

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
NORTHWEST MOUNTAIN REGION

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
and
RECORD OF DECISION

FOR THE AMENDMENT TO THE OPERATIONS SPECIFICATIONS FOR AIR
CARRIER OPERATIONS, AMENDMENT TO A FAR PART 139 CERTIFICATE, AND
MODIFICATION OF THE TERMINAL BUILDING at Snohomish County Airport/Paine
Field, Everett, Washington

December 4, 2012

I. Introduction

This document serves as the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact and Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) and provides final agency determinations and approvals for the proposed action, namely approval of the amendment to operations specifications for air carrier operations, approval of the amendment to a FAR Part 139 certificate, and approval for the issuance of grant funds for the modification of the terminal building. This FONSI/ROD is based on the information and analysis contained in the Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) dated September, 2012, attached hereto.

Furthermore, this FONSI/ROD:

- A. Completes the FAA's required environmental review and decision making process. It is prepared and issued to announce and document certain Federal actions and decisions in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) [42 U.S. C. Section 4321, et seq.], the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) [40 CFR Parts 1500-1508] and FAA Orders [Order 1050.1E, Change 1, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures (March 20, 2006) and Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions (April 28, 2006)]. This FONSI/ROD is also used by the FAA to demonstrate and document its compliance with the several procedural and substantive requirements of aeronautical, environmental, programmatic, and other statutes and regulations that apply to FAA decisions on proposed actions;
- B. Provides the final Federal determinations and approvals based on environmental analysis and findings in the attached Final EA. The FAA's decisions are based on the information and analysis contained in the Final EA and all other applicable documents which were available and considered, and which constitute the administrative record; and
- C. Approves certain Federal actions associated with the amendment to operation specifications, amendment to the FAR Part 139 certification, and modification of the terminal building.

II. Proposed Action

The Proposed Action evaluated in the attached Final EA is the issuance of amendments to Horizon Air and Allegiant Air operations specification to allow them to provide scheduled commercial air service to the Airport. The proposed service would require an amendment to the Airport's existing Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 139 operating certificate. In response to this request, the County is proposing to construct a modular addition to the existing terminal building to accommodate the commencement of scheduled commercial air service operations and passengers.

Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field (PAE) is located in Snohomish County, Washington, approximately 20 miles north of Seattle. The Airport is owned and operated by Snohomish County under the County Executive and the County Council with an on-site Airport Director. Two airlines, Horizon Air and Allegiant Air, have requested amendments of operations specifications to operate at Paine Field with specific aircraft types. Horizon Air proposes to serve the Airport with Bombardier Q400 turboprop aircraft with a turbojet aircraft, the Bombardier CRJ700 as its substitution aircraft. Allegiant Air proposes to serve the Airport with Boeing MD83 turbojet aircraft.

The Airport currently has no scheduled commercial air service and its existing terminal building is not suited to serve the projected number of passengers in a safe manner consistent with local health and safety codes. Consequently, the County has engaged design consultants to determine the size of a passenger processing facility that would be necessary to accommodate the two prospective carriers. In order to efficiently and safely serve the aircraft and passengers using those aircraft, the existing passenger processing space needs to be increased. Based on FAA planning guidelines to accommodate these passengers in a safe manner, and meet security requirements, it has been determined that approximately 18,000 square feet would be needed with two aircraft "boarding gates", and these would be sized to accommodate 225 people in the gate boarding area. According to Snohomish County Code requirements, there is sufficient existing on-airport surface parking available to accommodate the parking requirements of a building this size and thus, no additional parking is required. This terminal expansion will be a modular building placed on an existing paved apron area just west of the existing terminal building and the terminal will be sized to accommodate only the projected passengers as identified by the two airlines. There will be a covered breezeway between the existing terminal building and the new modular building. A bag make up enclosure will be attached for airline ramp personnel service. The total size of the modular terminal, bag make up enclosure and the connecting breeze-way to the existing terminal building will be approximately 29,350 square feet. These improvements may be constructed in phases. Automobile parking will be provided

in existing parking areas and there is adequate ramp space to accommodate the Q400 and MD83 aircraft.

III. Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to allow passengers to fly between Paine Field and Portland, Spokane and Las Vegas. The FAA has evaluated the request from both Horizon Air and Allegiant Air to amend operations specifications to allow scheduled commercial air service to Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field and to approve an amendment to the FAR Part 139 operating certificate for Paine Field. The need for the Proposed Action is to meet demand for commercial service within the area, as identified by Horizon Air and Allegiant Air. The purpose of and need for the addition of a modular terminal building is to accommodate the proposed scheduled commercial air service at the Airport.

IV. The Proposed Agency Actions and Approvals

The FAA actions, determinations, and approvals necessary for this project to proceed to completion include the following;

- Issuance of the proposed operations specifications amendment for Horizon Air to permit scheduled commercial air service at Paine Field using the Bombardier Q400 Dash 8 as its primary aircraft and the Bombardier CRJ700 as its substitute aircraft pursuant to 14 CFR Part 119;
- Issuance of the proposed operations specifications amendment for Allegiant Air to permit scheduled commercial air service at Paine Field using the MD83 aircraft pursuant to 14 CFR Part 119;
- Approval of an amendment to the FAR Part 139 operating certificate for Paine Field; and,
- Approval of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding for the construction of modular terminal building sufficient to accommodate the proposed passenger service, if requested.

V. Alternatives Analysis

The evaluation and conclusions of the alternatives analysis can be found in Chapter B of the Final EA. The FAA participated in the alternatives analysis, and determined that the assumptions and methodology used and the conclusions reached by the airport sponsor in the study were appropriate.

The alternatives analysis was undertaken in accordance with NEPA and to achieve compliance with FAA land use policies and grant assurances, while maintaining the airport's existing operational capability. The two alternatives (the No Action and the Proposed Action) are outlined below:

No Action

No commercial service would occur at the Airport under this alternative and no changes to the existing terminal building would be made. The annual operations levels associated with this alternative would be approximately 112,733 in 2013 and approximately 113,787 in 2018.

Proposed Action

The FAA would approve an amendment to the Horizon Air and Allegiant Air Operating Specifications pursuant to 14 CFR Part 119 that would allow both airlines to provide scheduled commercial service to Paine Field, if all safety, operational, and environmental issues are satisfied, and would amend the Airport's Operating Certificate accordingly. Horizon Air would serve the Airport with Bombardier Q400 Dash 8 turbo prop aircraft, with Bombardier CRJ700 as its substitution aircraft. Allegiant Air would serve the Airport with Boeing MD83 aircraft. Allegiant Air proposes to initiate service with 2 departures per week and then increase to 10 departures per week the fifth year. Initially this would represent 208 operations per year (104 arrivals and 104 departures) growing to 1,040 operations in the fifth year. Horizon Air proposes to initiate service with 6 departures per day and then increase to 10 departures per day the fifth year. Horizon's operation would represent 4,380 operations per year initially growing to 7,300 operations in the fifth year. In total these airlines would add 4,588 operations per year initially and 8,340 in the fifth year. The associated enplanements are projected to be 112,000 in the first year (98,000 by Horizon and 14,000 by Allegiant) growing to 238,200 in the fifth year (168,000 by Horizon and 70,200 by Allegiant).

Thus, approval of the Proposed Action would increase the level of aircraft operations and passengers using the airport relative to the No Action. The Proposed Action also includes the funding, if requested, of portions of the modular addition to the existing terminal building to accommodate the passengers served by the two carriers. The proposed modular terminal building would be approximately 29,350 square feet, consisting of 18,060 square feet of passenger terminal space, 1,664 square feet of bag make-up, 1,535 square feet of entrance concourse and 8,100 square feet of bag concourse. It would accommodate two aircraft "boarding gates", and would be sized to accommodate 225 people in the gate boarding area. This is the maximum number of people that can be accommodated on one Q400 and one MD83. Based on Snohomish County Code requirements, there is sufficient existing on-airport surface parking available to accommodate the parking requirements of a building this size and thus, no additional parking is required. This demand would generate the need for six to ten additional airline employees, several which may be contracted from existing Fixed Base Operators. A total of seventeen employees, including airline, FBO, Transportation Security Administration (TSA) employees, security, rental car and maintenance workers are anticipated. Employees would also use the existing on-airport parking.

After careful consideration of the analysis of the impacts of the various alternatives considered, and of the ability of these alternatives to satisfy the identified purpose and need for the proposed project; and after review and consideration of the testimony at the three public hearings, of comments submitted in response to both the Draft and Final EA's and of coordination with federal, state, and local agencies; and after considering federal policy, the FAA hereby selects the Proposed Action as the Preferred Alternative in the EA for federal support.

