



Short Form Environmental Assessment

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
MEMPHIS AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF AVIATION

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS

Airport Name: Pitt-Greenville Airport

Proposed Project: Runway 26 Safety Area Grading, Runway 8 Approach Clearing, and Easement Acquisition

Date Submitted to FAA/SBG: April 25, 2018

This environmental assessment becomes a Federal document when evaluated, signed, and dated by the Responsible FAA/SBG Official.

Responsible FAA/SBG Official

Date

General Information and applicability

This Short Form Environmental Assessment (EA) is to be used only for federally obligated airports within the boundaries of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Memphis Airports District Office (KY, NC, and TN). Prior to preparing any NEPA documentation, including this form, contact the MEM-ADO/SBG Environmental Protection Specialist or designated staff responsible for NEPA compliance for the subject airport to determine the level of documentation needed. Completed documentation without prior FAA/SBG concurrence may result in approval delays or rejection of NEPA documentation.

The Short Form EA is intended to be used only when the following conditions are met: (1) the federal action cannot be categorically excluded (CATEX) because of involvement with extraordinary circumstances or because the action is not consistent with any CATEX described in FAA Orders 1050.1F or 5050.4B (or subsequent versions), (2) impacts from the federal action would be limited to one extraordinary circumstance, (3) the federal action would not create significant impacts to any environmental category unless it is mitigated to the point of non-significance, (4) the action is not considered controversial. Note that in certain cases the FAA/SBG may elect to prepare a full EA even if these conditions appear to be met.

Steps for competing Short-Form EA

This form is intended to comply with FAA requirements for satisfying NEPA. The preparer should be familiar with NEPA, CEQ, and FAA laws, requirements, and policies, including, but not limited to, FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B (or subsequent versions).

The short form is formatted into three sections. Section I covers general information on the proposed action as well as information and certification from the preparer and airport sponsor. Section II addresses the purpose and need statement and alternatives. Section III covers affected environment and environmental consequences. All sections must be addressed for the form to be considered complete. The level of information needed to address each section is dependent upon the project and extent of impacts. However, for Section III, responses should provide enough information to allow the reviewer(s) to conclude there is no impact or no significant impact. A graphic depiction of the proposed action must be attached to the form. The use of additional graphics, pictures of the study area, and appendices is recommended and may be required pending upon the proposed action and environmental impacts.

As previously mentioned, Section III addresses the affected environment and environmental consequences. If the proposed action does not impact a particular resource, provide a brief explanation for why there is no impact. If the proposed action does impact a resource, describe the affected environment for the resource before discussing environmental consequences. For all resources, consider impacts caused by construction and post-construction activities. Also consider direct and indirect impacts. Cumulative impacts must be addressed in Section III (O).

Helpful factors that should be considered as part of the assessment and internet websites are listed below each resource section. The factors to be considered and websites provided are not intended to be a comprehensive list. Additional factors and sources should be reviewed as needed. Consultation with resource agencies, field analysis, or computer modeling may be required to aid the FAA/SBG in determining the extent of impacts. The preparer should contact the MEM-

ADO/SBG representative to determine the level of agency coordination, field analysis, and modeling needed.

Although multiple variations exist for adequately completing the NEPA process, the MEM-ADO recommends following the generalized steps below for Short-Form EAs:

1. Finalize planning process
2. Conduct preliminary environmental analysis
3. Obtain concurrence from MEM-ADO/SBG on use of this form
4. Conduct agency scoping, field analysis, and modeling as needed
5. Complete draft short form EA
6. Submit draft EA to MEM-ADO/SBG
7. Revise draft EA as needed
8. Obtain concurrence from MEM-ADO/SBG to initiate public involvement
9. Make draft EA available to public and issue public notice
10. Hold public meeting (if required)
11. Revise draft EA as needed
12. Submit final draft EA to MEM-ADO/SBG
13. Receive FONSI
14. Issue public notice for availability of final EA and FONSI

Completion of the Short Form EA will permit the FAA/SBG to issue one of the following determinations: (1) issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), (2) request that a full EA be prepared, (3) request that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared.

Section I

1. Airport and Project Information:

Airport Name and Three Letter Identifier: Pitt-Greenville Airport (PGV)

Airport Address: 400 Airport Road, Greenville, NC 27834

City: Greenville County: Pitt State: North Carolina

Project Name: Runway 8-26 Approach Clearing

Estimated Start Date: 11/1/2018 Estimated Completion Date: 11/30/2019

2. Preparer Information:

Name: Kara Giblin

Title: Environmental Specialist

Organization: Talbert & Bright Inc.

Address: 4810 Shelley Dr.

City: Wilmington State: North Carolina

Telephone: 910-763-5350

E-mail: kgiblin@tbiilm.com

Preparer Certification

I certify that the information I have provided in this document is, to the best of my knowledge, correct.

Kara Giblin
Signature

5/15/18
Date

3. Airport Sponsor Information:

Name: Betty Stansbury

Title: Executive Director

Organization: Pitt-Greenville Airport

Address: 400 Airport Rd.

