

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION  
WESTERN-PACIFIC REGION

---

***FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT***

---

**Proposed Development of Skybridge Arizona Development**  
Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport  
Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority, Arizona



For further information:

Jean Wolfers-Lawrence  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Office of Airports Planning and Programming  
800 Independence Ave, Washington D.C.

March 27, 2020

## GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

**WHAT'S IN THIS DOCUMENT?** This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed SkyBridge Arizona Development (Proposed Development). The purpose of the Proposed is to support a safe and viable airport now and into the future by providing unconditional approval of an update to the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) which includes the Proposed Development. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) dated March 27, 2020. This document discusses all alternatives considered by FAA in reaching its decision, summarizes the analysis used to evaluate the alternatives, and briefly summarizes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative, which are evaluated in detail in this Final EA. This document also identifies the environmentally preferred alternative and the agency preferred alternative.

**BACKGROUND.** In December 2019, the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA) prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) for the Proposed Development. The Draft EA addressed the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development including various reasonable alternatives to that proposal. The Draft EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [Public Law 91-190, 42 USC §§ 4321-4347]; the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) [40 CFR Parts 1500-1508]; and FAA Orders 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, and 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. PMGAA published the Notice of Availability for the Draft EA on January 27, 2020 and the document was available for review through February 25, 2020. No substantive comments were received on the Draft EA.

**WHAT SHOULD YOU DO?** Read the FONSI to understand the Federal actions that the FAA intends to take in connection with the Proposed Development at Phoenix-Mesa-Gateway Airport.

**WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS?** PMGAA may begin to implement the Proposed Action.

**NOTE:** This FONSI represents the FAA's determination that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Development requiring FAA action. In the EA, PMGAA evaluated the environmental effects of the entire Proposed Development; however, the FAA's Federal action is limited to airport layout plan (ALP) approval of only those portions of the Proposed Development that meet the criteria established in 49 U.S.C. § 47107(a)(16)(B), commonly referred to as Section 163(d) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018. The FAA concluded that certain portions (specifically, the aircraft hangar and the staging ramp) of the Proposed Development meet the criteria of Section 163(d), while other portions do not. Therefore, the FAA will take the Federal action of approving only those portions

of the ALP that meet the Section 163(d) criteria.

By evaluating the entire Proposed Development, rather than only the proposed Federal Action, the EA represents a conservative disclosure of environmental effects because it examines impacts of activities that are not part of the Federal action subject to NEPA review or special purpose law compliance. For this reason, the EA will include the terminology of the Proposed Development when discussing the entirety of the development program that the airport sponsor proposes and that was evaluated in the EA. The Proposed Development includes those development components over which FAA does not have any Federal action of ALP approval. The EA will also use the terminology "Proposed Federal Action" to describe those subcomponents of the Proposed Development which represent portions of the ALP falling under the FAA's approval authority as limited by Section 163(d).

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION  
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)  
PROPOSED SKYBRIDGE ARIZONA DEVELOPMENT  
PHOENIX-MESA GATEWAY AIRPORT  
PHOENIX-GATEWAY AIRPORT AUTHORITY, ARIZONA**

**1. Introduction**

This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the environment for the proposed SkyBridge Arizona development at Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport (Proposed Development). The Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA) is the sponsor for the Airport. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before taking the Federal action of approving the portions of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts components for which FAA has approval authority. Approving the ALP is authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (Public Laws 97- 248 and 100-223).

**2. Project Purpose and Need**

The Sponsor's purpose of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) is to support the long-term viability of the airport by providing a sustainable revenue source from a parcel of land that is currently undeveloped. Approximately 65 percent of the project site (i.e., 230 acres) is outside of the Air Operations Area (AOA)<sup>1</sup> and has been identified for non-aeronautical land use on the ALP (October 2018 revision). The Proposed Development will help to provide the airport's share of the funds needed for important airport capital improvement projects and to help cover the cost of operating the airport. The proposed 352.8-acre mixed-use development will provide an international air logistics and processing center and a balanced mix of market-driven uses to ensure the long-term viability of the airport.

