United States Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
Great Lakes Region
Chicago, Illinois

RECORD OF DECISION

FOR
FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL EIS to 1992
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

INDIANAPOLIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
INDIANAPOLIS , INDIANA

November 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF EXHIBITS

LIST OF TABLES

---

1. FEDERAL AGENCY DECISIONS

This Record of Decision (ROD) provides final agency determinations and approvals for Federal actions by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). These actions include development of the Midfield Terminal, construction of a midfield access road, relocation of the Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT), and demolition of the existing passenger terminal and ATCT. These actions are necessary both for completion of certain safety initiatives as well as to allow for the development of the Midfield Terminal and its associated development.

The Federal actions are described in detail in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS), Indianapolis International Airport (IND), dated June 21, 2001. The agency's decisions are based on the information contained in the FSEIS and all other applicable documents available to the agency and considered by it, which constitute the administrative record.

This ROD is issued in accordance with the requirements of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 40 CFR 1505.2. The principal features include:

- A statement of the agency's decisions;
- An identification of all alternatives considered by the FAA in reaching its decision, with a specification of the alternative or alternatives that are considered to be environmentally preferable; and
- The means adopted (mitigation measures) to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected.

FAA DETERMINATION

Based on a review of the FSEIS approved on June 21, 2001 and all applicable information, it is the FAA's final determination that the proposed improvements indicated on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), as well as the associated safety actions, for IND are approved. This development is specifically described in Chapters 2, 4, and 5 of this ROD, and was identified in the FSEIS as the Proposed Project. In addition, this development is environmentally approved as being eligible for Federal financial assistance.

These approvals of the proposed ALP, safety actions, and FAA's determination of eligibility for Federal funding constitute final approval. The FAA notes that the airport sponsor, the Indianapolis Airport Authority (IAA) has agreed to the various conditions of this approval, in particular, the conditions requiring mitigation measures.

In reaching this determination, consideration has been given to 49 U.S.C. 47101 (a)(7), which states that it is the policy of the United States "that airport construction and improvement projects that increase the capacity of facilities to accommodate passenger and cargo traffic be undertaken to the maximum feasible extent so that safety and efficiency increase and delays decrease." Furthermore, the FAA has given careful consideration to: (a) the aviation safety and

operational objectives of the project in light of the various aeronautical factors and judgments presented; (b) the needs of the IND as part of the national air transportation system; and (c) the anticipated environmental impacts of the project.

The FAA has carefully considered all reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project. Although the No-Build Alternative had fewer developmental and environmental impacts (Wetlands, Biotic Communities, Threatened & Endangered Species, and construction-related impacts) than the preferred alternative and is the "environmentally preferred alternative," it failed to achieve the purposes and needs for this project. However, implementation of the Proposed Project will improve airport safety, public access, and passenger-handling efficiency. For the reasons summarized in this ROD, and supported by detailed discussion in the FSEIS, the FAA has determined that there is no possible, prudent, feasible, and practicable alternative to the Proposed Project Alternative, which is the agency's preferred alternative.

This ROD completes the approving agency's thorough and careful environmental review and decision-making process and is prepared and issued by the FAA 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 CEQ [40 CFR Parts 1500-1508] and FAA directives [Order 1050.1D and Order 5050.4A]. The 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 related statutes and regulations that apply to FAA decisions and actions on proposed projects.

This ROD provides the final FAA determinations and approvals based on environmental analysis and findings in the FSEIS. Based upon a review of the FSEIS approved on June 21, 2001, and all applicable information, it is FAA's final determination that implementation of the Proposed Project as depicted on the applicable ALP is environmentally approved.

2. BACKGROUND

In June 1992, the FAA issued the ROD on the *Final Environmental Impact Statement – Master Plan Development, Indianapolis International Airport*, environmentally approving the development of the Proposed Projects contained in that 1992 document. The Proposed Projects assessed in the 1992 Final Environmental Impact Statement (1992 FEIS) included nine primary actions of which five have been completed and four have not yet been initiated. Since the issuance of the 1992 FEIS and the associated ROD, specific changes to the location of the Midfield Terminal, the Midfield Terminal access road, and the Air Traffic Control Tower have been made which necessitated supplemental environmental documentation. The present FSEIS is the required supplementary environmental documentation to the 1992 FEIS.

A number of miscellaneous actions assessed in the 1992 FEIS are not included in the FSEIS because they have no relationship to the midfield development and/or are not otherwise ripe for development. **Exhibit E-1** shows the 1992 Airport Layout Plan (located at the end of this document), **Exhibit E-2** shows the completed projects assessed in the 1992 FEIS, and **Exhibit E-3** shows the elements and the status of the primary actions proposed in the 1992 FEIS (Appendix B, *Airport Layout Plan*, includes an updated ALP with all of the Proposed Project elements).