City: Greenville State: North Carolina

Telephone (252) 902-2025

E-mail: betty.stansbury@pittcountync.gov

Airport Sponsor Certification

I certify that the information I have provided in this document is, to the best of my knowledge, correct. I also recognize and agree that no construction activity, including but not limited to site preparation, demolition, or land disturbance, shall proceed until the FAA/SBG issues a final environmental decision for the proposed action described in this document.

Betty Stansbury
Signature

5/15/18
Date

Section II

1. Provide purpose and need statement.

Purpose and Need

The proposed project is to remove obstructions to the Runway 8-26 approach surfaces and Runway 8 Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) obstacle clearance surfaces per FAA AIP Grant Assurance 20 *Hazard Removal and Mitigation*, FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A Change 1A *Airport Design*, FAA Advisory Circular 150/5340-30H *Design and Installation Details for Airport Visual Aids*, FAA Order JO 6850.2B *Visual Guidance Lighting Systems*, and Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Chapter 14 Part 139. Currently, trees both on and off airport property at the approach end of Runway 8, and terrain at the approach end of Runway 26 on airport property, penetrate the clearance surfaces identified in the referenced FAA Advisory Circulars/Orders. The airport needs to maintain clear approaches to the runway both for the safety of the traveling public and for the viability of the airport's continued service to the community. Avigation easements will need to be obtained from off-airport properties to allow removal of the existing obstructions and prevention of new obstructions within the Airport's airspace.

Background

The Pitt-Greenville Airport (PGV) is designated in the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) as a "non-hub primary airport." PGV has approximately 48,000 annual aircraft operations according to PGV's Airport Master Record and provides up to five daily air carrier departures to Charlotte, NC, including by 50-seat regional jets and 37 to 39 seat DeHaviland Dash 8-100 turbo-prop aircraft. A wide variety of general aviation aircraft also operate at PGV, ranging from single-engine piston aircraft to business jets and large chartered aircraft (primarily for transport of college athletic teams to and from Greenville) up to Airbus A320 aircraft and Boeing 737.

Runway 8-26 is 4,997 feet long and has RNAV (GPS-based) approaches as well as a Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) for visual approach guidance on both runway ends. Runway 8-26 is utilized by both general aviation and commercial aircraft. Crosswind runways are an important part of an air carrier airport's daily operations, providing both an additional runway for general aviation as well as an alternate approach and landing when windy conditions make the approach and landing on Runway 2-20 unfavorable, or when Runway 2-20 is closed for construction or maintenance activities.

Obstructions from trees and terrain have impacted approaches available on Runway 8-26. Due to the presence of tall trees in the approach to Runway 8, pilots have complained to the airport that the Runway 8 approach is unsafe, nighttime instrument straight-in approach procedures have been canceled for Runway 8, and nighttime circling procedures have been canceled for both runway ends by the FAA. These cancellations have limited the utility of the runway and restricted the operational capability of the airport overall. Currently, the approaches are NOTAM'd out of service, but these changes will become published as permanent until such time as the obstructions are removed.

Specifically, trees located at the approach end of Runway 8 have been identified as penetrating three separate, but partially overlapping, FAA approach/obstacle clearance surfaces, as follows:

20:1 Approach Surface: This approach surface is described in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150-5300-13A *Airport Design*, Table 3-2 *Approach/Departure Standards Table* as the “Approach end of runways expected to accommodate instrument approaches having visibility greater than or equal to $\frac{3}{4}$ statute mile, or expected to serve large airplanes (day or night). Includes circling approaches”. This surface begins 200’ from the runway threshold and rises 1’ for every 20’ outward to a distance of 10,000’ from the end of the runway. The width of the surface ranges from 400’ at its beginning point to 3,800’ at its point furthest from the end of the runway. The dimensions, slope and origin point of this surface are fixed by standards and penetrations are not permitted. Tree obstructions to the 20:1 surface are located on Airport property (both north and south of the Tar River), and on land owned by the City of Greenville and a private property owner south of the Tar River.

30:1 Glidepath Qualification Surface (GQS): This approach is described in FAA AC 150-5300-13A *Airport Design*, Table 3-2 *Approach/Departure Standards Table* as the “Approach end of runways expected to accommodate approaches with vertical guidance (Glide Path Qualification Surface [GQS]).” This surface begins at the runway threshold and rises 1’ for every 30’ outward to a distance of 10,000’ from the end of the runway. The width of the surface ranges from 350’ at its beginning point to 3,800’ at its point furthest from the end of the runway. The dimensions, slope and origin point of this surface are fixed by standards and penetrations are not permitted. Tree obstructions to the 30:1 surface are located on Airport property (both north and south of the Tar River), and on land owned by the City of Greenville and a private property owner south of the Tar River.

