

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

Location

Williamsport Regional Airport (IPT)
Montoursville Borough, Pennsylvania

Introduction

This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) sets out the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) consideration of environmental and other factors for Airport Layout Plan (ALP) approval and federal financial assistance for the 20-Unit Nested T-Hangar Development Project at Williamsport Regional Airport (IPT). This FONSI is based on the *20-Unit Nested T-Hangar Development Project Environmental Assessment* (EA) submitted by the Williamsport Municipal Airport Authority (Airport Sponsor), dated March 1, 2023.

Background

The Williamsport Municipal Airport Authority (Airport Sponsor), as owner and operator of IPT, is proposing the construction of a 20-Unit Nested T-Hangar. The Proposed Project will make available a new modern facility which will be an enhancement for prospective tenants given the aging of some of the hangar infrastructure currently at the Airport. The project is included on the current approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and dates back to the ALP included in the 2005 IPT Airport Master Plan.

Project Description

The Proposed Action consists of adding 20 T-Hangars adjacent to existing hangars near Taxiways K and B. The project consists of the following components:

- New 20 Unit Nested T-Hangar (pre-engineered metal building, approximately 23,000 square feet)
- Electrical and exterior lighting
- Single electrical service entrance and meter for the entire facility
- Pavement demolition (removal of 2.2 acres of pavement, filled with topsoil and seeded)
- Building concrete building floor slab and foundations (reinforced concrete foundation, subbase course, crushed aggregate base course)
- Asphalt apron for hangar access and taxiing (additional 2.2 acres)

The construction timeframe is expected to be April 2023 through October 2023.

Proposed Federal Action

The FAA actions involved in the implementation of the Proposed Action include the following:

- Unconditional approval of those portions of the IPT Airport Layout Plan to depict the Proposed Action pursuant to 49 U.S.C. §§ 40103(b), 44718, and 47107(a) (16), and determination and approval of the effects of this project upon the safe and efficient

utilization of navigable airspace pursuant to 14 C.F.R. Parts 77 and 157 and 49 U.S.C. § 44718.

- Determinations concerning funding through the Federal grant-in-aid program authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (recodified at 49 U.S.C. §47107) (this FONSI/ROD does not determine eligibility or availability of potential funds); and
- Determination under 49 U.S.C. §§40101(d)(1) and 47105(b)(3) as to whether the Proposed Action maintains and enhances safety and security, and meets applicable design and engineering standards set forth in FAA Advisory Circulars;

The Environmental Assessment (EA) analyzed the possible environmental impacts of these proposed actions and was prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) implementing regulations.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide the Airport Sponsor with diversified revenue streams consistent with the Airport Sponsor's obligation to enhance the Airport's financial self-sufficiency as specified in Grant Assurance 24. The operation of the Airport is important to the continued economic benefit to the region and state. Generating revenue through aviation-related developments would assist the Airport to become more financially sufficient. The Airport Sponsor has the opportunity to continue making the Airport as financially self-sustaining as possible by providing additional income to the Airport through the construction and operation of the additional hangars. The Proposed Project would also help in accommodating the high demand for hangars throughout the state of Pennsylvania, and those on the waiting list for hangars specifically at IPT, which would directly assist in creating those revenue streams to enhance the Airport's self-sufficiency.

The need for the project was identified in the 2005 Master Plan. The Master Plan included a base year of 2002 and 20-year planning period that went out to 2022. At the time the Master Plan was published in 2005, the Plan indicated that IPT did not warrant the construction of additional hangars at that time but noted the importance from an overall land development perspective to provide for such facilities in the long term. It went on to state that the condition of the existing (2002) hangars ranged from excellent to fair, some of which may require replacement during the 20-year planning period.

A 2021 survey of all 116 public-use airports in Pennsylvania conducted by the Aircraft Owners and Pilot Association (AOPA) in partnership with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation's Aviation Advisory Committee, Bureau of Aviation, and the Aviation Council of Pennsylvania identified a strong need for additional hangar space throughout the state.¹ It indicated that 38% more hangars would need to be constructed in Pennsylvania to meet the current demand.

¹ <https://www.aopa.org/news-and-media/all-news/2021/june/09/hangars-in-high-demand>

In addition, the Authority has a waiting list for hangars and expects most of the tenants in the oldest hangars to move. The facilities are obsolete, and the Authority does not plan any further investment in them due to the cost.

Alternatives

Two airport safety elements were the primary criteria for the evaluation of the alternatives – the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) line-of-sight and the *14 Code of Federal Regulations Part 77 – Safe, Efficient Use, and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace (Part 77)* requirements.

Air traffic controllers are responsible for providing clearance for takeoff or landing, and for the safe separation and movement of aircraft and vehicles on the airfield. Therefore, visibility from the ATCT cab to the runway ends and all areas of the airfield (i.e., movement areas) are important elements for the safe operation of the Airport.