<u>Completed Actions</u>

- Construct a new 11,200-foot replacement Runway 5L/23R with associated taxiway development

- Develop a north taxiway to proposed Runway 5L/23R
- Develop a south taxiway to proposed Runway 5L/23R

- Develop a western taxiway parallel to existing Runway 14/32
- Relocate the Indiana Power & Light Company power lines west of the airport
- Relocate Bridgeport Road
- Implement the airport's Part 150 noise abatement air traffic actions

<u>Uncompleted Actions</u>

- Construct a new Midfield Terminal
  - Relocate the ATCT
- Construct a new midfield interchange at Interstate 70/Bridgeport Road (midfield interchange)
- Develop two cross-field taxiways
- Develop an additional high-speed taxiway exit for Runway 14/32 (The development of an additional high-speed taxiway for Runway 14/32 is no longer on the airport's Airport Layout Plan and is not being assessed as part of this evaluation.)

While the majority of the actions assessed in the 1992 FEIS have been completed, the Midfield Terminal, midfield interchange, and associated developments have not been constructed (see **Exhibit E-2,** *Projects Assessed in 1992 that are Complete)*. However, there have been a number of steps taken toward the development of these projects. These include: completion of environmental mitigation as detailed in the 1992 FEIS (i.e., wetlands and "Indiana Bat" habitat); construction of replacement Runway 5L/23R, which opened the midfield site for development; partial removal of old Runway 5L/23R and relocation of navigational aids (NAVAIDS); and the preparation of additional studies to further define the Midfield Terminal project Peer Review Process of Midfield Terminal Studies, Terminal Area Master Plan, Indianapolis International Airport Midfield Terminal Project Definition Manual (Project Definition). The development of an additional high-speed taxiway for Runway 14/32 is no longer on the airport's ALP and is not being assessed as part of this evaluation.

Since the ROD was issued on the 1992 FEIS, several environmental and planning studies have been conducted that have updated environmental analysis or have recommended programs that affect the airport:

- **1995 -** ***Federal Highway Administration Environmental Assessment (1995 FHWA EA):*** The 1995 FHWA EA environmentally assessed the potential impacts of several roadway improvements near the airport including the realignment of I-70, a new interchange at I-70 and Six Points Road, and a new midfield interchange at I-70. In addition, the relocation of a navigational aid and the pillars for a future taxiway bridge would be constructed as part of the I-70 relocation. Because the midfield interchange is also included in this FSEIS, the FAA is coordinating the preparation of this FSEIS with the FHWA regarding impacts and mitigation from the midfield interchange, as well as the cumulative impacts of both projects. Where applicable,
- the 1995 FHWA EA has been incorporated into this FSEIS by reference. In addition to the environmental impact evaluation, the 1995 FHWA EA provided the currently proposed location and configuration of the midfield interchange, which was different from the interchange location which was described in the 1992 FEIS.
- **1997 -** ***FAR Part 150 Update:*** This document contained two components: Noise Exposure Maps (NEM) and a Noise Compatibility Program (NCP). As part of the NEM analysis, the forecast of operations and fleet mix for the year 2002 were updated. This forecast represents the latest and most accurate data regarding future fleet mix for the airport. The recommended measures of the NCP set forth modifications to the preferential runway use program, flight track locations, and Noise Abatement Departure Procedures for Runways 23L/R. These recommendations guide the airport's current noise abatement policies.
- **1999 -** ***Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS):*** This SEIS disclosed the potential impacts from implementing the noise abatement air traffic procedures recommended in the 1997 FAR Part 150 Update. The FAA issued a ROD on March 17, 2000 providing the environmental clearance to implement the NCP measures.
- **2000 -** ***Indianapolis International Airport Project Definition Manual:*** In 1999, the IAA initiated the planning analysis phase of the recommendations for development of a Midfield Terminal, which has been a part of the airport's master plans since the 1970's. This planning analysis was preceded by two preliminary planning documents: the *Terminal Area Master Plan* and the *Peer Review Process.* Both the *Terminal Area Master Plan* and the *Peer Review Process* confirmed the need for a Midfield Terminal and recommended further study. The ***Indianapolis International Airport Project Definition Manual*** (Project Definition) was completed in April 2000. Design and construction of the Midfield Terminal has not begun. The environmental approval of this FSEIS by the FAA is required for this project. In addition, several other steps need to be completed before construction can proceed.