PAPI Obstacle Clearance Surface (OCS): This clearance surface is described in FAA Order 6850.2B *Visual Guidance Lighting Systems* as a surface that is established to provide a minimum clearance over obstacles during approach. The standard PAPI approach angle identified by FAA is 3 degrees. The PAPI OCS begins at a point in the middle of the runway at the approach end, 300 feet in front of the PAPI system and proceeds outward into the approach zone at an angle 1 degree less than the aiming angle of the third Light Housing Assembly (LHA) from the runway. The surface extends 10 degrees on either side of the runway centerline extended and extends 4 statute miles from its point of origin. Tree obstructions to the PAPI OCS surface are located on Airport property (both north and south of the Tar River), and on land owned by the City of Greenville and a private property owner south of the Tar River. Based on coordination with FAA, clearing the Runway 8 PAPI OCS to provide a standard 3-degree PAPI approach angle is required to support existing airport operations on Runway 8.

Also, at the approach end of Runway 26, terrain on Airport property penetrates the 20:1 approach surface and is in violation of runway safety area grading requirements. The ground currently slopes upward at the end of the runway and must meet the 0% to -3% slope standard within 200 feet of the runway, as described in FAA AC 150-5300-13A *Airport Design* (Page 82, Paragraph 313d).

2. Describe the preferred alternative and include all connected actions. Attach a graphic depiction of the proposed action, including haul routes and staging areas if applicable, to the back of this form or in an appendix.

The proposed project will remove approach and obstacle clearance obstructions including trees both on and off airport property at the approach end of Runway 8, and terrain at the approach end of Runway 26 (see Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix A). The clearing at the approach end of Runway 8 will require acquisition of an aviation (“air rights”) easement on portions of a City of Greenville (21-acre easement) and a private parcel (4-acre easement). The City and private land owner have been notified and have agreed to right of entry for the purpose of surveying and appraising the easements. The work at the Runway 8 end includes tree removal in wetlands and within the riparian buffer area along the Tar River. The work at the Runway 26 end will require regrading of the terrain in the Runway Safety Area and associated installation of drainage structures to maintain positive drainage of storm water away from the runway.

Runway 8 Approach

The preferred alternative is to remove all trees within the combination of the PAPI obstacle clearance surface, the 20:1 approach surface, and the 30:1 GQS at the approach end of Runway 8 (Figures 2a and 2b). The combined clearing area is 37.6 acres (21.5 acres on Airport land, 13.6 acres on City land, and 2.5 acres on private land). Clear cutting in this area, rather than removing only the current penetrators, will avoid repeated clearing operations.

As the trees are located within wetlands along the Tar River, the project is being coordinated with the NC Division of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) (see Appendix B). Efforts will be made to avoid ground disturbance in wetlands. Trees will be removed with the stumps to remain in place to minimize erosion. Trees will be hauled off site, rather than left on the ground, due to safety concerns with leaving the cut trees in a flood zone. The tree removal method in wetlands shall be specified as follows:

- Avoid placement of soils and debris in designated wetlands or Waters of the U.S.
- Construction of access roads in wetlands will not allowed; temporary bridges may be used to cross small streams.
- All clearing within wetlands shall be performed by either hand clearing methods or by use of logging mats and/or clearing equipment specifically designed for work in wetland areas.
- Trees will be removed from the wetlands and disposed of off-site.
- Trees to be removed will be cut to not more than 6 inches above the ground. The grubbing of stumps and roots will not be allowed.

Approximately 3 acres of trees are also located within the Tar-Pamlico riparian buffer limits (see map in Appendix B). The NCDEQ has published guidance for airports pertaining to methodology for tree removal within buffer areas, which is included in Appendix B. Tar-Pamlico Riparian Buffer Zones consists of two zones with different tree clearing criteria; the total width of both zones is 50 feet. Zone 1 consists of the first 30 feet of land from the top of bank of a waterbody. Zone 2 begins where Zone 1 ends and continues for another 20 feet outward. Trees in Zone 1 must be felled by hand (chainsaws, etc.) and removed by chain or cable; no mechanized clearing is allowed. Mechanized clearing equipment is allowed within Zone 2. For this project, the tree removal method in the Tar-Pamlico Riparian Buffer Zone shall be specified as follows:

- All clearing within the areas designated for Buffer Area Clearing Zone 1 shall be performed by hand clearing methods, including use of chainsaws. No equipment will be allowed within the areas designated for Buffer Area Clearing Zone 1.
- Trees cut within the riparian buffers will be felled using the rope and pulley system to control the direction of fall and avoidance of hung trees.
- Low growing vegetation, less than 5 feet in height, shall remain undisturbed within the buffer areas.
- Trees to be removed will be cut to not more than 6 inches above the ground. The grubbing of stumps and roots will not be allowed.
- Shredding or chipping of material within the buffers will not be allowed.

The preferred alternative for access to the clearing area south of the Tar River outside the Tar-Pamlico Buffer Zone is via existing access and logging paths on the City of Greenville property, removing felled trees through Airport and City lands to West 5th Street. This is consistent with the City's request to access the project area via old logging paths. Contractor will be allowed to access the Buffer Zone clearing area via the Tar River, if practicable to access the area by boat/barge.

Runway 26 Approach

Approximately 5.6 acres will be graded to meet the 0% to -3% slope standard within 200 feet of the runway. Figure 2a shows the approximate grading limits and haul route associated with the work in the approach to Runway 26. The area to be graded is currently mowed/maintained grass.

3. Describe the no action alternative including the environmental, operational, and economic impacts that would occur if used.