Part 77 defines several surfaces surrounding an airport that extend outward and upward and are used to determine obstructions to air navigation that may affect the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace and the operation of planned or existing air navigation and communication facilities. The Part 77 Transitional Surface exists primarily to prevent existing or proposed manmade objects from extending upward into navigable airspace.

There were multiple alternatives in addition to the no action alternative that were considered and they are listed below.

1. Alternative 1 (Proposed Project): is the Airport Sponsor's preferred alternative and is shown on the Airport's current/approved FAA ALP (see Figure 3, Final EA). This alternative does not penetrate the Part 77 Transitional Surface. It is located next to other T-hangars and adjacent to landside tenant access. Alternative 1 would allow tenants accessing the proposed hangars and not drive cross active taxiways to access their aircraft. The line of sight from the ATCT to the Runway 9 end clips the corner of the Alternative 1 but is not enough to cause an obstruction. Alternative 1 meets the Purpose and Need, does not penetrate the Part 77 Transitional Surface and is not an obstruction for ATCT. Therefore, Alternative 1 (Proposed Project) was carried forward for further evaluation.
2. Alternative 2: is in the center of the airfield, east of Taxiway H (see Figure 3, Final EA). This alternative's hangar location does not violate the Part 77 Transitional Surface height restrictions. For tenants to access aircraft their hangar(s), they would drive across active taxiways and apron area. The tenants accessing the Alternative 2 hangars would traverse the Airport Operations Area (AOA) which requires them to be in communication with, and be under the control of, the ATCT staff.

Construction of Alternative 2 would result in construction equipment crossing active taxiways and apron to access the site and would also be subject to the rules of operating in the AOA. Alternative 2 completely blocks the line of sight from the ATCT to the Runway 9 end and Taxiway K and H movement areas. Alternative 2 meets the Purpose and Need and does not penetrate the Part 77 Transitional Surface. However, Alternative 2 is an obstruction for ATCT and requires construction and tenant vehicles to cross the

AOA. Therefore, Alternative 2 was not carried forward for further consideration in this EA.

3. Alternative 3: Alternative 3 is in the center of the airfield, just west of Taxiway H (see Figure 3, Final EA). The Alternative 3 hangar location does not violate the Part 77 Transitional Surface height restrictions. Alternative 3 blocks the line of sight from the ATCT to the Runway 9 end and the Taxiway K movement area. Alternative 3 meets the Purpose and Need and does not penetrate the Part 77 Transitional Surface. However, Alternative 3 is an obstruction for ATCT and therefore was not carried forward for further consideration in this EA.
4. No Action Alternative: Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Project would not be approved or implemented, and construction and operation of the project would not take place. The No Action Alternative would not satisfy the Purpose and Need for the project. Although the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need, it is being retained for environmental baseline comparative purposes and to fulfill CEQ regulations (40 CFR Part 1502) implementing NEPA, and to comply with FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, and FAA Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions.

Discussion

The March 2023 EA addresses the effects of the proposed action on the quality of the human and natural environment, and is made a part of this Finding. The environmental impact categories of Coastal Resources, and Section 4(f), Farmlands were not relevant to the Proposed Action due to their absence within the study area and no further analysis was conducted.

The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories: Air Quality; Biological Resources; Climate; Hazardous Materials and Waste, Solid Waste, Pollution Prevention, and Contaminated Sites; Historic, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources; Land Use; Natural Resources and Energy Supply; Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use; Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks; Visual Effects; Water Resources; and Cumulative Impacts.

The following provides a summary of the analysis of various resource categories, which are described in greater detail in the Environmental Consequences Section of the Final EA.

Air Quality

FAA Order 1050.1F provides the FAA's significance threshold for air quality, which states, "The action would cause pollutant concentrations to exceed one or more of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), as established by the USEPA under the Clean Air Act (CAA), for any of the time periods analyzed, or to increase the frequency or severity of any such existing violations. There are NAAQS for six "criteria" air pollutants—carbon monoxide (CO), lead (Pb), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂). There are standards for two sizes of PM—PM_{2.5} which are particles with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less and PM₁₀ which are particles with a diameter of 10 microns or less.

The EPA designates areas as having air pollutant levels that are either lower than/meeting the NAAQS or higher than the NAAQS. An area with measured pollutant concentrations which are lower/meeting the NAAQS is designated as an attainment area and an area with pollutant concentrations that exceed the NAAQS is designated as a non-attainment area. Lycoming County is currently designated attainment for all of the NAAQS.