The Project Definition defines the program requirements and establishes design criteria and guide specifications for all facilities needed to accommodate the forecast passenger demand at IND in the year 2010. It includes drawings, diagrams, and narrative text describing the layout and details of the terminal building and all required support facilities of the Midfield Terminal. The project description for the midfield terminal area has evolved since the completion of the 1992 FEIS. The Project Definition provides the most current (1999 conditions), detailed description of the proposed development. The analysis of environmental impacts in the 1992 FEIS will be compared with the current project description and updated, if necessary.

The proposed Midfield Terminal, midfield interchange and associated airside developments as defined in the Project Definition would be located between Runway 5R/23L and Runway 5L/23R. These improvements are included in the FSEIS and will collectively be referred to as the Proposed Project.

- **2000 - *Midfield Terminal Benefit-Cost Analysis:*** In 2000, the IAA engaged Leigh Fisher Associates to perform a benefit-cost analysis of airfield elements of the Midfield Terminal Program. This analysis was performed in accordance with FAA policies and guidance regarding benefit-cost analyses. The purpose of the analysis was twofold: (1) to ensure that the airfield elements of the Midfield Terminal Program have positive economic justification and are superior in this regard to other terminal development alternatives, and (2) to support an application to the FAA for a Letter of Intent securing Federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funds for the Midfield Terminal Program.

  The findings of the benefit-cost analysis indicate that the present value of project benefits-which include reductions in airline taxi time, airline delay, and passenger travel time-exceed the present value of project costs by $70.6 million. These findings also indicate that the airside elements of the Midfield Terminal Program will provide several "hard-to-quantify" benefits, including enhanced margins of safety for aircraft operations, environmental benefits, and increased airline operating efficiencies.

- **2000 - *Airport Traffic Control Tower Siting Study:*** The IAA has conducted a planning study to evaluate and recommend a location for the new ATCT. The IAA has been coordinating these efforts with the FAA. While all sites examined included some drawbacks, the preferred site for the ATCT was selected based upon the best long-term view of the airfield. This ATCT location was environmentally assessed in the FSEIS, and referenced in the attached ALP, subject to approval in this ROD. Through the siting process, which included computer modeling of the airfield view with the assistance of the FAA Tech Center, potential line-of-sight issues were identified with the southeastern end of Runway 14/32. In follow-on to this study, alternatives for meeting the line-of-sight requirements for the southeastern end of Runway 14/32 are under study by the IAA in active ongoing coordination with the FAA and local airline tenants. As of the date of this ROD, the preferred siting alternative includes the modification of structures attached to the FedEx building and the displacement or relocation of Runway 32 landing and takeoff thresholds by up to 582 feet. The FSEIS assessed and considered these actions as necessary for maximizing the functionality of the ATCT, and the attached ALP shows the preferred siting alternative. The FSEIS assesses the impacts of the ATCT including its location, and displacement of the runway threshold as stated above and reflected on the ALP. The IAA has committed to implementing, and this ROD constitutes approval of these actions to support relocation of the ATCT.

THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO INDIANAPOLIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

The 1992 FEIS utilized the latest available planning design guidelines and forecasts of passengers and operations available at that time to define the design elements of the Midfield Terminal, midfield interchange, and associated developments. Exhibit E-1 (located at the end of this document), shows the proposed layout for the Midfield Terminal as defined in 1992. However, at that time, a number of the design elements were unavailable or were preliminary estimates. Since 1992, the IAA has conducted a number of studies to refine and update the design elements of the Midfield Terminal. These studies, including the most recent Project Definition, have incorporated the latest planning guidelines regarding gate use factors, commercial/retail space, ticket

check-in areas, baggage claim space, moving sidewalk requirements, aircraft gate requirements, parking and automobile requirements. The result is that most of the individual design elements from the 1992 FEIS have been refined and updated. However, the overall design objectives for the Midfield Terminal, built to meet the latest planning guidelines and to accommodate future passenger and aircraft demand, remain consistent with that stated in and assessed in the 1992 FEIS.

For the FSEIS, the Proposed Project consists of, and environmentally reviews, a new Midfield Terminal and associated development (relocation of Airport Traffic Control Tower, development of midfield interchange, and construction of cross-field taxiways). **Exhibit E-3,** *Proposed Project Elements* (located at the end of this document), shows the Proposed Project elements being evaluated in the FSEIS. **Table T-1,** *Comparison of 1992 FEIS Project Description with the Proposed Project* (located at the end of this chapter), provides a comparison of the project elements from the 1992 FEIS and the Proposed Project.