The airport is currently pursuing several large capital improvement projects including the proposed relocation of the airport's passenger terminal complex and ancillary facilities to the northeast section of the airport, the relocation of the existing air traffic control tower, and the removal of non-standard airfield geometry. Due to the local revenue shares required for these future airfield projects, the airport needs additional sustainable local revenue sources to allow the projects to go forward.

The FAA's purpose for the Proposed Federal Action is to ensure the safe and efficient use of the U.S.'s navigable airspace. The FAA must respond to the Sponsor's request to change the Airport Layout Plan for the Proposed Development. The FAA review these change to ensure airspace obstructions to the airport or obstructions to safety areas would not occur.

**3. Proposed Action and Federal Actions**

The Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action), known as SkyBridge Arizona, would be a mixed-use development that includes a joint U.S.-Mexico Customs inspection facility and air cargo hub and would consist of both aeronautical and non-aeronautical land uses. Anticipated businesses include air cargo, aerospace

---

<sup>1</sup> Air Operations Area (AOA) = All airport areas where aircraft can operate, either under their own power or while in tow. The AOA includes runways, taxiways, apron areas, and all unpaved surfaces within the airport's perimeter fence. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5210-24, *Airport Foreign Object Debris (FOD) Management* (9/30/2010), para. 1.1.a. .

and auto parts, food processing (dry goods and refrigerated products), e-commerce, office/research and development (R&D), retail, and a hotel.

Section 163 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 has limited the FAA's review and approval authority for Airport Layout Plans (ALP) and associated review under NEPA. All items of development that are subject to FAA approval shall comply with the requirements of NEPA. For the proposed project at Mesa-Gateway Airport, the FAA retains approval authority over the taxilane, aircraft hangar and aircraft ramp.

The Proposed Federal Action, for which FAA is making a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) consists of the following project elements for the aeronautical portions of the project (approximately 154.8 acres<sup>2</sup>):

- Construct a 75-foot-wide by 2,545-foot-long taxilane (Taxilane L) southwest from Taxiway A;
- Construct approximately 277,330 square yards of ramp outside of the Taxilane L and Taxiway A object free areas; and
- Construct nine hangars (approximately 1.33 million square feet [sf] of hangar space on 84.8 acres).

The Proposed Development also consists of the following project elements for the non-aeronautical portions of the project (approximately 129.6 acres). Final use of the non-aeronautical space will be determined based on tenant needs within the constraints of the predetermined infrastructure (for example, roads, stormwater system):

- Construct approximately 2.34 million sf of non-aeronautical development, including 200,000 sf of R&D and 70,000 sf of hotel and retail development.

Additional project components (to be completed in phases by the developer prior to occupancy) would include:

- Import approximately 500,000 to 700,000 cubic yards (cy) of fill material to provide the necessary site elevations for development and site drainage;
- Construct four on-site detention basins (approximately 24.3 acres total) to control runoff from the project;
- Construct on-site roads, vehicular parking areas, and landscaped open space areas (44.1 acres);
- Extend utility infrastructure onto the project site to serve all areas of development; and
- Construct security checkpoints and a security fence around the perimeter of Taxilane L and between building openings.

The Federal Action necessary to carry out the proposed project includes:

*Unconditional approval of the portion of the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Layout Plan (ALP) depicting the proposed taxilane, aircraft hangar and aircraft ramp space pursuant to 49 United States Code (USC) §§ 40103(b), 44718 and 47107(a)(16); and Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77.*

#### **4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered**

The EA considered and carried forward two alternatives, the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) and No Action alternatives. PMGAA, along with the developer, considered other available parcels within the airport property boundary as well as limiting the development to proposed aeronautical portions while holding the remaining portions for future aeronautical development.