The General Conformity Rule of the CAA prohibits federal agencies (including the FAA) from permitting or funding non-highway projects where the proposed project is in a non-attainment area without additional analyses. The additional analysis includes comparing the project-related emissions to de minimis threshold levels. De minimis levels are the minimum threshold pollutant levels for which a conformity determination must be performed. Although Lycoming County is located in an attainment area, additional quantitative and qualitative analysis was performed to ensure emissions would still be below de minimis.

Aircraft Operational Emissions:

An aircraft operational emissions inventory was prepared for the additional aircraft operations as a result of the Proposed Project. The aircraft emissions were computed using the FAA-approved Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) version 3e. The emissions inventories were prepared for CO, NO₂, SO₂, PM₁₀/PM_{2.5} and VOC. The table below presents the aircraft operational emission inventories for the two analysis years - 2024 and 2029. For informational purposes, the de minimis thresholds for each pollutant have been included in the table.

Table 1

Proposed Project Additional Aircraft Emissions (Tons Per Year)

Year	CO	NO ₂	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	VOC
2024	9.74	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.17
2029	9.89	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.17
<i>de minimis threshold</i>	100	50	100	100	100	50

Source: RS&H, 2022

Construction Emissions:

Construction of the Proposed Project would cause a temporary and minor increase in emissions from the use of construction equipment such as backhoes, dump trucks, graders, rollers, and worker vehicles used to travel to/from the construction site.

The FAA Order 1050.1F Desk Reference identifies that for air quality, small projects sometimes can be evaluated qualitatively or by comparison to a previous project for which a quantitative air quality analysis is available. In the context of airport construction projects, that often include runway extensions, runway rehabilitation projects, new or expanded passenger terminals / concourses, major ramp expansions and multi-story parking garages, the IPT 20-Unit Nested T-hangar project can be considered as having a low potential for significant air quality impacts from the construction activities. This is due to the relative short construction period, the volume of pavement being removed/added and the hangar building size. Therefore, a comparison of the

Proposed Project's construction activities to a previous project for which a quantitative air quality analysis was conducted is identified below.

The qualitative analysis utilized a recent EA was prepared for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey for the John F. Kennedy International Airport (JFK) Redevelopment Program. The FAA Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) was signed on 4/21/2020. The proposed action in the JFK EA included a major redevelopment of the airport terminals and roadways that includes including substantial demolition of multiple existing passenger terminals and a large parking garage, construction of two large new terminals and a ground transportation center, roadway realignment and removal/addition of airfield pavement.

The two largest components of JFK redevelopment include the two large new passenger terminals and ground transportation center. Based on information included in the EA², these three components of the redevelopment plan would include the following major construction activities over the five-year construction period:

- Demolition of about 6.1 million square feet of existing buildings
- Construction of about 7.2 million square feet of new buildings
- 2.3 million square feet of pavement removal
- 1.9 million square feet of new pavement

The construction emissions for the JFK EA were calculated using the EPA's Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES) software for both the on-road and off-road construction equipment. Construction emissions are quantified for each construction year and are based on the total hours that each piece of construction equipment will be operating.

As noted previously, the EPA establishes the guiding principles and policies for protecting air quality conditions throughout the nation. EPA's primary responsibility is to promulgate and update the NAAQS which define outdoor levels of air pollutants that are considered safe for the health and welfare of the public. The six NAAQS criteria air pollutants—CO, NO₂, O₃, SO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} are to be evaluated for all projects that occur throughout the U.S. As such, the criteria pollutants evaluated in the JFK EA are also those that were to be evaluated for the IPT Proposed Project.

In the JFK EA, the second year of construction, 2021, had the highest level of construction emissions. The year 2021 construction emissions identified in the EA for the criteria pollutants are as follows:

CO: 81.6 tons VOC: 30.6 tons NO₂: 28.3 tons
SO₂: 0.2 tons PM₁₀: 30.8 tons PM_{2.5}: 4.2 tons

These totals are below the de minimis threshold of 50 tons per year of NO_x and VOC and 100 tons per year for CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} and do not result in a significant air quality impact. While the IPT and JFK projects differ in size and scale, there is common construction equipment that is likely to be used on both projects. These generally include cranes, backhoes, dump trucks, concrete trucks, graders, rollers, and worker vehicles used to travel to/from the

² <https://www.panynj.gov/port-authority/en/about/studies-and-reports/case-studies-reports.html>

construction site. The primary difference between the two projects would be number of pieces of equipment in use, and the total hours that each piece would be in operation.

Given the very large difference in the size and scale of the IPT Proposed Project and JFK project, and the JFK construction emissions do not result in a significant air quality impact, it can be expected that the IPT Proposed Project construction emissions would also not result in a significant air quality impact.

Emissions from construction activities could be minimized by employing standard construction procedures which include:

- Reducing exposed erodible surface areas,
- Reducing equipment idling times,
- Contractor knowledge of appropriate fugitive dust and equipment exhaust controls,
- Use of low- or zero-emissions equipment, and
- Use of covered haul trucks during materials transportation.