Should no action be taken, the airport will continue to operate Runway 8-26 on an increasingly limited basis, and only for such operations as can be conducted in a safe manner. These would currently include visual approaches and daytime instrument operations only on Runway 8. When wind conditions are unfavorable for operations on Runway 2-20, Runway 8-26 may not provide a viable alternative, resulting in diversions to other airports or cancellation of flights. As trees continue to grow, the operational capability of Runway 8 will continue to degrade. The continued loss of Runway 8-26 night instrument/circling operational capability will have an overall impact on the safety of the traveling public and possible economic impacts to the airport through diminution of aircraft activity and loss of service. The Airport would need to seek a Modification to Standards for the terrain violation at the Runway 26 end, which cannot be mitigated without removal.

The No Action Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project; however, this alternative is carried throughout the EA as a baseline due to NEPA requirements. No trees would be cleared, and no grading work would be undertaken at the approach end of Runway 26.

Environmental impacts relating to the No Action Alternative would be negligible. No trees or other vegetation would be removed, so there would be no impact to wildlife habitat, potential threatened and endangered species habitat, or migratory birds. There would be no increase in noise. There would be no visual impacts since trees would remain standing and there would be no blocks of cut forest visible from the river or other recreational areas. The No Action Alternative would not require any activity within the Tar River floodplain or wetlands and there would be no potential impacts to water quality.

Like the Preferred Alternative, the No Action Alternative would not increase emissions or impact air quality or climate. There would be no disturbance of DOT Section 4(f) or cultural/historic resources. Land use would remain consistent with zoning and compatible with planned land uses and surrounding communities.

4. List and describe other reasonable alternatives.

Runway 26 Approach

Under all action alternatives, the Runway 26 terrain would be graded as described for the preferred alternative (5.6 acres). The area of disturbance could not be reduced without continuing violation of FAA safety standards.

Runway 8 Approach

Three alternatives were considered based on reducing the area and number of trees that would need to be removed within the Runway 8 approach where there are extensive wetlands and the Tar River riparian buffer.

Alternative 1 (Change PAPI Angle): Reduce the area of tree clearing by increasing the aiming angle of the PAPI OCS from the standard 3 degrees to 3.25 degrees (Figure 2c). This alternative would clear 35.3 acres total, including 20.4 acres on airport land, 12.4 acres on City of Greenville land, and 2.5 acres on private land. The total area cleared would be 2.2 acres less than the preferred alternative.

Alternative 2 (30:1 GQS Penetrations to Remain): Reduce the area of tree clearing by not clearing the 30:1 GQS. Only the 20:1 approach surface and PAPI 3.0-degree OCS would be cleared. This alternative would clear 33.8 acres total, including 20.9 acres on airport land, 10.4 acres on City of Greenville land, and 2.5 acres on private land. The cleared area would be 3.8 acres less than the preferred alternative.

Alternative 3 (Select Tree Removal): Rather than removing all trees in the approach areas, remove only the trees that are currently penetrating and within 10 feet of penetrating the PAPI OCS, the 20:1 approach surface, and the 30:1 GQS at the approach end of Runway 8. Trees of this height are scattered throughout the project area and would need to be identified and marked. Additional trees may need to be removed for access to the site to perform clearing.

5. Provide rationale for why other reasonable alternatives were removed from consideration.

After consideration of the alternatives described above, Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 do not meet the purpose and need and are not carried forward for analysis in the EA.

Alternative 1 (Change PAPI Angle): The increased PAPI OCS would require pilots to land at a steeper, non-standard descent angle when landing on the runway. This alternative is not viable as it does not meet the purpose and need.

Alternative 2 (30:1 GQS Penetrations to Remain): This alternative would limit the approach/operational capabilities of Runway 8 to non-vertically guided instrument approaches and visual approaches only and therefore does not meet the purpose and need.

Alternative 3 (Selective Tree Removal): This alternative would reduce the number of trees removed in the initial clearing effort. However, implementation of this alternative would result in repeated, frequent clearing efforts, since as the remaining trees continue to grow, they would have to be individually removed as they become penetrations. Since this alternative would not result in a long-term solution to maintain clear approaches, it is not considered feasible and does not meet the purpose and need.

Section III

(A) Air Quality

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts from aircraft, ground vehicle, and equipment emissions (2) Project location with respect to NAAQS attainment/maintenance/non-attainment areas. (3) Modeling requirements

Note: Impacts should be discussed for any action involving outside construction.

Resources:

- (1) FAA 5050.4B Desk Reference air quality section:
http://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/environmental_desk_ref/media/desk-ref-chap1.pdf
- (2) EPA Greenbook: <http://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/>

- (1) By its nature as a tree clearing project (Runway 8) with minor grading (Runway 26), the preferred alternative is not reasonably anticipated to increase aircraft or ground vehicle operations at the airport, nor to increase vehicle traffic coming to the airport. No changes to existing airport infrastructure that would support increased operations from aircraft or ground vehicles are included in the project. The period of construction for work will be approximately 4 to 6 months to minimize impacts to airport operations. Therefore, temporary increased emissions of “criteria pollutants”, if any, resulting from the preferred alternative would reasonably be expected to have a negligible impact on air quality.
- (2) Pitt County is an attainment area for the NAAQS criteria pollutants per the EPA Greenbook.
- (3) PGV has approximately 55,000 annual enplanements and 48,000 total annual operations, which are well below the thresholds that require an air quality analysis (1.3 million enplanements and 180,000 GA/air taxi operations) per the FAA *Air Quality Handbook*.