The Midfield Terminal as defined in the 1992 FEIS was anticipated to open in 2001 and was designed to accommodate forecasted 2005 levels of enplaned passengers and operations. The Project Definition, completed in April 2000, updated the opening year to 2005 and defined the design elements to accommodate 5,500,000 enplaned passengers, which was based on updated forecasts for 2010. Since the preparation of the Project Definition, the FAA FY2000 Terminal Area Forecasts (TAF) for IND have been updated and report 5,287,635 enplaned passengers and 310,142 annual operations for 2010. The enplaned passenger projections in the TAF and the Project Definition are within four percent of each other. Because the TAF and Project Definition forecasts of enplaned passengers are similar and the TAF is FAA's official forecast of aviation activity at FAA facilities, the TAF projections will be used throughout this analysis.

The 1992 FEIS definition of the Midfield Terminal anticipated the need for 45 air carrier gates and 28 commuter spaces (turbo-prop) to accommodate the aircraft fleet projected for 2005. The updated definition of the Midfield Terminal in the Project Definition has 40 air carrier gates and two turbo-prop commuter gates. The difference in the number of gates is due to changes in the terminal design, which reflects higher gate utilization, increased passenger service level requirements, and updated aircraft requirement assumptions to reflect changes in updated forecasts of fleet mix. The change in the number of turbo-prop gates is due to the switch nationally from turbo-prop aircraft to regional jet aircraft for commuter operations. This change was not fully anticipated when the forecasts for the 1992 FEIS were prepared. Consequently, the number of turbo-prop spaces was significantly reduced in the Project Definition to reflect updated forecasts for turbo-prop operations. The regional jets, which are replacing the turbo-prop aircraft, would utilize the same gates as air carrier jet aircraft.

The overall square footage (680,000 square feet) of the Midfield Terminal in the 1992 FEIS is smaller than the Midfield Terminal described in the Project Definition (1,210,200 square feet); however, with the building and apron areas they both create the same approximate footprint. The increase in terminal square footage is a function of the latest planning/design guidelines for air passenger terminals, which call for more passenger gate space, increased commercial/retail space, larger ticket check-in areas, more passenger bag claim space and bag make-up areas, moving sidewalk requirements, and aircraft gates to accommodate a variety of aircraft types. The analysis of environmental impacts provided in the 1992 FEIS was not based on the square footage of the proposed Midfield Terminal; therefore, the 1992 FEIS environmental analysis is independent of either an increase or decrease in square footage. In view of the foregoing, the 1992 FEIS environmental analysis for the Midfield Terminal remains valid for use in the FSEIS for all areas except energy consumption, which was updated as necessary. The existing terminal and parking garages will be closed and demolished after the Midfield Terminal is constructed and operational.

The parking requirements in the 1992 FEIS underestimated the increased need for parking spaces resulting from the increase in enplaned passengers. Therefore, updated automobile parking requirements for 2010 were prepared and resulted in an increase in the number of surface and garage parking spaces proposed for the Midfield Terminal. The updated parking requirements include a total of 15,800 parking spaces (2,800 garage and 13,000 surface), which is 4,800 more spaces than projected in the 1992 FEIS. The 1992 FEIS did not define the terminal area apron necessary for the Midfield Terminal. The Project Definition has identified the proposed layout and size of 572,150 square yards for the midfield terminal area apron.

The 1992 FEIS identified the need and assessed the impact for relocating the ATCT to a new location on the airfield. It did not, however, identify the exact location for the ATCT. An ATCT siting study was conducted at the end of 2000 and found that among the 14 alternative locations, Site B (southwest of the Midfield Terminal) was the preferred location based on line-of-sight and airfield view. This ATCT location is depicted on the ALP and was environmentally assessed in the FSEIS. In addition, the

FSEIS environmentally assessed and the ALP depicts a runway threshold displacement of up to 582 feet for Runway 14/32, that would provide for an unobstructed view from the ATCT.

The automobile access to the Midfield Terminal was defined in general terms in the 1992 FEIS as being a new midfield interchange off I-70 near Bridgeport Road. No specific plans of the location or design were available in 1992. The 1995 FHWA EA evaluated the impacts of several roadway improvements including the midfield interchange. In addition to disclosing the potential environmental impacts, the 1995 FHWA EA provided the specific location and configuration of the midfield interchange. Where applicable, the 1995 FHWA EA is incorporated into the FSEIS by reference. Service roads and interior circulation roadways were not specifically defined in the 1992 FEIS. The FSEIS now provides the environmental assessment pertinent to the location of the airfield service and interior circulation roadways.