Biological Resources

Coordination with the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation & Natural resources via their Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) Environmental Review tool, indicated that “no known impacts to threatened and endangered species and/or special concern species and resources within the project area” for state listed species under the jurisdiction of the PA Game Commission, PA Fish and Boat Commission, and the PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and that “no further coordination is required with jurisdictional agencies.” Also, as stated in the response from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the PNDI, “no impacts to federally-listed or proposed species are anticipated” and “no further consultation/coordination under the Endangered Species Act is required.” The full PA PNDI is included in Attachment 2 of the Final EA.

The Proposed Project would occur entirely on Airport property and on land that is actively managed and mowed on a regular basis. The Proposed Project site does not support wildlife habitat or substantial vegetation. Given the location, the Proposed Project would not result in substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species habitats or populations. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not have significant impacts to biological resources.

Climate

The Preferred Alternative would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction and operational activities. The following table below indicates the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emission increases associated with the increase in operations.

Table 2
Proposed Project CO₂e Emissions (metric tons)

Year	CO ₂ e
2024	18
2029	19

Source: R.S.&H, 2022

The construction of the Proposed Action is estimated to contribute an estimated 4,459 short tons of CO₂e. For comparative purposes, according to the 2021 Pennsylvania Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report, total statewide GHG emissions for Pennsylvania in 2018, the latest year with complete data available, was 269 million metric tons of CO₂e. The transportation sector in Pennsylvania accounted for a total of 63 million metric tons CO₂e. The Proposed Project would increase the Pennsylvania GHG's by 0.0000067% in 2024 and 0.0000071% in 2029.

This information is presented for informational purposes only, to provide context for the overall contribution of the Proposed Action to an issue that is global in scale. There are currently no federal requirements for reporting greenhouse gases from aviation sources and no significance thresholds. However, the recommendation to use alternative fuels or electricity when possible will be incorporated into the project where possible.

Hazardous Materials and Waste, Solid Waste, Pollution Prevention, and Contaminated Sites

The following databases were reviewed to determine the presence of hazardous waste / contamination sites near the Proposed Project:

- USEPA National Priorities List
- USEPA NEPA Assist Mapper
- USEPA My Environment Mapper
- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP) mapping

A review of the USEPA National Priorities List, USEPA NEPA Assist Mapper, and the USEPA My Environment Mapper noted no contaminated sites at, or near, the Proposed Project (see Attachments 6, 14 and 15 of the Final EA). The PA DEP mapping identified both active and inactive storage tanks on-airport property; however, none of these were near the Proposed Project (see Attachment 16 of the Final EA).

Construction of the Proposed Project would cause temporary increases in construction debris and solid waste. Temporary construction waste may include such materials as concrete, asphalt, wood, metals, vegetation, roofing materials, carpet, plastic, pipe, and others. Operation of the Proposed Project would generate minimal recurring solid waste relative to the total waste generated at the airport and would not be considered significant. Waste generation via construction or operations will be disposed of in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Therefore, no significant environmental impacts are anticipated to result from the Proposed Action.

However, if construction-related activities result in the discovery of previously unknown hazardous substances, the Airport would be responsible for removing and disposing of contaminated media in accordance with state and local laws and regulations for hazardous waste management.

Historical, Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources

The FAA requested that consultation with the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (PA SHPO) occur. Information about the Proposed Project was provided to the PA-SHPO using the required online platform PA-SHARE website. The information uploaded to the site included

the description of the project, current land use, the Proposed Project construction footprint, and current and historical aerial photographs. Correspondence from the PA SHPO indicates the Proposed Project would have “no effect” on above ground historic properties. This correspondence is included in Attachment 4 of the Final EA. Therefore, the Proposed Action is not expected to exceed any threshold indicating a significant impact.

Land Use

The Proposed Action is consistent with local, state, and federal plans and objectives, and no uses have been identified within or outside of airport property that would be incompatible or otherwise degrade airport services or safety.

Montoursville Borough, in which the Airport is located, has adopted Zoning Ordinance 438, effective July 6, 2009. The ordinance zones all property owned by the Airport as "Airport Business District," and all other lands to the south of the Susquehanna Economic Development Association - Council of Governments-Council of Governments (SEDA-COG) Railroad and adjacent to the Airport as "Recreational District." The Proposed Project is located on Airport property and is consistent with allowable uses within the Airport Business District zoning.

No adverse impacts to land uses around the Proposed Action areas are anticipated.