VI. Affected Environment

Snohomish County Airport/Paine Field is located in an unincorporated area of the County. The northern and eastern portion of airport property abuts the City of Everett, while the western portion of airport property abuts the City of Mukilteo. There is also a small portion of airport property in the northwest corner of the Airport that is within the City of Mukilteo. The corporate boundaries of the cities of Lynnwood and Edmonds are approximately three miles to the south of airport property.

Paine Field is owned and operated by Snohomish County, Washington. Under the direction of the County Executive and the County Council, the Airport Director and Staff supervise the day-to-day operation of the Airport. Paine Field is an enterprise department of Snohomish County and is mandated to generate all revenue necessary to operate and maintain the Airport.

Paine Field is located approximately six miles southwest of the Everett Central Business District (CBD) and approximately twenty miles north of downtown Seattle, and is the major general aviation/industrial aviation airport serving Snohomish County and multiple communities located in the northern portion of the Seattle Metropolitan Area. The airport is home to 650 based aircraft, The Boeing Company, Aviation Technical Services (ATS), and other major aerospace companies. There are daily operations of Boeing 747, 777, 767, 787 and 737 aircraft and regular operations of MD 80 series aircraft, corporate and military aircraft including F/A-18 tactical jets, C-17, P-3, C-40, C-130 and C-5. ATS provides maintenance, inspection and repair services for multiple airlines, including: Southwest, Delta, Hawaiian, and Alaska.

The Airport consists of approximately 1,250 acres of land owned by Snohomish County located adjacent to the City of Everett and the City of Mukilteo. Paine Field has three runways, an extensive system of taxiways, aircraft parking aprons, hangars, an existing terminal building, and various other airport facilities.

Chapter C, Affected Environment, of the Final EA discusses the resource categories that are further evaluated in Chapter D, Environmental Consequences, of the Final EA. Chapter C further discusses the following resources that were found not to be present in the project area and did not warrant further evaluation:

- Farmland, and
- Wild and Scenic Rivers

VII. Environmental Consequences

Chapter D, Environmental Consequences, of the Final EA, provided an explanation of the regulatory requirements, methodology, and results. Below is a summary of the findings in each of the resource categories. For a complete description please refer to Chapter D, Environmental Consequences.

Air Quality

Air quality was evaluated both from an aircraft operational standpoint and a surface transportation standpoint. Increases in air quality were found to be de minimus. The analysis conducted for the air quality assessment demonstrated that no potential for adverse air quality impacts exists because of the Proposed Action.

While no significant impacts were identified due to construction, common short-term and temporary impacts resulting from airport construction are anticipated. Contractors would be required to comply with all applicable Federal, state and local laws and regulations, including FAA guidance contained in AC 150/5370-10B, AC 150/5320-15, Change 1 and AC 1505320-5B.

Climate

Climate change analysis was conducted in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1 Guidance Memo #3 titled "Considering Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA): Interim Guidance". This section addressed the effects of the proposed action at Paine Field in accordance with the FAA guidance. The analysis included the following greenhouse gases, water vapor H₂O, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and ozone (O₃).

Research has shown that there is a direct link between fuel combustion and greenhouse gas emissions. Based on FAA data, operations activity at Snohomish County Airport, relative to aviation throughout the United States, represents less than 1% of U.S. aviation activity. Therefore, assuming that greenhouse gases occur in proportion to the level of activity, greenhouse gas emissions associated with existing and future aviation activity at the Airport would be expected to represent less than 0.03% of U.S - based greenhouse gases. Therefore, emissions of greenhouse gases from the Proposed Action are not expected to be significant.

Coastal Resources

The Snohomish County Airport / Paine Field is located approximately two miles east and three miles south of Possession Sound. All of Snohomish County is included in the Washington State Coastal Zone Management Program. A certification of Consistency with the Washington State Coastal Zone Management Program will be applied for by the County prior to the implementation of the Proposed Action.

Compatible Land Use

The Proposed Action is consistent with comprehensive land use plans of the surrounding communities. There are no anticipated impacts or changes to land use as a result of the Proposed Action. There are no noise sensitive uses within the project area. Noise impacts on off-airport land use are discussed below under "Noise".