---

<sup>2</sup> NOTE: The land acreage numbers for Area C of the Concept Master Plan (Table 4.3) include acreage that is within the taxiway object free area, but outside of the Proposed Action area.

The purpose of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) is to support the long-term viability of the airport by providing a sustainable source of revenue from airport land that is already designated for future non-aeronautical development on the ALP. The following criterion was considered in determining the reasonableness of the alternatives under consideration:

- Would the alternative support the long-term viability of the airport by providing a sustainable source of revenue from airport land that is currently undeveloped, a portion of which is located outside of the Air Operations Area (AOA) and has been previously identified for non-aeronautical land use?
- Would the alternative result in airspace obstructions to the airport or obstructions to safety areas?

Because none of the alternatives considered (other than the Proposed Development) passed the “reasonableness” test, criterion related to “feasibility” were not necessary.

The Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) best satisfies the criterion contained in the screening process (i.e., meeting the project need); therefore, it was carried forward for evaluation in the Final EA and is the Sponsor’s “preferred” alternative.

Section 6-2.1(d) of FAA Order 1050.1F states in part: “*There is no requirement for a specific number of alternatives or a specific range of alternatives to be included in an EA. An EA may limit the range of alternatives to the proposed action and no action when there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.*”

FAA did not examine other alternatives because the project does not involve any unresolved conflict of resources.

## 5. Assessment

The potential environmental impacts and possible adverse effects were identified and evaluated in a Final EA prepared in March 2020. The Final EA disclosed that the following environmental impact categories would not be affected by the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action): Coastal Resources, Department of Transportation Act (Section 4(f)), Farmlands, Land Use, Environmental Justice, Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks, Visual Effects (light emissions), Visual Effects (Visual Resources/Visual Character), Wetlands, Floodplains and Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Section 4 of the Final EA identified the following environmental impact categories which were examined in detail:

- A. **Air Quality** Section 4.3 of the Final EA presents the emission estimates of CO, SO, VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> and demonstrates that during the construction period and subsequent operation of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action), the emissions would not exceed the *de minimis* thresholds. Under the Clean Air Act (CAA) General Conformity Rule, when project-related emissions are below *de minimis* thresholds the project is assumed to conform to the State Implementation Plan. As such, the General Conformity requirements of the CAA are not applicable to the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action).
- B. **Biological Resources (Migratory Birds)** Section 4.4.3 of the Final EA describes that the southeastern corner of the study area provides suitable habitat for nesting bird species (including Western Burrowing Owl [*Athene cunicularia hpugaea*] that are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. During the December 2018 survey, six active owl burrows and two potentially active burrows were observed.

During construction ground bird nesting habitat would be impacted by project activities, including grading and vegetation removal. If the project activities are conducted between March and September, birds may be nesting within the construction area and individuals could be directly impacted. Direct impacts may also include loss of active nests during vegetation removal. FAA has not established a significance threshold for

non-listed species. However, avoidance measures identified in Section 4.4.4 of the Final EA would ensure compliance with the MBTA.

During operation no long-term (operation) impacts to migratory birds would occur due to the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action).

- C. **Climate** Section 4.5 of the Final EA describes the types and amounts of greenhouse gases (GHG) potentially emitted as a result of construction and operation of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action). Although there are currently no Federal standards for aviation-related GHG emissions, it is well-established that GHG emissions can affect climate. The Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would contribute GHGs temporarily during construction and would also result in increased vehicular and aircraft GHG emissions during operation of the project. The estimates, presented in metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e), are provided for disclosure purposes only.
- D. **Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste** Section 4.6 of the Final EA notes that the project study area has been the subject of numerous extensive hazardous materials cleanup efforts. All areas of known contamination have been cleared. However, due to the presence of past contaminants, the potential exists for previously unknown contaminants to be uncovered during construction of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action). The Sponsor would keep appropriate spill prevention and clean up kits on site and report discoveries of hazardous materials or accidental spill during construction per the mitigation and avoidance measures identified in Section 4.6.1.4 of the Final EA apply.

