begun to subside, thereby reducing congestion, the long-term trend of strong growth remains. Boeing's 2022 World Air Cargo Forecast projects air cargo between East Asia and North America will grow at 4.4 percent annually through 2041. In particular, growth in food-related products from North America to Asia grew by 33 percent between 2011 and 2021, as a share of total tons. According to 2022 data from the Airports Council International (Airports Council International 2022), the aggregate tonnage among the world's top 10 busiest cargo airports increased 15 percent year-over-year. Although ANC 2022 cargo was down 4.3 percent compared to 2021, cargo was still up 26 percent compared to 2019 to approximately 3.5 million tons of cargo (Airports Council International

2023). Airports Council International attributes the decline to the ongoing geopolitical tensions and disruptions to global trade and supply chains. The Anchorage Economic Development Corporation (AEDC) is projecting eight percent growth through 2023, and annual tonnage increases in the two percent range each year thereafter (AEDC 2020).

Transpacific Logistics Hub: Located at the midpoint between Asia and North America, ANC is the third-busiest cargo airport in the world. Most of the business at ANC is from Transpacific flights stopping to refuel when carrying heavy payloads. Currently, there is no place for goods and equipment to be unloaded beyond proprietary facilities (e.g., UPS and FedEx); therefore, the airport functions as a “gas-and-go” facility for other commercial air cargo carriers. This project is a key component needed to turn ANC into a global logistics hub. Currently there is insufficient climate-controlled storage in Alaska to make it competitive as a Transpacific hub. Cold goods, including fish and seafood, produce, and pharmaceuticals, must be stored in Washington state. The proposed project will enable a more efficient transfer of goods and equipment between planes at ANC through creation of holding facilities, which would increase the efficiency of international and domestic cargo shipments. Further, this major investment in air cargo transfer is expected to provide a foundational enterprise which other companies will build upon.

State of Alaska Economic Need: Sustainable economic growth is a goal of the State of Alaska. Introducing new cargo facilities, such as hardstands and climate-controlled warehouses, will not only meet the immediate demand described above, but will also support and encourage projected long-term growth by transforming ANC from a fuel stop and crew-change site, to an all-purpose site where cargo carriers can efficiently deplane and enplane cargo, including temporarily storing cargo in a warehouse. The improvement in cargo facilities, particularly climate-controlled facilities, is also expected to make ANC more competitive and make Alaska a more desirable Transpacific cargo hub. Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage facilities would create long-term economic growth in Alaska by creating permanent job opportunities in numerous construction and operational job sectors and bringing hundreds of millions of dollars into the local economy. ANC currently supplies one in 10 jobs in Anchorage and generates \$1.84 billion in economic benefit (Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport 2022).

ANC On-Airport Needs: As Transpacific air cargo volumes have grown, ANC has become a leading air cargo airport, creating a need for additional infrastructure to park and service planes, and store and move cargo. ANC is currently limited to the private domestic cargo carriers’ warehouse and transfer facilities, none of which are leasable. The current on-airport cold storage is limited and largely confined to proprietary facilities; as such, there is limited ability to transship perishable and temperature-sensitive goods at ANC, and delays may result in loss of cargo. International cargo currently has limited holding locations, let alone climate-controlled for perishable cargo. Currently, perishable materials remain on aircrafts until the receiving aircraft arrives. A climate-controlled facility will allow for cargo to be offloaded from an aircraft, reducing the time an aircraft must wait for the receiving aircraft. As stated above, the cargo industry is a growing sector of ANC and airport cargo infrastructure is now beyond capacity during peak times, with anticipated decreases in capacity on the horizon. According to the 2023 Alaska International Airport System (AIAS) Annual Report (AIAS 2023), the AIAS sees growth in international passenger and cargo operations as well as intra-Alaska air operations. ANC has 22 airport-controlled hardstands, 14 of which are publicly available for commercial cargo use. An additional eight gates at the North Passenger Terminal are not dedicated to but periodically used as commercial cargo parking. In addition, a private terminal owned by UPS anticipates expansion of its six existing hardstands to accommodate freighters so those hardstands will no longer be available for third party lease. Further, anticipated growth of international passenger traffic

would likely remove ANC's North Passenger Terminal as an option for cargo freighter parking (Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport, 2014). One air cargo development (NorthLink Aviation) is currently under construction with an anticipated 15 hardstands to be added and available for lease, however ANC has added six new cargo carriers in 2023. In sum, ANC is unlikely to have enough cargo aircraft parking and cargo facilities to meet current and future demands even when considering the addition of 15 hardstands under construction. We do not perceive this Alaska Cargo development as growth inducing at the airport as growth is already generally anticipated and driven by market demands.

3. PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action would include the following components:

- New aircraft parking apron (eight hardstands)
- Climate-controlled cargo warehouse
- Hardstand fuel distribution
- Ground support equipment shop and parking
- Ancillary/Control space
- Road connection to Postmark Drive

A new, approximately 29-acre concrete pad would be constructed to support the warehouse, parking apron, possible hardstand fueling locations, airside loading areas (for aircraft to aircraft loading), outdoor storage, vehicle parking, and emergency and maintenance vehicle access around the building. Prior to placement of the pad, the site would be cleared, and overburden would remain on site mostly undisturbed. Landside deplaning cargo for local transport is expected, but very limited and not daily.