(B) Biological Resources

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to federal and state-listed species (2) Impacts to non-listed species and migratory birds (3) Impacts to habitat

Note: Impacts should be discussed for any action involving terrain/vegetation disturbance.

Resources:

- (1) USFWS IPAC: <http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>
- (2) KY state list <http://naturepreserves.ky.gov/pubs/Pages/cntyreport.aspx>
- (3) NC state list <http://www.ncnhp.org/>
- (4) TN state list: http://environment-online.state.tn.us:8080/pls/enf_reports/f?p=9014:3:25305085995908:::

To determine the potential for impacts to biological resources in the Area of Potential Effect, Environmental Professionals, Inc. (EPI), performed the following tasks:

- Consulted with Federal and State agencies (including US Fish & Wildlife Service and NC Natural Heritage Program) to obtain a list of state and federally listed species with known occurrence or habitat in Pitt County.
- Reviewed habitat requirements for each species prior to a field site visit to rule out species whose habitats are not in the project area and not in close enough proximity to be potentially impacted by the proposed project.
- Performed field visits to define existing habitat/biotic communities present and identify the presence/evidence of listed species.

The results of EPI's review are included in Appendix C and summarized below.

- (1) The proposed action would not impact federally listed species. The project area was surveyed for federally-listed species with potential habitat in the project area including the endangered red-cockaded woodpecker, and three species of concern: the southern hognose snake, loggerhead shrike, and eastern Henslow's sparrow. The forested habitat is not suitable for red-cockaded woodpecker and this species is not expected to occur there. Southern hognose snake, loggerhead shrike, and eastern Henslow's sparrow were not observed during the surveys and the clearing will not impact these species. According to the USFWS Raleigh Ecological Field Office website, northern long-eared bat is not known to occur in Pitt County. There are limited mature pine that would provide suitable bat winter habitat. USFWS has reviewed EPI's report and stated the project is not likely to adversely affect any federally-listed species (see correspondence is included in Appendix C).

The state-listed threatened bald eagle was observed flying over the project area during the July 10, 2017, survey. An additional survey along the Tar River on September 14, 2017, did not find bald eagle nests along the riverine corridor. No state-listed species of concern or rare species were observed during the survey.

- (2) The forested habitat in the project area provides habitat for migratory birds. Removal of trees and grading a mowed/maintained grass area would not have persistent negative impacts to non-listed species and migratory birds. The project area will be inspected prior to construction to assure there are no nesting eagles.

(3) The proposed action would impact 37.6 acres within dry-mesic oak-hickory forest, mesic mixed hardwood forest, and cypress-gum swamp habitat within the Runway 8 approach. All trees will be cut and hauled off-site. The stumps and low growing vegetation will remain within the Runway 8 approach to minimize surface/soil disturbance. Wetland trees will be allowed to grow without disturbance until they become penetrators again.

Within the Runway 26 approach, 5.6 acres of mowed/maintained grass would be temporarily impacted.

(C) Climate

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts from Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) from aircraft, ground vehicles, or other sources (2) Qualitative analysis should be used unless air quality modeling was used in part of Section III (A) Air Quality

Resources: (none)

By its nature, the Runway 8-26 approach clearing project is not reasonably anticipated to increase aircraft or ground vehicle operations at the airport, nor to increase vehicle traffic coming to the airport. No changes to existing airport infrastructure that would support increased operations from aircraft or ground vehicles are included in the project. The period of construction time for the tree clearing operations will be limited to approximately 4 to 6 months; therefore, temporary increased emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) resulting from the proposed action would reasonably be expected to have a negligible impact on climate.

(D) Coastal Resources

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to Coastal Barrier Resources and Coastal Zone Management (CAMA) (2) Need for Federal Consistency Review

Note: This section is only applicable to the 20 coastal counties in NC

Resources:

- (1) USFWS coastal barrier mapper <http://www.fws.gov/cbra/Maps/Mapper.html>

There would be no impact to coastal resources under the proposed action. The project will not occur within one of the 20 coastal counties as identified in the Coastal Area Management Act. Therefore, there is no need for a Federal Consistency Review for Coastal Barrier Resources or Coastal Zone Management (CAMA) permits.