Natural Resources and Energy Supply

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in a temporary and minor increase in readily available energy and natural resources in the form of fuel and other construction materials. The Proposed Project would result in a minor increase in energy and utility usage at the Airport for the facility to operate. Fuel usage would increase due to the additional aircraft operations forecast as a result of the Proposed Project. However, the minor increases in consumption of resources would not strain local or regional gas, diesel fuel, water, electricity, or natural resource supplies. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse energy or natural resource impacts.

Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use

The Proposed Project is forecast to add approximately 1,250 annual aircraft operation. The additional operations were calculated based on the average operations per based aircraft that are currently located at the airport.

A noise screening analysis using the FAA’s Area Equivalent Method (AEM) model was prepared. The AEM results indicate that there would be a small increase in the 65 DNL contour area of 3.5%. The 3.5% increase is well below the FAA’s noise criterion of 17% and therefore the Proposed Project does not result in a significant noise impact and no further analysis is necessary. The full noise study and results are included in Attachment 7 of the Final EA.

Lycoming County Zoning Ordinance Section 5130 Noise Prediction Levels sets forth permissible sound levels for various activities within the county. Noise generated by construction activities are exempt from these levels between the hours of 7 a.m. and 9 p.m. Construction of the Proposed Project will occur during these hours and will comply with all local zoning rules. The closest residences are located approximately 2,000 feet north of the Proposed Project site

and are separated by multiple on-airport hangars. Given the type of construction associated with the Proposed Action and the distance from construction areas to noise-sensitive land uses, no significant construction noise impacts would occur.

Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks

The FAA has not established significance thresholds for socioeconomics, environmental justice, or children's environmental health or safety risks. The FAA has identified factors to consider in determining whether a Proposed Action would result in a significant socioeconomic impact. Because the Proposed Action would not produce substantial economic growth in undeveloped areas, disruption of the physical arrangement of established communities, extensive relocation of residents without available sufficient relocation housing, relocation of businesses that would create severe economic hardship, a substantial loss in community tax base, or a substantial degradation of level of service on area roadways, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant socioeconomic impact.

Construction of the Proposed Project would cause a minor increase in surface vehicles using roadways in the area to access the construction site. However, this would be temporary, lasting the duration of the construction period. The Proposed Project would be accessed using the road currently used to access the existing hangars in the area (Airport Road). Given the small number of hangars and typical infrequent visits by owners to a hangar, the Proposed Project would not alter traffic patterns or cause a noticeable increase in surface traffic congestion or decrease in Level of Service.

The Proposed Project would not affect surrounding communities. Construction of the Proposed Project would be on Airport property, occur over a short period of time, and would result in construction jobs which would be beneficial to the local economy. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have a positive impact on local economic activity, but would not impact public service demands, or result in population shifts.

A review was conducted to consider if impacts from the Proposed Project would have the potential to lead to a disproportionately high and adverse impact to an environmental justice population. Population and demographic data are collected throughout the U.S. during the decennial census. Every 10 years, the U.S. Census Bureau conducts a census to determine the number of people living in the U.S. The census information, along with information collected as part of the American Community Survey, includes social, economic, and housing characteristics of the population. Census blocks are the smallest geographic area for which the Census Bureau tabulates data. The geographic boundaries of the blocks are formed by physical features such as roads, streams, railroad tracks, or other features. A census block group is a cluster of census blocks. The block group is the smallest geographic entity for which the census publishes demographic data that includes descriptors of race and annual household income.

Using the Pennsylvania DEP Environmental Justice Area mapping tool, two census block groups met the criteria as being an environmental justice area. The PA DEP defines an EJ area as any census group where 20 percent or more of the individuals live at or below the federal poverty line, and/or 30 percent or more of the population identifies as a non-white minority, based on

data from the U.S. Census Bureau and the federal guidelines for poverty. The two census block groups 111.002 and 111.003 are adjacent to each other and located approximately 1.6 miles northwest of the airport. The areas are shown in Attachment 8 of the Final EA. Block group 111.002 includes 32% minority persons and 29% of the block group live at or below the federal poverty line. Block group 111.03 includes 25% minority persons and 56% of the block group live at or below the federal poverty line.

The off-airport impacts from the Proposed Project would primarily be noise (aircraft and construction), air quality, and increased vehicles accessing the airport (construction and new tenants). Given the location of the environmental justice areas in relation to the Airport, none of the environmental impacts would disproportionately affect these populations.

The Proposed Project would have no significant adverse effects to human health or the environment as documented in the Final EA. Off-airport effects of the Proposed Project would primarily be noise (aircraft and construction), air quality, and increased vehicles accessing the airport (construction and new tenants). The Montoursville Area High School is located approximately 3,500 feet north of the Proposed Project and is separated by multiple buildings and Broad Street. Given the location of the nearest school in relation to the Airport, none of the environmental impacts would disproportionately affect the health or safety risk to children.