In order to provide the necessary aircraft access between both sides of the airfield with a midfield terminal, two cross-field taxiways were proposed in the 1992 FEIS. To complete this, one existing taxiway was to be extended and another taxiway was to be constructed. The construction of a new taxiway has been completed (Taxiway P, 1996), but, as of the date of this ROD, the extension to Taxiway R has not been completed because the Midfield Terminal has not been constructed. In addition to refining the design of the Midfield Terminal, the Project Definition has reassessed the operation of the cross-field taxiways. The Project Definition found that to provide efficient aircraft taxi-flow to and from the Midfield Terminal and across the airfield, a dual taxiway system would be the preferred configuration. To accomplish this, the extension of Taxiway R as recommended in the 1992 FEIS would be completed and an additional cross-field taxiway just north of Taxiway R would be constructed. The proposed cross-field taxiways are still within the same general area assessed in the 1992 FEIS and would still include the extension of an existing taxiway and the construction of another cross-field taxiway. All completed actions at the airport, and all not yet completed actions of the Proposed Project, were either previously assessed environmentally or have now been so assessed in the FSEIS. Uncompleted airport actions not part of the Proposed Project will be environmentally assessed when ripe for Federal decision.

Table T-1

COMPARISON OF 1992 FEIS PROJECT DESCRIPTION WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Indianapolis International Airport

Proposed Project	Existing Terminal	1992 FEIS Project		Proposed Project Definition	
Midfield Terminal	**2000 (estimate)**	**2001**	**2005**	**2005**	**2010**
Total aircraft	258,124	359,882*	389,557*	284,133**	310,142**
Enplaned	3,869,672	4,494,600*	5,041,000*	4,576,588**	5,287,635**
Earliest opening	-	2001		2005	
Design demands	-	2005		2010	
Aircraft gates	34 air carrier	45 air carrier		40 air carrier	

	4 concourses		
Square footage [2]	458,379	680,000	1,210,200
Total parking spaces	10,915	11,000[3]	15,800[4]
Existing terminal facilities	-	Closure and demolition	Same as 1992 FEIS
Terminal area apron	330,603 square yards	The dimensions of the terminal apron were not defined in the 1992 FEIS, because the design was conceptual	572,150 square yards
Airport Traffic Control Tower	-	New tower, demolish old tower	Additional measures to provide unobstructed views of the runway end and demolition of old tower.
Airport entrance roadway from the southwest, Midfield Interchange	-	New roadway	Modified from the 1992 FEIS – interchange has moved approximately 0.75 miles east of the location assessed in the 1992 FEIS
Associated service roads	-	New roadway	Modified from the 1992 FEIS
Airfield Development			
Cross-field taxiways	-	Existing taxiway extension and new taxiway development	Existing taxiway extension and new taxiway development at different location.

* 1990 IAA Master Plan Update forecasts.

** FAA FY2000 Terminal Area Forecasts (TAF). Forecasts in the *Indianapolis International Airport, Midfield Terminal Project Definition, Project Definition Manual*, did not include operations and were slightly lower than the TAF for enplaned passengers (2005 – 4,700,000, 2010 – 5,500,000).

[1] The 1992 FEIS analysis assumed that the proposed Midfield Terminal would be developed as early as 2001 and sized to accommodate 2005 demands. The IAA Project Definition Manual (2000) assumes that the Midfield Terminal would be developed as early as 2005 and sized to accommodate 2010 demands.

[2] Includes the terminal building and concourses for passenger processing, baggage, ticketing, concession, and office space.

[3] 1,000 garage parking spaces and 10,000 surface parking spaces.

[4] 2,800 garage parking spaces and 13,000 surface parking spaces.

Source: *Indianapolis International Airport, Midfield Terminal Project Definition, Project Definition Manual*, Volume 3, April 2000. Environmental Management Plan Section. Indianapolis International Airport website.

3. AGENCY ACTIONS

The Federal actions are:

- The approval of revisions to the ALP for construction and operation of proposed airport development, listed in full in Chapter 2 of the FSEIS;
- The Federal environmental approval necessary to proceed with processing of an application for 1) Federal funding for those development items qualifying under the former Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended and recodified at 49 U.S.C. 47101 et seq. and 2) approval for the collection and use of passenger facility charges (PFC) under the former Federal Aviation Act, as amended and recodified at 49 U.S.C. 40117.
- The environmental approval of transfers of certain lands in the Midfield Terminal, and the Six Points Interchange with I-70 areas (exhibits 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4 of the FSEIS) between Indiana Department of Transportation (InDOT) and IAA.