Occupied hangars within the project could contain various hazardous products routinely used in the maintenance of aircraft, for example, fuel, oil, and cleaning products. In addition, businesses located within the non-aeronautical portion of the project could use or generate hazardous products depending on the type of industry. However, no significant impacts related to hazardous materials would occur during operation.

The airport operates under existing applicable regulatory requirements for preventing and controlling the effects of pollution during its construction activities. Appropriate spill prevention and cleanup kits are readily available on-site and accidental spills are promptly cleaned up. For the Proposed Action alternative, the contractor would be required to follow those, and other standard hazardous materials containment procedures, should an inadvertent spill occur.

During construction, debris and incidental trash would be created. The project contractors would be responsible for hauling off construction debris and disposing of it properly at a local landfill or recycle and transfer station. No uncommon construction debris is anticipated.

Once constructed, individual businesses within the SkyBridge Arizona Business Park would coordinate with the city's Environmental Management & Sustainability Department to dispose their solid waste. No issues with providing solid waste collection and disposal are known at this time, and no significant impacts related to solid waste would occur.

The Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would increase the amount of impervious surface within the project study area by approximately 90 percent. Conceptual site plans include approximately 310 acres of impervious surfaces comprised of buildings and pavement and approximately 40 acres of pervious surfaces comprised of open space or landscaping. Therefore, the airport's Storm-Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be updated to include the newly developed areas. In addition, SkyBridge operators/businesses would have their own Multi-Sector General Permits (MSGPs), as applicable. No significant impacts related to pollution prevention would occur.

- E. Historic, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources** Section 4.7 of the Final EA notes that a total of 12 cultural properties have been identified within the Proposed Development's Area of Potential Affect (APE) including; two archaeological sites and 10 historic-era buildings and structures. The treatment for two archaeological sites is covered by an existing Programmatic Agreement between the USAF, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and concurring parties. Due to the completion of previous studies, the agreement does not require any further treatment. The FAA is not a party to that Programmatic Agreement. Of the 10 historic-era buildings and structures, three are in the direct APE and seven are in the APE for indirect effects (refer to Exhibit 3D in Chapter Three of the Final EA). None of these historic-era properties are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Place (NHRP).

The FAA made a finding of "no historic properties affected" for the proposed development and received concurrence from SHPO of this finding February 27, 2019. The FAA's consultation with SHPO is included in **Appendix D** of the Final EA.

FAA also conducted government-to-government tribal consultation with the following Native American Tribes in January 2019: Ak-Chin Indian Community; Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Hopi Tribe; Gila River Indian Community; and Tohono O'odham Nation. No responses or comments from the tribes were received by FAA.

- F. Natural Resources and Energy Supply** As described in Section 4.8 of the Final EA, the Proposed Development's (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) effects on natural resources and energy supply are primarily related to the amount of fossil fuel, electricity and potable water and resources required by aircraft, motor vehicle traffic, and construction/development.

The city encourages the use of energy efficient building methods, as well as enforcing the 2009 Energy Conservation Code. Based on the draft SkyBridge Arizona Concept Master Plan, the use of alternative energy sources such as solar power in car parking areas, exterior lighting, and rooftops would also be encouraged, although glint and glare studies would be required and must be approved before any solar photovoltaic systems are allowed. Section 7.3.5 of the SkyBridge Arizona Concept Master Plan, in particular, addresses innovative strategies in incorporating renewable energy into the Proposed Development.

The Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) is not expected to create a demand that would exceed available or future water or other natural resource or energy supplies and, thus, have indirect impacts on the region.

- G. Noise and Compatible Land Use** As described in Section 4.9 of the Final EA, the construction phases of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would involve earthwork/grading, the pouring of asphalt, and the construction of buildings and infrastructure. Construction noise is a temporary impact and would not be above DNL 65 dB for an extended period.