The new aircraft parking apron will include a paved surface with up to eight hardstands. The hardstands may be equipped with in-ground fuel hydrants (supplied by transportation pipelines east of Runway 15/33) and in-ground power connections. Taxiways would connect the aircraft parking apron to the north/south Runway 15/33 via existing taxiways. The warehouse facility pad would have various design elements depending on function, including driving aisles and parking areas which would connect the warehouse to North Tug Road and Postmark Drive. As proposed, the warehouse would support climate-controlled cargo storage, and provide ancillary functions, such as offices. The building would be pile-supported.

For water and sewer utilities within the area, trenches to the buildings would be excavated prior to placement of the concrete pad. Utilities under the proposed building would hang from the building's concrete structural foundation and would not require trenching. Electricity and telephone/internet would be installed using Ditch Witch® equipment (or similar) in small trenches to the buildings.

Staging and stockpiling will occur on the site in areas designated for development. Fill material would be sourced from local permitted sites and trucked in using existing roads. No road improvements would be required for hauling fill. Excavated material, which will only result from trenching for utilities, will be used to backfill in the original locations.

4. REQUESTED FEDERAL ACTION

The Federal Action requested of the FAA by the Sponsor is to approve the ALP amendments for the aircraft parking apron proposed for the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project. There are no proposed modifications to FAA Design Standards included in the project.

5. REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives Development and Comparison

Alternatives developed and evaluated under this project include the No-Action alternative and the Proposed Action preferred alternative. The No-Action alternative represents baseline conditions from which the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action can be measured.

For an alternative to be considered, it must be reasonable, feasible, and meet the project's purpose and need. Alternatives that were considered for analysis under the purpose and need were limited to ANC property. The purpose of any proposed development would be to develop infrastructure to efficiently support air cargo and climate-controlled warehousing operations at ANC. Off-site locations to develop such infrastructure would not be reasonable or feasible. Design measures to avoid or minimize impacts of the Proposed Action were not considered alternatives, rather design changes, because the project variations all largely have the same footprint and location.

Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward

Alternatives that were considered for analysis under the purpose and need were limited to ANC property. The purpose of any proposed development would be to develop infrastructure to allow for efficient movement between aircraft and the facility and efficiently support air cargo operations at ANC. Locations outside ANC were dismissed primarily because of inefficient, or potentially complete lack of, access to the cargo carriers needing to enplane and deplane cargo. Locations outside of ANC were also dismissed because they were not within the Foreign Trade Zone. It is essential the proposed development be completely located on ANC property, which is a Foreign Trade Zone, in order to take advantage of air cargo transfer rights granted by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). Additionally, air cargo needs to be located near aircraft hardstands, and aircraft hardstands need to be located near existing taxiways. Therefore, off-site alternative locations to develop the proposed project would not be reasonable or feasible.

Alternative locations analyzed on ANC property for the proposed cargo and climate-controlled facilities are the South Airpark, West Airpark, and North Airpark. For those alternatives that were considered technically feasible, screening criteria were developed from the purpose and need statement to determine if the alternatives are reasonable. Screening criteria are shown in Table 1 in the EA as well as the viability analysis. Only the Proposed Action met all screening criteria.

Proposed Action

The Proposed Action (or project) alternative would amend the ALP and develop the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage lease lot for cargo infrastructure in recognition of the forecast loss of infrastructure in a different part of ANC. The Proposed Action alternative would develop a cargo parking apron, hardstands, and a climate-controlled warehouse building to park cargo aircraft and store cargo. Cargo operations are not likely to decrease and, more likely, cargo infrastructure at ANC will be in high demand. The Proposed Action minimizes environmental impacts to the greatest extent practicable while addressing identified issues as stated in the project purpose and need.

No Action

Under the No-Action alternative, there would be no amendment to the ALP and no improvements constructed at the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage lease lot and the lot would remain unused airport property. ANC would remain over-capacity for cargo resources and the cargo infrastructure need would not be met. Furthermore, inefficiencies may increase in the future due to the forecast increase in cargo operations at ANC, or demand for ANC as a cargo hub may diminish due to the lack of cargo infrastructure. In addition, ANC added six new cargo carriers in 2023, as noted above (Section 2).

Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage as the leaseholder proposes to develop its lease lot. It does not have authority to develop outside its lease lot. Nevertheless, various other alternatives were considered including (1) South Airpark; (2) West Airpark; (3) North Airpark.

The totality of the circumstances presented, and evaluation of other alternatives that were considered but not advanced, supports the reasonable alternative analysis presented in Section 2.0 of the Final EA.

6. ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Section 3 and Table 2 of the Final EA present an environmental impact analysis, which discloses the project's potential impacts to resource categories defined in FAA Order 1050.1F. The Proposed Action would result in no significant impacts to any of the FAA-defined resource categories, including those resources that are protected under special purposes laws and requirements such as Executive Order 11988, *Floodplain Management*; Executive Order 11990, *Protection of Wetlands*; Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act; or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Air Quality

The magnitude of operations at ANC are not expected to change as a result of the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage Project, particularly no increase in vehicular movements which are the primary contributor of carbon monoxide and nitrous oxides at ANC. New ground service equipment, such as container loaders or service vehicles, may be introduced to service cargo jets; however, the emissions from these vehicles would be negligible. The project is not expected to emit the remaining four US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Criteria Air Pollutants. The proposed climate-controlled warehouse will be Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (commonly referred to as LEED) certified, a global recognition that the design adheres to climate and air quality benchmarks. As relates to the significance threshold, there are no existing violations of air quality standards in the proposed project area and the proposed action will conform with LEED air quality standards, which provides limitations for emissions to meet the standards. The introduction of new carbon monoxide emissions from the proposed action would result from new water heaters and furnaces in the climate-controlled warehouse. New water heater(s) and a furnace(s) are not expected to lead to substantial carbon monoxide emissions and Anchorage meets the air quality standards for all six criteria air pollutants.

Construction would temporarily result in a minor increase in air pollutant emissions from earth-moving activities and construction equipment emissions. However, the Proposed Action is in an area that is in attainment for all air pollutants and construction would be temporary. Dust during construction would be regulated using Best Management Practices (BMPs) and compliance with the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (APDES) Construction General Permit. Therefore, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in an exceedance of air quality pollutants based on National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) . Because of the temporary nature of construction and the areal size of the Proposed Action, the Proposed Action would not result in significant air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

The ecology of the land makes it suitable habitat for nesting and migratory birds. However, the context of the land creates adverse impacts to biological resources for two reasons. First, animals are more prone to human conflict on the land than if they identified another location to nest and rest. If wildlife nest or rest on the location of the Proposed Action they are subject to trapping and removal by US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Wildlife Service (WS). Secondly, the site is contaminated with PFAS which is a known toxin that can adversely impact the health and welfare of animals or their offspring.

The proposed action would place permanent fill in approximately 22 acres of undisturbed land which is also known to be wildlife habitat. If the land did not exist, wildlife would nest and rest elsewhere and would not be subject to potentially stressful removals by WS. The undisturbed land that currently acts as habitat is contaminated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). PFAS contamination can have detrimental effects on the health of wildlife and their offspring. If the location did not provide habitat for wildlife and birds the animals would choose habitat elsewhere to the benefit of their health. Eliminating the habitat would be beneficial to wildlife such that it would reduce human/animal conflict and require animals to choose habitat elsewhere, likely a location without contamination.

The project area would be less susceptible to invasive species due to the addition of an impervious surface.

Climate

Two regulated GHGs may be emitted at the project area, CO₂ (jet emissions and building energy usage) and HFCs (refrigeration emissions). The proposed cargo improvements may result in an increase in emissions due to the refrigeration at the climate-controlled warehouse and the day-to-day operations of the warehouse (e.g. lighting and heating). The remainder of the project, including parking apron will not change the ANC fleet mix or size and will therefore not result in a net gain of CO₂ emissions. Overall CO₂ emissions from cargo jets may decrease at ANC because the jets will be provided space to park and spend less time idling waiting for a parking position to become available.

For building operation, CO₂ emissions were estimated based on a facility-related energy use value of six kilowatt hours (kWh) per square foot per year. The ACCS climate-controlled warehouse is proposed to be 136,000 square feet. The CO₂ emissions of the proposed ACCS climate-controlled warehouse were estimated based on the EPA's natural gas emissions factor of 0.0053 metric ton of CO₂ (based on therms per square foot per year) (EPA 2023a) and electricity emissions factor of 1067.7 metric ton of CO₂ from the EPA eGRID (based on kilowatt hours per square foot per year) (EPA 2023a). Based on the facility's estimated energy usage, it would produce 1,632 metric tons of CO₂ per year, which is equivalent to the energy use of 318 homes for one year. This is not expected to be a significant effect to climate.

GHG emissions in the form of HFCs may be emitted from the climate-controlled warehouse. An HFC free climate-controlled warehouse will be pursued, however the alternative methodology for refrigeration may not be feasible. If the climate-controlled warehouse requires the use of HFCs for refrigeration, emissions from the facility will not constitute a significant impact under NEPA. GHG emissions are often measured in CO₂ equivalent. HFCs have a high global warming potential meaning that they are a more potent GHG than CO₂. The CO₂ equivalent calculation (EPA 2023) shows that approximately 13.5 metric tons of HFC constitutes 25,000 metric tons of CO₂. The proposed project's climate controlled warehouse is not yet calculated due to preliminary design stages, but generally estimated to emit far less than 13.5 metric tons of HFCs, the CO₂ equivalent of 3,078 homes' energy use for one year.

GHG emissions due to construction will be CO₂ emissions from heavy machinery such as excavators, dozers, loaders, smooth drum rollers, sheep's foot roller, ski loader, rock trucks, dump trucks, blade motor grader, and potentially scrapers. The EPA's Simplified GHG Emissions Calculator was used to quantify project emissions (EPA 2022). The estimate for total diesel fuel needed for project construction is 90,420 gallons. The estimate for total motor gasoline needed for project construction is 5,327 gallons. According to the GHG Emissions Calculator the total CO₂ metric ton emissions from heavy machinery during project construction is 969 metric tons over a two-year period. The project's 969 metric tons of CO₂ emissions is equivalent to 122 homes' energy use for one year.

Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention

The Proposed Action is located in an area of documented soil contamination associated with Hazard ID 27137. As described above, the area is contaminated with hydrocarbons and PFAS compounds, the highest levels of PFAS contamination occurring along the southern boundary of the Proposed Action. To construct the Proposed Action, the bog will require surcharging (placing fill on top of the land to compress the soils and sediments) to create the structural integrity for the proposed facilities. As the surcharging occurs, the contaminated bog water is expected to seep out. The surcharging will occur from one project direction to another (e.g., north to south) so that the contaminated water seeps out of the land in a uniform and

predictable way. The fill will be amended with PFAS treatment. The water will be captured where it seeps out and filtered through a granular activated carbon filter which has been shown to effectively remove longer chains of PFAS, such as PFOA and PFOS, from water (EPA 2018). Additional technologies are being developed at a rapid pace and the final technology chosen to cleanup expelled water will be coordinated with Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC). The PFAS contaminated soils will remain in place and capped with an impervious surface which will minimize the PFAS compounds percolating to groundwater through saturation by rain. Coordination with ADEC is ongoing and a final remediation plan will be approved by ADEC prior to construction (see Appendix G for coordination). The contaminated site will not be disturbed without mitigation in place for adverse impacts. Mitigation will follow guidance and regulation that exists, both state and federal, and will be approved by state authority. As such, no adverse effects to human health or the environment are expected; conversely cleaning up PFAS contaminated water would provide an environmental benefit. An Interim NEPA Contaminated Materials Management Plan (CMMP) with proposed details for mitigation is located in Appendix B, as well as record of consultation with ADEC.

This CMMP would prescribe how construction would occur in order to minimize adverse impacts. Typical BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize adverse impacts which may result from the discharge of fill material, such as erosion.

Due to the largely undeveloped nature of the project area, the Proposed Action would generate minimal construction waste. Hazardous materials used during construction would be limited to minor amounts of fuel, lubricants, hydraulic fluids, cleaning solvents, and paint. Any generated construction waste would be disposed of at the local landfill in accordance with state and federal laws and regulations. Waste, hazardous or solid, will not be an appreciably different type or quantity than that which exists currently at other aviation facilities. Fuel, lubricants, hydraulic fluids, cleaning solvents, and paints are commonly used for vehicle and aviation maintenance, which is ubiquitous throughout the airport. Solid waste will be minimal because the site does not require mass excavation or demolition. Stormwater discharges during construction would adhere to a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) required under a Construction General Permit. Stormwater during facility operations will drain into the ANC stormwater system.

Over time, the Proposed Action may result in incidental and minor releases of hazardous materials within the project area. Depending on the quantity of hazardous materials, a spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan may be required and implemented per 40 CFR 112 and ADEC spill prevention and response regulations outlined in 18 Alaska Administrative Code 75. In addition, the project will be required to comply with the hazardous materials, storage, and spill directives of the ANC Lease (ADA 32351), ANC Operations Manual, and all applicable airport regulations.

One of the primary activities that contribute to water pollution at airports around the country is the use of glycol-based aircraft deicing fluids. Glycol mixed in a stormwater discharge has the potential to migrate to receiving waters and reduce available oxygen to aquatic life. The glycol use at ANC will not change as a result of the project because the project is not increasing the fleet size or mix at ANC. Stormwater discharges at ANC are regulated and authorized under and APDES General Permit (AKR061000, expires 10/31/2024). Industrial facilities are required to be co-permittees, develop a SWPPP, and adhere to the stipulations of the ANC General Permit during operations.

Historical and Cultural Resources

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) consists of those areas within the proposed construction disturbance footprint. The Proposed Action is unlikely to impact any significant historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural resources. No such resources have been documented within or adjacent to the APE. Portions of the project area are previously disturbed. Moreover, the project area does not exhibit features such as lookout points, fish streams, or good tool stone that would increase the likelihood of encountering buried archaeological resources. Therefore, the APE has low probability for undiscovered cultural resources.

A Findings Letter was sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on July 19, 2022, requesting a finding of No Historic Properties Affected. The SHPO responded with a concurrence letter agreeing to a finding of No Historic Properties Affected on August 5, 2022. Appendix C provides Section 106 documentation. Tribal consultation letters were sent to Chickaloon Moose Creek Native Association, Chickaloon Village Tribal Council, Cook Inlet Region Inc., Cook Inlet Tribal Council, Eklutna Inc., Knikatu Inc., Knik Tribal Council, and Native Village of Eklutna on February 2, 2024. One response of “no comments on the tribal trust or subsistence issues...” was received from Eklutna Inc. on February 12, 2024. No other responses were received regarding tribal consultation. Appendix C shows Section 106 documentation.

Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use

A preliminary noise analysis determined that noise impacts from the project operations are limited to a degree that they don't warrant a detailed analysis as described in FAA Order 1050.1F Desk Reference (please see Noise Analysis in Appendix D). The noise analysis used the Airport Equivalent Method (AEM) as a screening tool to evaluate noise impacts. AEM is a mathematical procedure that provides an estimated noise contour area of a specific airport given the types of aircraft and the number of operations (take offs or landings) for each aircraft. The tool requires input of additional landings and take offs to evaluate changes to noise contours. Although there will be no increase in airport activity due to the Proposed Action, the noise analysis used 18 additional landings and take offs as an absolute worst alternative case in order to evaluate noise impacts with the AEM tool. Eighteen additional landings and take offs (36 operations) represents an abundance of caution in evaluating noise at this location, however the screening resulted in a finding that the proposed project does not reach or exceed the production of DNL 1 dB of additional noise, as such no noise analysis is warranted. No significant noise impacts will occur.

Construction of the Proposed Action would result in varying levels of noise generation subject to change based on the construction intensity and distance to a given receptor. As a logarithmic unit of measurement, the decibel cannot be added or subtracted linearly. Some guidelines for understanding changes in noise levels follow.

- If two sounds of the same level are added, the sound level increases by approximately 3 dB. For example: 60 dB + 60 dB = 63 dB.
- The sum of two sounds of a different level is only slightly higher than the louder level. For example: 60 dB + 70 dB = 70.4 dB.
- Sound from a “point source,” such as construction equipment, decreases approximately 6 dB for each doubling of distance.

- Although the human ear can detect a sound change as faint as 1 dB, the typical person does not perceive changes of less than approximately 3 dB.
- A 10 dB change in sound level is perceived by the average person as a doubling, or halving, of the sound's loudness.

Construction noise typically dissipates at a rate of approximately 6 dB for each doubling of distance (between the noise source and the receptor, which is the location that is representative of where the sound would be experienced (e.g., a residence)). Based on anticipated equipment that would be used during construction of the Proposed Action, the typically noisiest construction equipment with mufflers (independent of background ambient noise levels) used during excavation and grading was the basis for this analysis. These pieces of equipment may generate a noise level of approximately 88 dB at 50 feet from the noise source. Based on a sound dissipation rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance, a sound level of 88 dB at 50 feet from the noise source would be approximately 82 dB at a distance of 100 feet, 76 dB at a distance of 200 feet, and so on. That sound dissipation rate and the corresponding attenuation estimates are conservative in that they do not take into account any intervening shielding (including landscaping or trees) or barriers, such as structures or hills between the noise source and noise receptor, which would further reduce noise levels. (Federal Highway Administration, 2006). As reported in the Airport's FAR Part 150 Compatibility Study Update, a semi-permanent noise monitor was set up at 3190 Bridle Lane, which is at the approximate location of the nearest residential land use to the project study area (ANC 2015). The ambient noise at this monitoring site was recorded at 59.3 dB in the winter and at 64.9 dB in the summer. Therefore, due to the distance from the closest sensitive noise receptor, noise attenuation from the project study area, and typical ambient noise levels, construction noise would not likely be perceptible at the nearest residence to the project study area.

Project construction will abide by the Anchorage Noise Control Ordinance (AMC 15.70). Thus, and for example, work on nights, weekends, or holidays would require a Noise Permit. If the sound levels for construction triggered a requirement for a construction Noise Permit, the Municipality of Anchorage could place such conditions on the permit as deemed necessary or advisable by the Municipality, thus further addressing as appropriate the eventuality of temporary noise impacts. Abatement methods such as proper maintenance of construction equipment would help further reduce impacts.

Visual Resources / Visual Character

The Proposed Action is not expected to have impacts on light that substantially alter the character of the area; the proposed project area is on airport property adjacent to existing aviation facilities with security lighting. The climate-controlled warehouse would be up to 75 feet tall. Turnagain is the nearest neighborhood to the proposed facilities, approximately 0.85 miles away. The proposed facilities will not be visible to the neighborhood due to distance, vegetative buffers, and the existing infrastructure between the neighborhood and the proposed facilities. Earthquake Park is the nearest recreational resource to the proposed project, approximately 0.85 miles away. Earthquake Park and associated trails are vegetated, obscuring views of the airport and subsequently obscuring views of the proposed facilities.

Light emissions already exist in the area and the addition of the Proposed Action is not expected to interfere with normal activities. The proposed project is consistent with the land uses in the surrounding area and will not be visible from the nearest residential area, nor the nearest recreational area.

Water Resources: Wetlands and Groundwater

The Proposed Action would fill and result in unavoidable permanent impacts to about 22 acres of wetlands in Postmark Bog. According to the Anchorage Wetlands Management Plan (AWMP)(MOA 2014), the wetland is a part of site number 26D, "Postmark Drive West." The primary function of the Postmark Bog wetland is stormwater runoff attenuation from airport impervious surfaces. Complete avoidance of impacts to wetlands is not possible to meet the project's purpose and need. The size of the facility is necessary to help meet the demand for various storage types (cold, heated, and general) as well as equipment and aircraft staging and storage. The footprint of the pad has been minimized by decreasing the pad and driveway side slopes. In addition, by placing the building on piles, the amount of fill placed has been minimized. A USACE Individual Permit was approved on June 30, 2023 (Appendix E). The permit includes special conditions for wetland mitigation credits to be purchased prior to construction to compensate for the loss of functions of Postmark Bog. A total of 23.965 credits must be acquired to offset the loss of acreage and functions due to the Proposed Action.