The necessary Federal determinations and approvals are summarized below:

A. Approval under existing or future FAA criteria of project eligibility for Federal grant-in-aid funds and/or PFC's, including the following elements:

- Land Acquisition/Land Transfer
- Site Preparation
- Taxiway Construction and Appropriate Displaced Threshold Marking, if Needed
- Terminal, ATCT, and Other Landside Development
- Installation of NAVAIDS
- Environmental mitigation

B. Unconditional approval of the revised ALP for the projects identified and assessed in the FSEIS as depicted on the ALP (Appendix B).

C. Determination and actions, through the aeronautical study process of any off-airport obstacles that might be obstructions to the navigable airspace under the standards and criteria of 14 CFR Part 77.

D. Evaluation of the appropriateness of proposals for on-airport development from an airspace utilization and safety perspective based on aeronautical studies and criteria of 14 CFR Part 157.

E. Development of air traffic control and air space management procedures, as appropriate to the displaced threshold.

F. Determinations that air quality impacts associated with the Proposed Project are of such a nature that the Proposed Project conforms to all applicable provisions of the Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended.

G. FAA determination that there would be no undue burden (i.e., unusual circumstances) barring the IAA and/or InDOT from obtaining Clean Water Act Section 404 permit for the filling of wetlands.

H. FAA determination that there would be no undue burden (i.e., unusual circumstances) barring IAA from obtaining a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for stormwater and/or wastewater discharges.

I. FAA determination that release and transfer of Proposed Project-related IAA and/or InDOT lands as

needed for construction is environmentally approved. The proposed transfer shall be subject to the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 47107 (h).

J. FAA approval of the relocated portion of I-70 as depicted on the revised ALP.

K. FAA approval for the removal of structures attached to the FedEx Building.

L. FAA approval of the location of airfield service and interior circulation roadways as depicted on the revised ALP.

4. PURPOSE AND NEED

The 1992 FEIS stated that the construction of a new Midfield Terminal was needed to meet future long-term aircraft parking and passenger processing requirements. The facility requirements from the airport's Master Plan Update, prepared in 1990, were based on meeting aviation demand for the year 2005. Because ten years had passed, the Project Definition, prepared in 2000, revised the facility requirements for the Midfield Terminal based on updated forecasts of enplaned passengers for 2010; 5,500,000 enplaned passengers. After the publication of the Project Definition, the FAA's FY 2000 TAF was updated for IND and reported 5,287,635 enplaned passengers and 310,142 annual operations for 2010. The TAF projection of enplaned passengers for 2010 is approximately four percent lower than the enplaned passenger forecasts in the Project Definition for 2010. For the analyses contained in this FSEIS, the TAF projections of enplaned passengers and annual operations will be used for consistency.

The tragic events of September 11, 2001 have led to increased security and reduced activity at IND and other airports nationwide. Although this project was proposed and evaluated prior to September 11, 2001, the proposed project would still meet important needs at IND as evaluated by the FSEIS. The long-term forecasts included in the FSEIS are based on the best available data and valid assumptions, and the Proposed Action and its need are still sound. Long-term forecasts assume that temporary downturns or upswings may occur during the forecast period. In the past, aviation activity has undergone significant, although temporary, reductions in response to economic downturns or security events such as the Persian Gulf War, but recovered in the longer term.

The Project Definition states that the Midfield Terminal could be developed as early as 2005, and the facility should be sized to accommodate 2010 demands. Therefore, the baseline year for this FSEIS is 2005, representing opening year conditions and 2010 representing the five-year future condition. The purpose and need in the 1992 FEIS based the development of the Midfield Terminal on meeting future aviation demand. Increased aviation demand remains forecasted for IND, therefore the purpose and need remains adequate, accurate, and valid regarding the development of the Midfield Terminal.

The Proposed Project also includes the relocation of the ATCT, the development of a midfield terminal interchange, and construction of cross-field taxiways. The primary purpose for these actions, as stated in the 1992 FEIS, is to support the operation of the new Midfield Terminal. Because the new Midfield Terminal has not yet been constructed, none of these projects have been necessary. The need for providing access by aircraft and automobiles to the new Midfield Terminal and orienting the ATCT in the most efficient location still exists. However, each of these improvements has been slightly modified to accommodate the revised design of the Midfield Terminal. Nevertheless, the Purpose and Need chapter in the 1992 FEIS regarding the associated development projects remains adequate, accurate, and valid.

The 1999 SEIS for air traffic procedure changes did not assess the impact to noise from the development and operation of the Midfield Terminal nor the other associated developments being assessed in this FSEIS. It did however, assess air traffic recommendations from the 1997 FAR Part 150 Update and prepared the approved future (2002) noise exposure contour for the airport.

5. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The alternatives chapter in the 1992 FEIS provided a discussion of alternatives for the Proposed Project. These included the

use of other modes of transportation, use of other airport facilities, and various alternatives to the development of airport facilities. The following paragraphs discuss the validity and accuracy of the 1992 FEIS alternatives analysis.

Other Modes of Transportation

The 1992 FEIS found that the use of other modes of transportation (e.g., rail, bus, and automobile) would not eliminate the need for future airport development. Alternative modes of transportation offer feasible alternatives to the air traveler, particularly those traveling 250 miles or less. However, only two of the top 28 market cities fall within 250 highway miles and only two are within 250 air miles. Beyond 250 miles, alternative modes of transportation become less desirable because of the cost and time to reach the market. The use of other modes of transportation remains an inadequate alternative for meeting transportation demand today.

Use of Other Airports

In order to assess the use of other airports in the area, the 1992 FEIS analyzed the capability and benefit of developing other airport facilities in the Indianapolis Metropolitan Area (IMA). The 1992 FEIS found that the use of other airports in the metro area would not be a feasible or reasonable alternative because none of the nearby airports had the necessary runways and terminal facilities to accommodate commercial jet aircraft. None of the airports in the metropolitan area have added the necessary facilities since the 1992 FEIS was prepared.

With no feasible airports in the metropolitan area, the 1992 FEIS analyzed the use of the closest air carrier airports. The closest air carrier airport is Terre Haute (HUF), however this airport was not found to be a feasible or reasonable alternative since it is located nearly 70 miles from Indianapolis. Additionally, HUF does not have adequate passenger demand to entice national carriers to add service to the level currently provided at IND. No new air carrier airports have been developed closer to Indianapolis since the 1992 FEIS was prepared.

Terminal Concepts

Expansion of the existing terminal was discussed in the 1992 FEIS as an alternative to the Midfield Terminal. Four different concepts were analyzed, however, each would result in severe construction disruption and would exacerbate automobile congestion and air quality impacts north of the airport along I-465 and within the existing terminal area. These impacts, as disclosed in the 1992 FEIS analysis, would still be present if the existing terminal were to be expanded. Therefore, the expansion of the existing terminal is not a reasonable alternative to the Proposed Project.

Alternative Access Concepts

The 1992 FEIS also discussed two airport roadway access concepts including improving the existing access roadway system and an alternative access roadway system. The findings indicated that the existing roadway system could be improved to serve an expanded existing terminal. However, even with improvements, the existing roadway system would not be a reasonable alternative for serving a midfield terminal because it would result in substantial redevelopment of airport support facilities and would cause severe disruption of airfield activities.

The alternative access roadway system would serve the airport from a midfield interchange off I-70, south of the airport. The 1992 FEIS found that the south access roadway system was the best option for reaching the new Midfield Terminal based on airport disruption and traffic flow. It was also found that it would be infeasible to serve the existing terminal from a south access roadway system because of space limitations and airport support facility relocations. The concept of a south access roadway system from I-70 is being continued in the FSEIS. Moreover, the 1995 FHWA EA found that locating the midfield interchange 0.75 miles farther south than proposed in the 1992 FEIS would result in an improved roadway configuration with the proposed relocated I-70. Chapter Four*, Environmental Consequences*, assesses the midfield roadway including the updated location of the interchange at I-70.

Because the 1992 FEIS analysis of alternatives continues to remain valid today, the subsequent finding that the Proposed Project was the preferred choice also remains adequate, accurate, and valid.

Alternatives Environmentally assessed in the FSEIS

Under the NEPA, the FAA has a responsibility to explore and objectively evaluate all prudent, feasible, reasonable, and practical alternatives, including those not within the jurisdiction of the Federal agencies.

For major Federal actions in which the Federal Government, as a proprietor, plans and develops a Federal facility, the scope of alternatives considered by the sponsoring Federal agency is wide ranging and comprehensive. However, where the sponsor is not the Federal Government, but is a local government or private applicant, the Federal agency role is necessarily more limited with substantial weight given to the preferences of the local sponsor.

In determining the best way to meet the needs identified in the FSEIS, the FAA identified numerous alternatives to the proposal. During this exploration of alternatives, all reasonable, feasible, prudent and practicable alternatives were carefully examined, ranging from the "No- Build/No-Action Alternative" to development alternatives including a future No-Build/No-Action Baseline, noise abatement air traffic action, land use compatibility action alternatives, and facility development alternatives.

It should be noted that NEPA requires that a No-Build/No-Action Alternative be considered in the environmental assessment of impacts. Although not always prudent, the No-Build Alternative is discussed as a potential alternative and serves as a baseline for the assessment of future conditions.