(E) DOT Section 4(f)

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to parks, national forest, wildlife refuge, or other recreational areas (2) Impacts to Section 106 resources (3) Constructive use impacts from noise (4) Impacts to Section 6(f) Lands

Resources: (none)

- (1) There are no national forests or wildlife refuges within the project limits or in the immediate vicinity of the airport. A portion of the project area is within the Phil Carroll Nature Preserve (City of Greenville property). This preserve is not open to the public other than a campsite accessed from the river. The campsite is not within the project area (Figure 2a). The Tar River is used for recreation such as paddling and fishing. The City is aware of the need for an avigation easement on the property and has agreed to right of entry for the purpose of surveying and appraising the easement. The City requests project equipment in the preserve utilize, wherever possible, the old logging paths to reduce impacts.
- (2) The project area and a project description were provided to the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and a response was received on June 30, 2017; see Appendix D. SHPO determined that the project as proposed will not affect any historic structures.
- (3) The project will not result in an alteration to the current airfield configuration/traffic pattern or fleet mix for Runway 8-26. Therefore, there is no increase in aircraft noise levels related to the project.

(F) Farmland

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to farmlands considered to be prime, unique, or statewide and locally important (2) Farmlands include pasturelands, croplands, and forest (even if zoned for development)

Note: In certain cases, airport owned land may be considered farmland.

Resources:

(1) NRCS/USDA AD 1006 Form:

http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb1045394.pdf

The airport is in an Urbanized Area (UA) according to information and mapping from the US Census Bureau (see Figure 3). The Farmland Protection Policy Act Paragraph 658.2(a) indicates that Land/Farmland that is already in use or committed to be in use for urban development or an Urbanized Area or water storage may not be considered farmland:

“Farmland already in urban development also includes lands identified as “urbanized area” (UA) on the Census Bureau Map, or as urban area mapped with a “tint overprint” on the USGS topographical maps, or as “urban-built-up” on the USDA Important Farmland Maps. Areas shown as white on the USDA Important Farmland Maps are not “farmland” and, therefore, are not subject to the Act.”

Based on this information, there are no project impacts in this category for the work at the approach end of Runway 26. The work at the approach end of Runway 8 involves the clearing of trees within forest habitat. Trees will be felled and removed with the stumps to remain in place. Based on NRCS soil farmland classification data, soils in the approach end of Runway 8 are Pactolus Loamy Sand (Pa) and Swamp (Sw); neither are prime farmland.

(G) Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts or removal of hazardous materials/waste from existing sites or facilities (2) Use of hazardous materials for new construction (3) Impacts to solid waste facilities from construction and post-construction activities (4) Use of pollution prevention activities, plans, programs, or policies

Resources:

- (1) EPA Superfund site search: <http://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/srchsites.cfm>
- (2) EPA hazardous waste cleanup sites: <http://www.epa.gov/cleanups/cleanups-my-community>
- (3) EPA solid waste generation: <http://www3.epa.gov/epawaste/conservation/imr/cdm/pubs/cd-meas.pdf>

There will not be any impacts in these categories under the proposed action.

- (1) No hazardous waste sites exist within the project area, therefore no impacts from the removal of existing hazardous materials/waste are expected during construction of this project. For a location of known hazardous waste sites in the airport vicinity, see Figure 4.
- (2) No hazardous materials are anticipated to be required for the project. Materials used for the project will be handled in the manner prescribed by the materials manufacturer.
- (3) Construction debris generated by the project will be very limited; trees will likely be sent to a lumber yard and would not go to the landfill. The City of Greenville's Sanitation Division of the Public Works Department is responsible for the management of solid waste in Greenville. Construction waste is handled by the Pitt County Transfer Station, located approximately 9 driving miles from the Airport. The Pitt County Transfer Station accepts construction and demolition debris for disposal on site. During a phone conversation with the Pitt County Transfer Station on March 31, 2017, it was confirmed that the Pitt County Transfer Station has adequate capacity available for project debris if any are generated.
- (4) For ground disturbance in the Runway 26 project area, the airport has NPDES Industrial Stormwater permit coverage under state general permit NCG150021 and has implemented a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. There will be no ground disturbance in the Runway 8 project area that would require NPDES permitting for offsite work. Water quality is discussed further in Section N.

(H) Historical, Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to above and below ground resources (2) Indirect impacts from light emissions, vibration, and noise (3) Impacts to viewshed from construction or removal of buildings, trees, and other objects

Note: Obtain FAA/SBG concurrence before completing any of the following: (1) Initiating formal Section 106 proceedings (2) Coordinating the APE or determination of effects (3) Consulting with THPOs

Note: "Previously disturbed" terrain does not necessarily exclude the action from Section 106

Resources:

(1) NPS NRHP database: <http://www.nps.gov/nr/research/>

(2) NC GIS historic sites: <http://gis.ncdcr.gov/hpweb/>

Note: These databases do not feature all known or potential sites.

There will not be any impacts in these categories.

- (1) The project area and a project description were provided to SHPO and a response was received on June 30, 2017; see Appendix D. SHPO determined that the project as proposed will not affect any historic structures or resources.
- (2) There are no historic structures in the vicinity of the project, so any impact in this category is unlikely. See map in Appendix D.
- (3) There are no historic structures in the vicinity of the project, so any impact in this category is unlikely.

(I) Land Use

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to existing and/or planned land uses or zoning (2) Compatibility with airport design standards such as RPZs (3) Consistency with local public agencies (4) Creation of wildlife attractants

Resources: (none)

There will not be any impacts in these categories under the proposed action.