Construction Impacts

The construction impacts associated with the Proposed Action are temporary and are not expected to exceed the thresholds of significance. Traffic patterns may be temporarily altered due to the additional vehicular traffic related to the construction of the modular terminal building. Any additional potential temporary construction impacts would be minimized by the contractor through the use of the Best Management Practices as defined in the Final EA.

Department of Transportation Act: Section 4(f)

There are no Section 4(f) resources within the project area. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in any impacts to properties protected under Section 4(f).

Fish, Wildlife, and Plants

The Proposed Action will have no effect on fish, wildlife, or plants because no protected species are permanent residents on the Airport and no critical habitat or state listed priority habitats occur on the Airport.

Floodplains

According to published Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps, the majority of the Airport is located within Zone X, or areas determined to be outside of the 500-year floodplain. The closest 100-year floodplains are the floodplain associated with Possession Sound approximately two miles northwest and the floodplains associated with Stickney Lake located slightly more than two miles southeast of the project area. No floodplains will be impacted by the Proposed Action.

Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste

The Proposed Action would not result in significant changes to the handling, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The Proposed Action will result in an increase of aircraft fueling, however the Airport has spill plan in place to reduce the likelihood of a spill or respond in the event of a spill.

The Airport has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System for construction and to regulate the discharge of stormwater that may contain traces of harmful pollutants. This system is adequate to accommodate the activities associated with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action does not include the demolition of any structures or facilities, these increases are expected to be minimal and would not be expected to exceed the capacities of the local disposal facilities.

Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources

The Area of Potential Effect is defined as the immediate terminal area and the area within the 65 DNL noise contour. There are no sites within the APE designated or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, the FAA has made a determination of “no effect” on historic properties.

Light Emissions and Visual Environment

The Proposed Action would result in a slight change in the light environment around the Airport due to increased lighting in the vicinity of the modular terminal expansion. However; due to the mostly industrial land use in the

area, the Proposed Action would not result in any significant impacts relating to the lighting and visual environment of the Airport.

Natural Resources, Energy Supply, and Sustainable Design

The Proposed Action would lead to a minor increase in fuel consumption through the construction of the modular terminal expansion and the additional heating / cooling requirements of the terminal. Additional increases in fuel consumption associated with the commercial service operations and vehicle traffic will occur. This increase in energy consumption is not anticipated to have a significant impact on natural resources or energy supply.

Noise

Noise impacts were evaluated for both future years (2013 and 2018) considering both the No Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative. Noise contours were generated for all conditions using the Integrated Noise Model (INM), with the threshold contour defining land use compatibility being the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) of 65 decibels (dB). No noise sensitive land uses are within the DNL 65 dB noise contour of either the No Action Alternative or the Preferred Alternative. Therefore, no noise sensitive uses would experience an increase in noise of 1.5 decibels (dB) within the DNL 65 noise contour. Therefore, no significant impact is associated with the proposed action.

Secondary (Induced) Impacts

The Proposed Action is not expected to alter or shift population, housing and or business development in the vicinity of the Airport. Therefore, the Proposed Action will not result in significant induced impacts.

Socioeconomic Environment, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks

The Proposed Action does not impact any population group or neighborhoods based on the 65 Day-Night Noise Level (DNL) noise contour and the FAA's threshold of project-related significance; consequently, there can be no disproportionate adverse effects to special population groups, minority populations or low-income populations. While there are special population

groups in the surrounding community, there are no special population groups or neighborhoods located within the direct impact area (construction footprint) or within the 65 DNL noise contour (the indirect impact area); therefore there would not be any significant direct or indirect impacts on special population groups or neighborhoods. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to special population groups or neighborhoods.

There are two schools located within the project vicinity, however they are located well outside of the 65 DNL noise contour. There is no property acquisition associated with the Proposed Action nor will there be any effect on products or substances that a child is likely to come in contact with or ingest, such as air, food, drinking water, recreational waters or soil. No disproportionate impacts on the children's health, safety or general welfare are anticipated.

The Proposed Action is not expected to significantly change the socioeconomic environment around the Airport. Temporarily, the construction would provide an increased number of jobs within the area, paired with the potential use of other local goods and services to complete the Preferred Alternative. A slight increase in business both at the Airport and in the vicinity of Airport Road can be expected due to the increase in vehicular traffic to and from the Airport as result of the Preferred Alternative; however, no major shifts in public service demand or economic demand are anticipated.