The proposed project would result in impacts that meet or exceed the significance thresholds defined by FAA. However, the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) as the regulatory agency dictates mitigation requirements such that impacts will be offset by the appropriate amount of compensatory mitigation.

7. PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The following permits and approvals will be required prior to construction of the Proposed Action:

- ADEC Construction General Permit for Storm Water Discharges for Large and Small Construction Activities (Clean Water Act [CWA] Section 402).
- ADEC General Permit for Excavation Dewatering.
- ADEC Section 401 Clean Water Act Water Quality Certification.
- Alaska Department of Natural Resources SHPO Concurrence on Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act Findings.
- Department of the Army USACE Section 404 CWA Permit.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

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

Topic	Commitment
Hazardous Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If excess soils are generated that require treatment or disposal, coordination with ADEC will be required prior to treatment of disposal.• Dewatering will require a ADEC approved treatment plan prior to dewatering activities.
Wetlands	Compensatory mitigation will be provided for unavoidable impacts to jurisdictional wetlands.

9. MITIGATIONS AND REGULATORY CONCURRENCE

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

The sponsor’s consultation with ADEC regarding contaminated materials is documented in the Final EA and appendices. Actions related to contaminated materials have been reviewed and accepted by the ADEC. Therefore, the authority having jurisdiction has defined and recognized a state of conditional compliance under which the project has the legal authority to proceed. The FAA recognizes and accepts that authority.

The FAA notes the sponsor’s agreement to adhere to the following conditions set through consultation with ADEC:

- Prior to commencing the work, a Final Contaminated Materials Management Plan will replace the Interim NEPA Contaminated Materials Management Plan. The Final Plan will be reviewed and approved by ADEC prior to issuance of the General Permit for Excavation Dewatering.

The sponsor’s consultation with ADEC regarding Section 401 of the CWA is documented in the Final EA. A CWA Water Quality Certification was issued to the project sponsor by ADEC. The FAA recognizes the certification as concurrence and accepts ADEC authority.

The sponsor’s consultation with USACE regarding Section 404 of the CWA is documented in the Final EA. A Department of the Army USACE Section 404 CWA Permit was issued to the project sponsor by ADEC. The FAA recognizes the permit as concurrence and accepts USACE authority. Specific mitigations apply to offset impacts to jurisdictional wetlands, if not for the mitigations, the project would have a significant impact to jurisdictional wetlands.

The FAA notes the sponsor’s agreement to adhere to the following conditions set forth in the Department of the Army USACE Section 404 CWA Permit:

- Prior to commencing the work authorized by this permit, the permittee shall utilize 9.28 Klatt Bog Credits to partially offset the project’s calculated 13.73 debits. To offset the remaining 4.45 debits, the permittee shall purchase 14.685 credits of the appropriate type from Harmany Ranch Wetland Mitigation Bank, as proposed by the permittee and approved by the USACE. Such credit utilization and purchase will offset the loss of 21.6 acres of palustrine emergent and scrub-shrub wetlands.

10. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public outreach for the project began in May 2022 to inform the public about proposed developments to the Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage site. Public involvement included publishing the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Assessment in the Anchorage Daily News, which opened a comment period from May 29 to July 1, 2022. An additional public comment period to solicit feedback on the Draft EA was opened September 4, 2023 and closed October 15, 2023. A public meeting was held on October 3, 2023. The comments and responses Notification of the Draft EA availability and the scheduled public meeting was provided as follows:

1. Legal ad in the Anchorage Daily News
2. Notification on the State of Alaska Online Public Notification System
3. Notification through the State of Alaska GovDelivery
4. Postcards sent to businesses within one mile (approximately 100)
5. Email to the Federation of Community Councils
6. Public Involvement materials can be found in Appendix F.

One public comment was received during the initial scoping and discussed a primary concern of pollutants and hazardous materials spills as they relate to impacts to humans and biological resources. One formal comment was received at the October 3, 2023 public meeting and discussed a recommendation for in-ground power for jets so that they can turn off the auxiliary power units while parked. General discussion topics at the public meeting included ANC-wide cumulative impacts including noise, concerns of additional traffic on West Northern Lights Boulevard, general interest in the Section 404 CWA permit and mitigation, and discussion on contamination and remediation techniques. A comment response log can be found in Appendix F of the Final EA.

Additional public involvement that should be considered is the outreach associated with the ANC Master Plan update (Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport, 2014). The public involvement process for the ANC Master Plan update is the preliminary outreach to solicit comments on what should go where on airport property. The substantial public outreach efforts were conducted over 18 months from 2012 to 2014. The ALP was one outcome of the Master Plan update, and was conditionally approved (pending completion of NEPA) in 2015, including the proposed location being designated for cargo facilities.

11. INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION

On behalf of the FAA, agency scoping was conducted with agencies that may have jurisdictional resources within or near the project area. Scoping materials including a background letter and a preliminary environmental research report were sent to agencies on June 10, 2022 (Appendix G). Agencies were sent a Notice of Availability of the Draft EA and Notice of a Public Meeting on September 12, 2023.

In accordance with United States Code (USC) 49 USC 47101(h), the FAA has determined that no further coordination with the U.S. Department of Interior or the EPA is necessary because the Proposed Action does not involve construction of a new airport, new runway, or major runway extension that has a significant impact on natural resources including fish and wildlife; natural, scenic, and recreational assets; water and air quality; or another factor affecting the environment.