Visual Effects

The Proposed Project is located on existing Airport property near the center of the airfield where lighting currently exists. The closest residences are located approximately 2,000 feet north of the Proposed Project site and are separated by multiple on-airport hangars. Lighting for the Proposed Project would illuminate the interior and exterior of the hangar for security purposes. The exterior lighting would be minimal and consistent with other nearby hangars. Construction of the Proposed Project would occur during the day. Neither the construction nor the operation of the Proposed Project would create annoyance or interfere with normal activities from light emissions for nearby residents. The size of the hangars would also be consistent with other nearby hangars on the airfield and would not block or obstruct views of visual resources. No adverse impacts are anticipated.

Water Resources (Wetlands, Floodplains, Surface Water, Groundwater)

Wetlands

Previously a wetland area was identified. This wetland area was about 85 feet from the Proposed Project evaluated in this EA (circled in Attachment 9 of the Final EA). The wetland was not in an area that would be disturbed during construction or affected by the operation of the Proposed Project.

The wetland area, approximately 85 feet away from the Proposed Project, was identified in the December 2002-detailed wetland survey. The survey was prepared to document the presence/absence of wetlands within the project limits of a proposed Taxiway B extension. That project area was adjacent to Runway 9 and extended west approximately 1,700-feet from the end of Taxiway B. During the investigation, five wetlands were delineated. The wetlands were located in small, depressional areas adjacent to the runway and taxiway (see Attachment 9). Overland flow from the adjacent paved surfaces, direct precipitation, and a seasonal high

subsurface water table provide hydrology to the wetlands. No watercourses or water bodies were found to be associated with the wetlands. The Wetland Identification and Delineation Report (Kimball and Associates, March 2002) was submitted to the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the PADEP for review and concurrence. Personnel from the USACE completed an onsite jurisdictional determination in which the USACE concluded the wetlands did not fall within their jurisdiction as the areas were not hydrologically connected to Waters of the United States.

However, after reviewing the findings, the PADEP did claim jurisdiction over the wetlands and construction in the area would require the appropriate correspondence / permitting to address these. The Taxiway B extension was ultimately constructed and a review of current PADEP jurisdictional wetlands mapping, no longer identifies these areas as wetlands (see Attachment 17 of the Final EA).

For any potential indirect effects to water quality during construction of the Proposed Project, an Erosion and Sediment Control (E&S) plan would be designed in accordance with the criteria stated in the Pennsylvania Code Chapter 102 (Erosion and Sediment Control); and Pennsylvania Stormwater Best Management Practices Manual, dated December 2006. The E&S plan and Erosion Control permit application have been submitted electronically using the State's Chapter 102 ePermit System. The Proposed Project would have underdrains where the proposed apron pavement interfaces with turf areas located along the east, south, and west edges of the apron. Underdrains would be installed and tied into the existing storm drainage system along the adjacent taxiway. The pre-engineered building would come fitted with gutters and downspouts. Each downspout would transition from the architectural downspout to the cast iron or PVC storm drainage pipe to discharge into the city storm water management system.

The Proposed Project's earth disturbance activities would be implemented in accordance with the E&S plan to minimize the extent and duration of earth disturbance, maximize protection of existing drainage features and vegetation, minimize soil compaction, and utilize other measures or controls that prevent or minimize the generation of increased stormwater runoff. The following measures would be aimed at minimizing accelerated erosion and ensuing sedimentation during construction. Temporary erosion and sediment control would be accomplished by utilizing rock construction entrances, silt fence, filter bag inlets, a sediment trap, and temporary diversion berms.

Floodplains

Per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps for the Proposed Action location, the Proposed Action area is located within 1% annual chance or 100-year floodplain. The existing site has been previously disturbed by clearing natural vegetation and grading in accordance with FAA criteria. The Proposed Project would be constructed approximately on-grade and the T-hangar would be floodproofed in order to prevent pollutants and debris from entering the stream. The Proposed Project would not result in a "significant encroachment" because it would not:

- result in a high likelihood of loss of human life;

- have substantial, encroachment-associated costs or damage including interrupting service or loss of a vital transportation facility; or,
- result in notable adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values.

A floodplain permit would be obtained from the local authority to meet floodplain development requirements. The FEMA FIRM is included as Attachment 10 of the Final EA. Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, requires federal agencies to avoid, to the greatest extent possible, the long- and short-term adverse effects associated with use and/or modification of the 100-year floodplain, and to avoid direct or indirect development in the floodplain wherever there is a practicable alternative. This EA evaluated alternatives that would minimize effects to the 100-year floodplain and were assessed for compatibility with existing airport operations and safety criteria.