Surface Transportation

Surface transportation was also evaluated as to the impact of additional automobile traffic on the local surface transportation network. It was determined that the Preferred Alternative will not cause any Snohomish County arterials or any Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), City of Mukilteo or City of Everett intersections to change from an acceptable to a deficient level of service. All of the Snohomish County arterials analyzed in the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) (Appendix F) are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service in the opening year (2013) and the year 2018 under the Preferred Alternative. The No Action Alternative would have no effect on surface transportation. The Preferred Alternative will, however, add trips to four intersections that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service, regardless of whether or not the Preferred Alternative is implemented. These intersections are SR-525 at Beverly Park Road (WSDOT intersection), SR-99 at

Airport Road (City of Everett intersection), the I-5 northbound ramps at 128th Street SW/SR-96 (WSDOT intersection), and SR-525 at 84th Street SW (City of Mukilteo Intersection).

Water Quality

The Proposed Action includes a very small increase in impervious surface at the Airport as most of the actual development will be on existing paved surface. Storm water detention and water quality requirements associated with the Proposed Action can be accommodated under the existing master drainage plan. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not adversely impact the water quality of surface water resources, stormwater runoff, sanitary wastewater, or groundwater resources.

Wetlands

The Proposed Action will not result in any wetland impacts. The modular terminal improvements are not within wetland boundaries.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action is not anticipated to produce significant cumulative impacts when adding the anticipated project impacts to the effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions. A detailed cumulative impacts analysis is included in Chapter D, Environmental Consequences.

Mitigation

While the Proposed Action will not result in any federally defined thresholds of significance being exceeded, the additional traffic as a result of the Proposed Action does require mitigation pursuant to state and local requirements. In accordance with 40 CFR 1505.3, the FAA will take appropriate steps to ensure that mitigation actions identified in the EA are implemented during project development.

The project's impacts to the WSDOT intersections will be mitigated through the WSDOT traffic mitigation fees in accordance with the interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and WSDOT. The City of Everett has identified that capacity improvements for single-occupancy vehicles to the intersection

of SR-99 at Airport Road are not practical due to the existing lane configuration and lack of right-of-way. The SR-525 at 84th Street SW intersection could operate at an acceptable level with improved signal timings and therefore the impacts to this intersection will be mitigated through the City of Mukilteo traffic mitigation fees in accordance with the interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and Mukilteo. Based on the trip generation and identified codes the total traffic mitigation fees identified for payment to Snohomish County, WSDOT, and the City of Mukilteo for the Proposed Action is \$333,262.85. The Snohomish County mitigation fees are \$206,161.40, the WSDOT mitigation fees are \$32,695.20, and the City of Mukilteo mitigation fees are \$94,406.25.

VIII Public Involvement

Public participation occurred throughout this environmental assessment process. The FAA published the Draft EA in early 2010. A Notice of Availability was published in local newspapers and on the airport website. Copies of the Notice of Availability can be found in Appendix R. Three public hearings were held in various locations throughout the County subsequent to the publication. A 63 day comment period was provided, extending the normal 30 day period due to requests from the public. A substantial number of comments were received which ultimately resulted in changes or updates to the body of the Draft EA. These changes were presented in September 2012 with the public release of the Final EA which included the comments received on the draft document and the agency's responses to these comments. A 30 day public review and comment period on the new and revised information was provided. Comments received on new and revised information in the Final EA and the agency's responses to those comments are included in Appendix A and B of this document.

The Draft and Final EA were available for review on the airports website, local public libraries, the Snohomish County Planning Department, and the airport office.

IX. Agency Findings

The FAA makes the following determinations for this project based upon a careful review of the attached Final EA, comments on the Draft and Final EAs, the supporting administrative record, and appropriate supporting information.

- A. The proposed Action is consistent with the requirement that a person who is properly and adequately equipped and is able to operate safely under this part

and regulations and standards prescribed under this part shall be issued an air carrier operating certificate. Such certificate shall contain terms necessary to ensure safety in air transportation and specify the places to and from which, and the airways of the United States over which the person may operate as an air carrier.[49 USC Section 44705]

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of amending an air carrier operating specification to a person desiring to operate as an air carrier. When the air carrier requests approval to operate at the airport, the Principle Operations Inspector (POI) will determine adequacy of the airport and its facilities to support the air carrier's safe operation into and out of that airport. Upon satisfactory determination, the POI will issue Operations Specifications to allow the air carrier to operate at the airport.