- (1) The project would have no impacts on existing and/or planned land uses or zoning. The project is consistent with City and County zoning ordinances for height restrictions around the airport.
- (2) The project would clear the Runway 8 Approach of penetrations consistent with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A *Airport Design*, FAA Advisory Circular 150/5340-30H *Design and Installation Details for Airport Visual Aids*, and FAA Order JO 6850.2B *Visual Guidance Lighting Systems*.
- (3) The project is consistent with current and planned land uses for the area. The airport is in the process of obtaining avigation easements on the City of Greenville Phil Carroll Nature Preserve parcel and a private parcel. Both landowners have granted the airport right-of-entry to survey and appraise the land. The City supports the tree cutting but requests clearing equipment in the preserve utilize, wherever possible, the old logging paths to reduce impacts within the preserve. These access routes will be coordinated with the City.
- (4) The project will not create any wildlife attractants.

(J) Natural Resources and Energy Supply

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts on fuel, electricity, gas, water, wood, asphalt, aggregate, and other construction material supplies (2) Impacts from construction as well as post-construction and maintenance activities

Resources: (none)

The project would not change energy requirements or the energy supply. The project would not change aircraft/vehicle traffic patterns that could alter fuel usage. The project would not impact fuel, electricity, gas, water, wood, asphalt, aggregate, or other construction material supplies.

(K) Noise and Compatible Land Use

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to non-compatible land uses and local land use standards (2) Changes in operational activity, fleet mix, flight tracks, or engine runups (3) Modeling requirements

Note: Effective 5/29/15 all modeling must be completed with AEDT. See FRN:

<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/05/15/2015-11803/noise-fuel-burn-and-emissions-modeling-using-the-aviation-environmental-design-tool-version-2b>

Resources:

(1) FAA 5050.4B Desk Reference noise section:

http://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/environmental_desk_ref/media/desk-ref-chap17.pdf

(2) FAA noise/land use compatibility chart: http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=1ae7ac2b63580049ff71cc00a57ce7fa&mc=true&node=ap14.3.150_135.a&rgn=di

[v9](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=1ae7ac2b63580049ff71cc00a57ce7fa&mc=true&node=ap14.3.150_135.a&rgn=di)

There will not be any impacts in these categories.

- (1) The proposed Runway 8-26 Approach Clearing project will not result in any non-compatible land uses or have any impacts on local land use standards. After clearing work is complete, there would be no noise impacts and the project would be compatible with surrounding land uses.
- (2) This project will not result in any permanent changes in operational activity, fleet mix, flight tracks, or engine runups. The project would allow nighttime approach operations to resume on Runway 8-26, the secondary runway, which are currently NOTAM'd as unavailable due to obstructions.
- (3) Noise modeling is not required since the proposed project will not result in any changes to operations or fleet mix.

(L) Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts from property acquisition and/or relocation of displaced persons/businesses (2) Impacts to population, economic activity, employment, income, public services, transportation networks, and planned development (3) Impacts to minority and low-income populations (4) Impacts to children

Resources:

- (1) Census Bureau fact finder: <http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- (2) Bureau of Economic Analysis: <http://www.bea.gov/>
- (3) EPA EJ Screen: <http://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/>

The project would have no impacts on socioeconomics, environmental justice, children’s environmental health, or safety. The work associated with the approach end of Runway 26 is located entirely on existing airport property. The work at the approach end of Runway 8 is located both on and off airport property. The area at the approach end of Runway 8 is wooded and vacant of houses or development. Nearby residential areas are unlikely to notice the tree removal in the project area or be affected by the removal activity. Avigation easements would be acquired over one City of Greenville parcel and one private parcel in order to perform the work. There would be no relocation of displaced persons/businesses.

(M) Visual Effects (including light emissions)

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to residential areas, Section 106 resources, Section 4(f) properties, protected coastal areas and rivers, scenic roads/byways, scenic trails, and sensitive wildlife species (2) Impacts from new construction or modification (3) Impacts from object removal (e.g. trees, buildings, etc)

Resources: (none)

The tree removal at the approach end of Runway 8 is surrounded by a larger forested area. The clearing would not be visible to residential areas. There are no Section 106 resources, Section 4(f) properties, coastal areas, scenic byways, scenic trails in or near the project area. No new lighting will be installed as part of this project.

Tree clearing at the approach end of Runway 8 will result in changes in the existing landscape. The underbrush and natural groundcover should re-establish in the tree clearing area. The area of cleared trees may be visible to people recreating on the Tar River. The campsite in the Phil Carroll Preserve is in a densely wooded area approximately 300 feet from the clearing boundary (see Figure 2a) and should not be visually impacted by the project.

There would be no visual effects to the Runway 26 project area, as grasses would quickly re-establish after grading activities are complete.