In addition to the Proposed Project, two additional Alternatives (2 and 3) were evaluated. Alternative 2 is in the center of the airfield east of Taxiway H (see Figure 3 of the Final EA). While Alternative 2 stays mostly outside the 100-year floodplain, a small portion on the southern end of the hangars would be within the floodplain. While a majority of Alternative 2 stays outside the 100-year floodplain, it completely blocks the line of sight from the ATCT to the Runway 9 end and Taxiways K and H movement areas. This line of sight blockage is a safety problem for aircraft and tenant vehicles in this area. Therefore, while Alternative 2 has less encroachment on the floodplain compared to the Proposed Project, it was deemed not feasible due to safety concerns.

Alternative 3 is also in the center of the airfield (see Figure 3). Most of the hangars in Alternative 3 would be within the 100-year floodplain. Alternative 3 also completely blocks the line of sight from the ATCT to the Runway 9 end and Taxiways K and H movement areas. This line of sight blockage is a safety problem for aircraft and tenant vehicles in this area. Therefore, while Alternative 3 also has less encroachment on the floodplain, due to the safety concerns, it was deemed not feasible due to the safety concerns.

The 100-year floodplain extends over about half of the Airport property (see Attachment 10). The Airport property available for development of the hangars outside of the floodplain and that complies with the Part 77 Transitional Surface is very limited. While Alternatives 2 and 3 had less encroachment on the 100-year floodplain, they were deemed not feasible due to safety concerns. Local regulations require a structure of this size to be “dry” floodproofed. As a hangar is essentially a large garage, it is not practical to keep water completely out of the structure. Therefore, a potential solution is for the airport to purchase and deploy flood barriers around the hangar in advance of large flooding. The flood barriers are 30-inches tall and would connect to “dry” flood-proofed wingwalls of the hangar facility.

The flood barriers would be stored at the airport and a trailer would be provided to transport the barriers to the T-hangar site. The barrier system would take three people about six hours to set up so there would be more than ample time to install the barriers in advance of a significant flood event. Additional details on the flood barriers are included in Attachment 13 of the Final EA.

A floodplain permit through Montoursville Borough will be required. In addition, Montoursville Borough Ordinance 491, Floodplain Management Ordinance, includes the requirements for building within a floodplain. The project is considered non-residential, so the structure is required to be floodproofed 1.5 feet above the published Base Flood Elevation (BFE). Elevating the structure above the BFE is not feasible, so the airport will meet this requirement by using portable flood barrier walls to dry-floodproof the structure up to the 1.5 feet requirement. Correspondence and meeting minutes for consultation with Borough officials relating to floodplains is included in Attachment 13 of the Final EA.

Surface Waters

The Proposed Project would not impact surface waters or contaminate a public drinking water supply. Most surface water at the Airport comes from rainfall except for small manmade ditches and ponds that may hold water following a rainfall event. Drainage at the airport consists of sheet flow across areas of low topographic relief combined with manmade ditches and low-order streams. The project study area is in the Susquehanna River Watershed and within the West Branch Susquehanna River Basin just downstream of the confluence with Loyalsock Creek. The West Branch Susquehanna River has identified water uses of warm water fishes (WWF) and migratory fishes (MF).

The existing area where the Proposed Project would be located is divided approximately in half by a ridge splitting flow to the north and south. The northern portion of the site sheet flows to existing storm inlets in the taxilane and is conveyed west via 18-inch pipes to an existing excavated pond. The pond ultimately discharges around the runway end and to the West Branch Susquehanna River. The southern portion of the site sheet flows southwest ultimately to the same excavated pond west of the site. The area where existing pavement would be removed is crowned and sheet flows to inlets on both sides of the pavement. Both areas ultimately drain south via pipes and discharge to ponds upstream of the West Branch Susquehanna River. The Proposed Project would tie into existing stormwater infrastructure and the amount of impervious surface added would be offset by an equal amount of existing impervious surface that would be removed. The existing drainage patterns will remain generally unchanged. Because both the current Proposed Project site and the area where existing pavement will be removed currently discharge to existing ponds and ultimately the West Branch Susquehanna River, the overall flow to the river with the Proposed Project would be unchanged. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not impact surface waters or have the potential to contaminate a public drinking water supply.

For potential indirect effects during construction, an Erosion and Sediment Control (E&S) plan would be designed in accordance with the criteria stated in the Pennsylvania Code Chapter 102 (Erosion and Sediment Control); and Pennsylvania Stormwater Best Management Practices Manual, dated December 2006. The Proposed Project's earth disturbance activities would be implemented in accordance with the E&S plan to minimize the extent and duration of earth disturbance, maximize protection of existing drainage features and vegetation, minimize soil compaction, and utilize other measures or controls that prevent or minimize the generation of increased Stormwater runoff. Temporary erosion and sediment control would be accomplished by utilizing rock construction entrances, silt fence, filter bag inlets, a sediment trap, and temporary diversion berms.