12. REASONS FOR DETERMINATION THAT THE PROPOSED ACTION WILL HAVE NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The attached Final EA examines each of the various environmental resources that were determined to be present at the project location or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would not cause any environmental impacts that exceed any thresholds of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B. Based on the information contained in the Final EA, the FAA has determined that the Proposed Action meets the purpose and need for the Proposed Action, would not cause any significant environmental impacts that cannot or will not be mitigated, and is the most reasonable, feasible, and prudent alternative. Accordingly, the FAA has decided to approve the Proposed Action as it is described in Section 3 of this FONSI/ROD.

The Proposed Action will not cause pollutant concentrations to exceed one or more of the NAAQS or increase the frequency or severity of any such existing violations. Therefore, a significant air quality impact, as defined by FAA, will not occur.

The Proposed Action will not be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a federally listed threatened or endangered species under U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service jurisdiction or result in the destruction or adverse modification of federally designated critical habitat. Therefore, a significant impact to biological resources, as defined by FAA, will not occur.

The Proposed Action is unlikely to have significant climate change impacts. Two regulated GHGs may be emitted at the project area, CO₂ (jet emissions) and HFCs (refrigeration emissions). The proposed cargo improvements may result in an increase in HFC emissions due to the refrigeration at the climate-controlled warehouse. If HFCs are emitted during operation of the proposed facility, they will not represent a significant impact and would be equivalent to the operations of approximately 81,200 household refrigerators. The remainder of the project, including parking apron will not change the ANC fleet mix or size and will therefore not result in a net gain of CO₂ emissions. Overall CO₂ emissions from cargo jets may decrease at ANC because the jets will be provided space to park and spend less time idling waiting for a parking position to become available.

The Proposed Action will not: violate applicable federal, state, tribal, or local laws or regulations regarding hazardous materials and/or solid waste management; involve a contaminated site with unmitigated adverse effects; produce and appreciably different quantity or type of hazardous waste; generate an appreciably different quantity or type of solid waste or use a different method of collection or disposal and/or would exceed local capacity; or adversely affect human health and the environment. Therefore, a significant impact to or from hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention, as defined by FAA, will not occur.

The Proposed Action will not include an Adverse Effect on historical, architectural, archaeological or cultural resources. A significance threshold for historical and cultural resources has not been established by FAA, however, a finding of Adverse Effect is a factor to consider. Because the Proposed Action has been determined not to adversely affect a historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural resource no significant impact, as stated by FAA, will occur.

The Proposed Action does not have potential to increase noise by DNL 1.5 dB or more for a noise-sensitive area that is exposed to noise at or above the DNL 65 dB noise exposure level, or that will be exposed at or above the DNL 65 dB level or greater increase, when compared to the no action alternative for the same timeframe. Therefore, a significant impact as defined by FAA will not occur.

Temporary noise impacts may result from the operation of heavy equipment, the presence of construction crews, and other associated construction activities. Abatement methods such as proper maintenance of construction equipment would help reduce these impacts. Construction of the Proposed Action will not require alteration of local vehicle traffic or air traffic patterns, nor are long-term increases to traffic volume due to operations anticipated. Therefore, noise impacts related to such changes are not anticipated.

The Proposed Action does not have the potential to: create annoyance or interfere with normal activities from light emissions; affect the visual character of the area, including the importance, uniqueness, and aesthetic value of the affected visual resources; contrast with the visual resources and/or visual character in the study area; block or obstruct the views of visual resources, including whether these resources would still be viewable from other locations. Therefore, a significant impact to visual resources and/or visual character, as defined by FAA, will not occur.

The Proposed Action impacts approximately 22 acres of USACE wetlands, jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The impacts will be offset by utilizing 9.28 Klatt Bog Credits and 14.685 Harmany Ranch Wetland Mitigation Credits. Because the credits offset the 22 acre impact as determined by the USACE in Department of the Army Permit POA-2021-00121, no significant impact will occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed action does not have the potential to cause significant cumulative impacts, as analyzed in each resource section in the Final Environmental Assessment.

The proposed action may produce temporary combined construction related air quality impacts, however, all projects would be regulated using BMPs and will require compliance with the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit. Therefore, cumulative impacts will be temporary, mitigated through BMPs, and not exceed regulatory levels of NAAQS emissions as required by the ANC air quality permit.

Cumulative impacts for wildlife habitat is predominately related to wetlands elimination. The proposed action would fill an additional 21.6 acres of wetlands. Reasonably foreseeable actions include the adjacent FedEx development, also located on Postmark Bog. The FedEx development proposed to fill an additional 14.32 acres of wetlands for a cumulative impact of 35.92 acres. The USACE requires mitigation for unavoidable impacts to jurisdictional wetlands. The amount of mitigation required has been determined by the USACE as the jurisdictional regulatory agency and will offset the loss of Postmark Bog wetlands. The total credits required by both FedEx and the Proposed Action for compensatory mitigation is 36.62 credits.