Once constructed, the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would result in additional aircraft operations at the airport. The Proposed Development and No Action alternative DNL 65, 70, and 75 dB noise exposure contours were prepared for forecast years 2025, 2030, 2035, and 2045. The noise exposure contours will increase in size through each of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) and No Action forecast years. With the additional cargo operations, the Proposed Development noise contours are larger when compared to that of the noise exposure contours of the corresponding No Action year. The noise exposure contour maps show that the DNL 65 dB noise contours extend off airport property to the northwest and southeast. However, they would not result in an increase in noise of DNL 1.5 dB or more, at or above the DNL 65 dB noise contour when comparing the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) to the No Action, for any noise-sensitive areas. Based on a review of aerial photography, no noise-sensitive land uses are contained within



the DNL 65 dB contour. Therefore, the significant noise impact threshold for aircraft noise, as defined by the FAA, would not be exceeded.

Noise-sensitive land uses are not located close enough to be adversely impacted by land-based noise during operations. Noise from tenants within the SkyBridge development and/or vehicular traffic associated with their operations would not be a significant impact of the Proposed Development.

- H. **Socioeconomics** As described in Section 4.10 of the Final EA the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community or displace housing or businesses since it would be constructed in a vacant area within the airport's existing boundaries.

The Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would provide jobs in the construction sector during the first to years of each of the three phases of construction for a period of six to 10 months per year. Construction employment is temporary and does not represent a change in the community tax base or a long-term opportunity to induce growth.

Construction traffic associated with the project would also occur during the first two years of each of the three phases of construction for a period of six to 10 months per year. The traffic would be temporary and would represent a minor percentage of the traffic experienced on the local and regional street network. No disruption of local traffic patterns or substantial reduction in level of service would occur.

The estimated long-term employment results of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) have been provided in the draft SkyBridge Arizona Concept Master Plan by phase of development occupancy (also called absorption). At full occupancy, the Proposed Development could accommodate over 6,400 full time jobs on-site. As stated in the Final EA these jobs are expected to pay an average of \$77,000 per year, which is more than 40 percent above the countywide average. This is a positive impact, and one that has been planned for by the city.

For every on-site job created by the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action), it is estimated that another 1.4 jobs would be created nearby due to the spending activities of on-site businesses, their suppliers, and employees (ADM Group et al. 2018). As stated in the Final EA the Proposed Development's contribution to the gross regional product is projected to total \$3.8 billion, including indirect and induced effects.

Site access to the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) is planned to occur from two points: Velocity Way (Access A) and a proposed collector roadway (Access B) approximately 1,500 feet south of Velocity Way. The Proposed Action alternative is expected to generate approximately 15,193 total weekday trips upon completion in 2035. During the morning and evening peak hours, it would generate approximately 1,590 and 1,608 trips, respectively.

By year 2045, the intersections of Power Road/Ray Road and Power Road/Pecos Road are expected to have unacceptable delay predominately due to the high volumes of left turn movements at these intersections. Because these intersections are built to their ultimate geometry, no major improvements are recommended. However, as roadways are constructed to the east, as proposed in the *City of Mesa 2040 Transportation Plan*, motorists would redistribute on the roadway network and most likely equalize throughout the region. Certain regional infrastructure projects are expected as part of the city's future plans to provide for a more robust roadway network within the study area. This expanded roadway network is necessary to accommodate projected future traffic growth and regional development, including the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action). These include the widening and signalization of Sossaman Road/Pecos Road and the extension of SR 24 east to Ironwood Road. The Proposed Development includes transportation demand management strategies to reduce its peak hour

trip impacts on the regional street network. In addition, it would be required to contribute traffic impact fees for the completion of regional street improvements.

- I. **Water Resources** As described in Section 4.11 of the Final EA, construction of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would disturb approximately 352.8 acres. Erosion and sedimentation may cause degradation of water quality due to stormwater runoff during construction activities. An Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) Pollution General Construction permit would be required before construction activities commence. A Construction General Permit is dependent on the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that contains specific best management practices to control the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, into the local surface water drainages.

The Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would substantially increase the amounts of impervious surfaces and, thus, stormwater runoff from the project study area. As described in the Final EA conceptual site plans include approximately 310 acres of impervious surfaces, such as buildings and pavement, and 40 acres of previous surfaces, such as open space or landscaping. Pollutants and chemicals associated with the Proposed Development's activities, therefore, could run off the new taxilanes, roadways, parking lots, and other new impervious surfaces, potentially flowing into the stormwater system. These pollutants could include but are not limited to, heavy metals from auto or aircraft emissions, oil, grease, debris, and air pollution residues. Landscaping fertilizers and pesticides can cause further adverse effects on water quality. Accidental spills of pollutants, such as fuel, could also occur. If left untreated, contaminated stormwater can result in the incremental degradation of water quality.

The existing and proposed drainage system is not connected to a public drinking water supply, and no significant impacts to surface water quality would occur because of the proposed development. The airport's SWPPP would be updated to include the newly developed areas.

The groundwater table underlying the project study area is at an approximate depth of 140 feet below ground surface (bgs). At this depth, groundwater would not be encountered during construction. Operation of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would not require the use of groundwater resources nor would it affect the underlying groundwater table. In terms of impacts to groundwater quality and/or recharge during operation of the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action), the increase in impervious surface would not substantially contribute to, or adversely affect, groundwater recharge and subsequent groundwater quality.

- J. **Cumulative Impacts** As described in Section 4.12 of the Final EA, numerous past or present actions have occurred or are occurring at the airport. Future projects are planned in the airport's most recent five-year Capital Improvement Plan. Based on the city's planning website, there are several active development projects in proximity to the airport within an area generally bounded by Ray Road on the north; Power Road on the west; Pecos Road on the south; and Ellsworth Road on the east.

All of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects discussed previously have independent utility from, and are not connected with, the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action). Any future projects may require separate NEPA review and potential significant impacts would require mitigation in compliance with Federal law. When combined with the previously mentioned projects, the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would have a negligible cumulative environmental impact. Therefore, the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) would not result in any significant cumulative impact.

## 6. Public Participation

Efforts were made to encourage public participation through a 30-day public review period of the Draft EA. The PMGAA published a notice in the *East Valley Tribune* on January 26, 2020. A copy of the Draft EA was made

available during the 30-day public review period at the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority, FAA Phoenix Airports District Office, Mesa Main Library, Southeast Regional Library and Queen Creek Library. Two comment letters were received during the comment period. Neither of which included substantive comments requiring a response or changes to the Draft EA. The comments letters are provided in Appendix F of Final EA. A copy of the newspaper Proof of Publication is provided in **Appendix F** of the Final EA.

## **7. Inter-Agency Coordination**

In accordance with 49 USC § 47101(h), FAA has determined that no further coordination with the U.S. Department of Interior or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is necessary because the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal 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.

## **8. Reasons for the Determination that the Proposed Action will have No Significant Impacts**

The attached Final EA examines each of the various environmental resources that were deemed present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action). The Proposed Development (which includes the Proposed Federal Action) will not involve any environmental impacts that exceed the threshold of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B.

Based on the information contained in this FONSI and supported by detailed discussion in the Final EA, the FAA has selected the Proposed Federal Action as described in Section 3 of this FONSI, the development of a taxiway, aircraft ramp and aircraft hangar space as part of the Proposed Development.

**9. Finding of No Significant Impact**

I have carefully and thoroughly considered the facts contained in the attached 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 of 1969 (NEPA). I also find the Proposed Federal Action will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any condition requiring any consultation pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an EIS for this action.

**APPROVED:**



\_\_\_\_\_  
Mike N. Williams  
Manager  
Phoenix Airports District Office

3-27-2020

Date

**DISAPPROVED:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mike N. Williams  
Manager  
Phoenix Airports District Office

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date