An NPDES permit application and package was submitted to the Lycoming County Conservation District in September 2022 (Permit Application Number PA410003C).

Ground Water

The Proposed Project would not impact groundwater or contaminate an aquifer used for public water supply. Groundwater units below the airport are comprised of the surficial aquifer system. The surficial aquifer system is largely unconsolidated sand and gravel approximately 20 to 200 feet (ft) thick. Local recharge to the surficial aquifer system occurs from surface water infiltration in the undeveloped and vegetated areas of the airport.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

While the Loyalsock Creek, located west of the Airport and shown in Attachment 12 of the Final EA, is listed in the Nationwide River Inventory, the Proposed Project is located on existing Airport property near the center of the airfield. The Proposed Project is approximately 1,800 feet (0.33 miles) from Loyalsock Creek. The Proposed Project drains to existing detention and infiltration facilities prior to discharge at the Airport outfall which will reduce flow and sediment transport from the site. Stormwater management permitting is required and will be completed prior to construction to ensure the Proposed Project does not negatively impact downstream receiving waters.

Erosion and sedimentation controls will be used during construction in accordance with State and Borough requirements. Additionally, the project requires a PADEP NPDES PAG-02 General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activities which will address erosion and sediment control through the duration of the project.

Construction Impacts

Construction impacts would be local in nature and temporary. Use of best management practices (BMPs) and permitting will ensure there are no significant impacts.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulatively, the past and proposed projects for the airport are not anticipated to cause a significant impact to the environment with the incorporation of minimization measures and use of BMPs.

Public Involvement

The EA was presented and discussed at the Williamsport Area Transportation Study Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordinating Committee Public Meeting on February 13, 2023, at the Lycoming County Third Street Plaza in Williamsport, PA. The meeting was advertised in advance on the Lycoming County Government website and was open to the public for in person attendance, via a telephone conference call-in number, and a Microsoft Teams meeting site. The agenda and meeting materials were available in advance of the meeting and are included in Attachment 18 of the Final EA. The flood barrier plan was discussed as the Proposed Project is located in a floodplain. There were no comments from the public/citizens on the presentation.

PA Department of Environmental Protection. The 20-Unit Nested T-Hangar Development Project requires an NPDES permit. NPDES permits issued by PADEP and the Lycoming County Conservation District are a matter of public record. Public Notice will be published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin, pursuant to 25 PA Code §102.32(c). Persons aggrieved by the permit action may request an informal hearing with DEP within 30 days of publication.

No impacts have been identified on properties protected under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 4(f), or floodplain or wetland resources. No adverse impacts are identified in this EA that cannot be satisfactorily managed with best management practices. No public interest or concerns are anticipated. The project is not expected to be controversial on environmental grounds. The 100-year floodplain is an area that corresponds to having a one percent chance of a flood in any given year. The Proposed Project is located entirely within the 100-year floodplain as airport property available for development of the hangars outside of the floodplain and allows for the safe operation of the airport is very limited. The Proposed Project would not cause notable adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values because it would not result in a high likelihood of loss of human life; have substantial, encroachment-associated costs or damage including interrupting service or loss of a vital transportation facility; or result in notable adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values.

An announcement of the FAA's environmental decision will be placed in local newspapers. Copies of the Final EA and the FAA's decision will be available at the airport's administration building, and at the FAA's Airports District Office in Harrisburg. It will be made available to the public for review for 30 days.

Permits

Montoursville Borough Floodplain Development Permit Application

Montoursville Borough Building Permit (submitted at 100% design)

Lycoming County – Stormwater Permit Application

Lycoming County – Zoning Permit Application

Lycoming County Conservation District/Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, General NPDES Permit

Mitigation

As the Proposed Project is entirely within the 100-year floodplain, and due to the unique characteristics of an aircraft hangar, special floodproofing measures are proposed. Montoursville Borough requires dry-floodproofing of all structures within the floodplain that are larger than 600 square feet regardless of use. A meeting with County and Borough officials took place on July 14, 2022, to discuss solutions to meeting the Borough's dry-floodproofing requirement. Included in the project are mobile flood barricades that can be installed by the Airport in advance of a significant rain event. These barricades would surround the hangar and connect to the floodproofed wingwalls along the hangar sides to prevent floodwaters from entering the aircraft hangar. A floodproofing mitigation plan is in the engineer's report and is included as Attachment 13 of the Final EA. Additional correspondence and meeting minutes for consultation with Borough officials is also included in Attachment 13 of the Final EA.

CONCLUSION AND APPROVAL:

After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained herein, the undersigned finds the federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and it will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or otherwise include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA.

Recommended:

Heather F. Davis-Jenkins
Environmental Protection Specialist
Harrisburg ADO

03/06/2023

Date

Approved:

Rick Harner
Manager, Harrisburg ADO

Date