(N) Water Resources

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts to floodplains, wetlands, surface waters, groundwater, and wild and scenic rivers (2) Impacts to jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional wetlands (3) Impacts from increased stormwater runoff (4) Changes in hydrologic patterns (5) Impacts to ground water recharge capability and drinking water supplies (6) Impacts from sedimentation, petroleum/chemical/hazmat spills, or other factors causing water quality degradation (6) Impacts to NRI listed rivers, river segments, or study rivers

Resources:

- (1) FEMA Flood Map Service Center: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal>
- (2) USGS National Map: <http://viewer.nationalmap.gov/viewer/>
- (3) USFWS National Wetland Inventory: <http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>
Note: The NWI is not considered an official wetland delineation.
- (4) NPS National River Inventory: <http://www.nps.gov/ncrc/programs/rtca/nri/index.html>
- (5) National Wild and Scenic River's website <http://www.rivers.gov/map.php>

- (1) Floodplains: A majority of the airport lies within the Tar River 100-year floodplain (Flood Zone AE) as shown on the effective FEMA Flood Insurance rate maps (FIRM's) and Figure 5. The clearing activity at the approach end of Runway 8 is entirely located within the Zone AE floodway for the Tar River. Work in this area will consist of the removal of trees with the stumps to remain. Debris from tree removal will be removed from the project site. No fill will be placed in the floodway.

The work at the approach end of Runway 26 is within the 100- and 500-year Flood Zones. Work will consist of minimal grading. Soils on site will be moved within the site, and no additional fill will be place within the flood zone.

Surface Waters: The project would temporarily impact nearby surface waters, including the Tar River, during clearing activities. However, since no ground clearing or stump grubbing will occur in the project area, the impacts on surface waters due to erosion would be minor. Any impacts would not be adverse.

Groundwater: Contact with groundwater is unlikely under this project.

Wild and Scenic Rivers: There are no rivers classified as Wild and Scenic Rivers in Pitt County.

- (2) Wetlands: The USFWS National Wetland Inventory (NWI) map indicates freshwater forested/shrub wetlands within the project area along the Tar River (Figure 6). The entire Runway 8 project area is mapped as freshwater forested/shrub and riverine wetlands.

A site visit was conducted by EPI in February 2017. The wetland survey confirmed a large portion of the Runway 8 project area is within potentially jurisdictional wetlands. A ditch is located on the boundary of the Runway 26 project area. The project involves removal of trees in the wetland area; however, no dredge/fill is proposed. Surface disturbance will be avoided in wetlands and stumps will remain in place to minimize erosion. Therefore, there is no requirement for a Jurisdictional Determination or permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. The Army Corps of Engineers will be notified prior to construction.

The City of Greenville requests that equipment accessing the Phil Carroll Nature Preserve utilize the old logging paths wherever possible to reduce temporary construction impacts on wetlands. Clearing within wetlands will be performed by either hand clearing methods or by use of logging mats and/or clearing equipment specifically designed for work in wetland areas. Grubbing of stumps and roots will not be allowed.

- (3) No appreciable increase in stormwater runoff rates is anticipated with this project. Tree stumps and understory vegetation will remain to prevent erosion.
- (4) The project will have no impact on the overall hydrologic/ drainage patterns within the project area.
- (5) There are no anticipated impacts to groundwater recharge capability or drinking water supplies.
- (6) Best management practices will be required/employed during construction to minimize the potential for sedimentation, petroleum/chemical/hazmat spills, or other factors that have the potential to cause water quality degradation.
- (7) There are no National River Inventory listed rivers, river segments, or study rivers in or near the project area. A 93-mile segment of the Tar River is listed in Nash, Franklin, Vance, Granville, and Person Counties. The reach of the Tar River within the project area is not a NRI-listed segment.

(O) Cumulative Impacts

Factors to consider: (1) Impacts from “other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of agency or person” (40 CFR § 1508.7) (2) Impacts on and off airport property (3) Study area varies for each environmental resource

Resources:

- (1) CEQ cumulative effects:
http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/nepapub/nepa_documents/RedDont/G-CEQ-ConsidCumulEffects.pdf

Trees will be cleared within the project area at the approach end of Runway 8, similar to past removal of tree obstructions in the Runway 20 approach. Stumps and understory vegetation will remain. The proposed tree removal and past airport tree removal is a relatively small area compared to the overall tree cover along the river corridor. The cleared areas are surrounded by undeveloped forest habitat. Cumulative impacts are not expected to be significant.

(P) Permits and Certifications

List all permits and certifications required to be obtained.

NCDEQ Sedimentation Erosion Control Permit/NPDES Stormwater Permit NCG 01000 will be required for temporary construction activities for the Runway 26 project area since grading will exceed 1 acre. There will be no ground disturbance in the Runway 8 project area; however, a NCDEQ Division of riparian buffer authorization for work in the Tar-Pamlico River Basin Buffer is required.

(Q) Mitigation

Describe mitigation required as part of the project. Include mitigation cost and when/where mitigation will occur. Do not include best management practices (BMPs).

None required.

(R) Public Involvement

List agencies and organizations that reviewed the proposed action.

North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) – Appendix B
US Fish & Wildlife Service – Appendix C
State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) – Appendix D
City of Greenville – Appendix E

In addition, this draft EA will be sent to the North Carolina State Clearinghouse.

Discuss additional public involvement actions taken. Please include the name and date(s) of newspaper publications. Attach affidavit or tear sheet.

A public information session will be held at the Pitt-Greenville Airport. This EA will be available for public review at the Airport and on its website.