Although we are not directly relying on the USACE environmental analysis, we note that they reached a similar conclusion. Specifically, the USACE concluded that cumulative impacts were not significant in the Department of the Army Environmental Assessment and Statement of Findings associated with the Individual Permit for the Proposed Action (POA-2021-00121): "When considering the direct and indirect impacts that will result from the proposed activity, in relation to the overall direct and indirect impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities, the incremental contribution of the proposed activity to cumulative impacts in the area described in section 9.2, are not significant. Compensatory mitigation will be required to offset the impacts of the proposed activity to eliminate or minimize its incremental contribution to cumulative effects within the geographic area described in Section 9.2.

Mitigation required for the proposed activity is discussed in Section 8.0." Please see Appendix E for the Department of the Army Environmental Assessment and Statement of Findings.

Due to the spill response mechanisms, the proposed project is not expected to add additional hazardous substances and will clean up PFAS contaminated water on-site as it is expelled from the ground during surcharging. Cumulative impacts analysis included the FedEx a planned development adjacent to the Proposed Action, also on PFAS contaminated land. FedEx has in place an ADEC approved plan for remediation of the contamination, leading to an overall decrease in abundance of PFAS. The proposed project and the FedEx development will decrease overall contamination abundance at ANC and ensure contaminated materials do not migrate off site. Details regarding the treatment plan can be found in Appendix B of the Final EA. ANC manages airport-wide PFAS and is responsible for coordinating with ADEC on long term monitoring and management.

There are no direct or indirect impacts expected from the proposed project, therefore there is not measurable accumulation of impacts, therefore no cumulative impacts related to historical and cultural resources. FedEx is currently planning a development adjacent to the Proposed Action. A cultural resources review under Section 106 of the FedEx property also resulted in a finding of no historic properties effected.

There are no direct or indirect impacts expected from the proposed project, therefore there is not measurable accumulation of permanent cumulative impacts related to noise. Although there is no perceptible increase in noise from the Proposed Action, it is important to disclose that FedEx is currently planning a development adjacent to the Proposed Action. Operation of the FedEx facility would not result in an increase as certain operations would be moved from the existing facility to the new facility. Cumulative impacts of both the FedEx facility and the Proposed Action are negligible as demonstrated by the Proposed Action Noise Analysis (Appendix D) and the understanding that FedEx is not increasing operations. Cumulative noise impacts airport-wide are studied and disclosed in the FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study (ANC 2015). The Proposed Action and the FedEx facility are proposed for construction from 2024 to 2026. Combined construction activities will increase temporary noise impacts. However, both projects are subject to the same noise ordinance requirements. Cumulatively, the consistency of noise may increase (more loud noises throughout the day), however cumulatively construction of the two projects together is not expected to increase dB output. Both projects are subject to the same inversely proportional relationship between source sound pressure and distance from the sounds source (-6 dB per doubling of distance). According to the inversely proportional relationship between source sound pressure and distance from the sounds source, the 65dB contour of construction equipment noise would be approximately 800 feet. The noise changes to 58dB at 1600 feet. No sensitive land exists within 1600 feet of either property.

The cumulative impact of the proposed project on visual resources and character is not expected to be significant because it is consistent with the existing visual character of airport property. Airport property in the area has existing aviation facilities, runways, taxiways, and terminals. FedEx is currently planning a development adjacent to the Proposed Action. The visible portions of the proposed FedEx consist of two buildings, vehicle parking, aircraft apron, a new connection to Postmark Drive, and a perimeter fence; all in support of air cargo activities. The Proposed Action and the proposed FedEx facility are consistent with the current visual resources in the surrounding area and will not create a significant interference with normal activities.

13. FEDERAL FINDING AND APPROVAL

Based on the information in this FONSI/ROD and supported by detailed discussion in the Final EA, the FAA has selected the Proposed Action as the Selected Alternative. The FAA must select one of the following choices:

- Approve agency actions necessary to implement the Proposed Action, or
- Disapprove agency actions to implement the Proposed Action.

Approval signifies that applicable federal requirements have been met. Approval would allow ANC to amend its Airport Layout Plan and allow Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Action. Disapproval would prevent ANC from amending its Airport Layout Plan and prevent Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage from implementing the Proposed Action.

Under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, I find that the project is reasonably supported. I, therefore, direct that action be taken to carry out Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport and Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage's actions outlined in Section 3 of this FONSI/ROD. As a condition of this FONSI/ROD, Alaska Cargo and Cold Storage and, where appropriate, Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport shall all the environmental commitments identified herein and in the Final Environmental Assessment, as well as the mitigations identified in Section 9 above.

I have carefully and thoroughly considered the facts contained in the Final EA. Based on that information, I find the proposed Federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives of Section 101(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other applicable environmental requirements. I also find the proposed Federal action will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for this action.

APPROVED:

Kristi A. Warden

Date

Division Director

Airports Division, Alaska Region

DISAPPROVED:

Kristi A. Warden

Date

Division Director

Airports Division, Alaska Region

RIGHT OF APPEAL

This FONSI/ROD constitutes a final order of the FAA Administrator and is subject to exclusive judicial review under 49 USC 46110 by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person contesting the decision resides or has its principal place of business. Any party having substantial interest in this order may apply for review of the decision by filing a petition for review in the appropriate

U.S. Court of Appeals no later than 60 days after the order is issued in accordance with the provisions of 49 USC 46110.