- B. The project is consistent with the requirement that an applicant for an airport operating certificate is entitled to a certificate if (1) the applicant provides written documentation that air carrier service will begin on a date certain; (2) the provisions of Section 139.103 of this subpart are met; (3) the Administrator finds that the applicant is properly and adequately equipped and able to provide a safe airport operating environment; and (4) the Administrator approves the airport certification manual. [14 CFR Part 139, Section 107]

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of amending an airport's operating certificate from a Class IV to a Class I operating certificate to serve scheduled commercial air service operations by large aircraft. Upon notification of a date certain of an air carrier initiating service at the airport, the FAA will inspect the airport to ensure compliance with 14 CFR Part 139 requirements of a Class I airport.

- C. The project is consistent with the existing plans of public agencies for development of the area surrounding the airport. [49 U.S.C. 47106(a)(1)]

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding. Extensive coordination regarding the proposed project has taken place between federal, state, and local agencies. The proposed development is not in conflict with the comprehensive planning and goals of Snohomish County or other local jurisdictions. Evidence of public and agency coordination can be found in Appendices B, C, J, L, Q, R, S, and T of the Final EA.

- D. The interests of the community in or near where the project will be located have been given fair consideration. [49 U.S.C. 47106(b) (2).

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of AIP funding. This is shown in Chapter C, Affected Environment, and Chapter D, Environmental Consequences. Three public hearings were held throughout the County. Appendices B, C, J, L, Q, R, S, and T of the Final EA and Appendices A and B of the FONSI/ROD contain the public comments and agency responses to comments

- E. The airport sponsor has taken and will continue to take actions that restrict land uses in the airport vicinity. [49 U.S.C. 47107 (a)(10)]

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of AIP funding. As a recipient of Airport Improvement Program funding, the County has signed grant assurances that require them to take appropriate action, to the extent reasonable, including the adoption of zoning laws, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations, including landing and takeoff of aircraft.

- F. The Proposed Action will comply with the enforceable policies of Washington State approved coastal management program and will be conducted in a manner consistent with such a program. [15 C.F.R. Part 930.51]

A Certification of Consistency with the Washington State Coastal Zone Management Program will be applied for by the County. As stated in the Final EA, upon issuance of an environmental finding, the airport sponsor will submit the Certification of Consistency with the Washington State Coastal Zone Management Program for Federally Licensed or Permitted Activities included in Appendix M. We believe that it is reasonable to expect a consistency determination based on discussions about the project with the permitting manager of the Planning and Commercial Development Department of Snohomish County.

X. Comments on the Final EA and Response to Comments

The Final EA was published with new and revised material which was identified in the document. The FAA requested comments on the new material and stated that only those comments received on the new material would be given responses. The FAA received 45 comments on the Final EA, five of which commented on the new and revised material presented in the Final EA. All of the comments received are presented in Appendix A of this FONSI/ROD. Responses to comments received on the new and updated information presented in the Final EA can be found in Appendix B of this FONSI/ROD.

XI. Decision and Order

After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained herein, the undersigned finds that the proposed Federal action, namely the Preferred Alternative, is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101 of NEPA and other applicable environmental requirements and is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment or otherwise, including any condition requiring consultation pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA.

The FAA has carefully considered the FAA's goals and objectives in relation to various aeronautical aspects of the proposed projects discussed in the EA, including the purpose and need to be served by the project, the alternative means of achieving them, the environmental impacts of these alternatives, the mitigation necessary to preserve and enhance the environment, and the costs and benefits of achieving these purposes and needs. I find that the Proposed Action described in the Final EA is reasonably supported and that issuance of a finding of no significant impact is appropriate. Therefore, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the FAA, I approve and direct that agency action be taken to carry out implementation of the Proposed Action discussed more fully in Section II of this Record of Decision.



Regional Administrator
Northwest Mountain Region
Federal Aviation Administration



Date

RIGHT OF APPEAL

This FONSI/ROD constitutes a final order of the FAA Administrator and is subject to exclusive judicial review under 49 U.S.C. Section 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 U.S.C. Section 46110. Any party seeking to stay implementation of the ROD must file an application with the FAA prior to seeking judicial relief as provided in Rule 18(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.