- **No-Build/No-Action Alternative:** This alternative would not include the construction of the Midfield Terminal, the midfield interchange, or relocate the ATCT.
- **Proposed Project Alternative:** Construction of the proposed Midfield Terminal, midfield interchange, new ATCT, and demolition of the existing passenger terminal and ATCT.

6. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

In accordance with 40 CFR 1505.3, the FAA will take necessary and appropriate steps, as described in this ROD, through Federal funding grant assurances and conditions, and airport layout plan approvals, to ensure that the following mitigation actions as described herein are implemented during project development. For its part, the FAA also commits to monitor the implementation of these mitigation measures. Thereafter, FAA will note any significant shortfalls in either the initiation or the implementation of required mitigation activities on behalf of the Airport Authority and appropriate remedial actions will be promptly undertaken as necessary. The approvals contained in this ROD are specifically conditioned upon full implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in this ROD which will, in turn, be made the subject of either a special condition, or conditions, to be included in future airport grants to the IAA.

A detailed environmental analysis of the potential environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the selected alternative was accomplished as part of the FSEIS. Two study periods were examined, 2005 and 2010. The year 2005 is projected to be the first year that the Midfield Terminal and associated development will be implemented and operational. Analysis of the year 2010 is provided to disclose the potential long-term environmental impacts associated with the proposed development. Development that is not reasonably foreseeable at this time and (i. e., future development actions, if any, not described and assessed in the FSEIS) is, therefore, not approved within this ROD. If any such future development actions become ripe for Federal decision at a later date, they will be subject to appropriate environmental review at that time.

This chapter of the ROD includes a summary of impacts and mitigation measures, which are discussed in the FSEIS, Chapter 5, for select environmental impact categories that have adverse impacts. After the mitigation discussion, the potential impacts and mitigation associated with the ATCT (ATCT) are also disclosed. A summary table of the impacts, **Table T-2**, *Environmental Impact Summary Matrix*, is included at the end of this chapter. Air Quality impacts are not included in Table T-2, because there are no discernable Proposed Project-related air quality impacts.

The primary responsibility for implementation of the identified necessary mitigation measures lies with the IAA. The FAA will have oversight responsibility and hereby conditions this ROD approval upon implementation of that mitigation, and FAA will further condition, through use of appropriate special conditions on grant award to IAA, implementation of these mitigation measures. The mitigation measures for those impact categories where mitigation measures are necessary to avoid or minimize

significant environmental impacts are summarized below. Also summarized below are the identified or adopted monitoring and enforcement programs applicable to this project.

Given all of the above, FAA hereby finds that all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been adopted, through appropriate mitigation planning, in accordance with all applicable environmental laws, regulations, and statutes.

Noise, Compatible Land Use, and Social Impacts and Mitigation

Impacts

Application of the Integrated Noise Model as described in the FSEIS, indicates that eleven houses will likely be newly impacted, via inclusion within the 65 DNL noise contours, by implementation of the 2005 proposed Midfield Terminal portion of the Project; however, only one of the houses was not already included in a previous land use mitigation program. It is further anticipated, however, that these houses would no longer be within the 65 DNL contours by the year 2010. Finally, an analysis of the predicted noise exposure in this area for the years 2007 (see FSEIS Appendix G, *Supplemental Environmental Analysis*) and 2010, also indicates that the total amount of land area within the 65 DNL noise contours will decrease with or without the implementation of the Proposed Project.

Three additional residential structures will be acquired and the residents relocated as a result of implementing the proposed midfield interchange development portion of the Proposed Project. These three houses were also identified for future acquisition in a previous noise mitigation program area.

Mitigation

It is recommended that the area occupied by the eleven homes be reassessed for noise impacts through an updated FAR Part 150 Study (IAA is planning to update the 1997 FAR Part 150 Update Study beginning in 2002). Alternatively, a separate noise impact analysis closer to the opening date of the Midfield Terminal would be undertaken. Any homes remaining within the 65 DNL will be offered mitigation (i.e., either "buy-out" or insulation) as determined appropriate by IAA. Any such homes "bought-out," including the residential structures to be acquired for the proposed midfield interchange portion of the project, will be subject to the requirements of the Uniform Relocation and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act.

Environmental Justice Impacts and Mitigation

Impacts

Adverse impacts to minority and/or low-income populations are not anticipated with the Proposed Project Alternative. As stated in Table 4.3-1 of the FSEIS, the majority of the airport environ's population (96.9 percent) is White, and the median household income is $ 33,842, well above the national poverty level of $ 15,000. Implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would not disproportionately impact minority and/or low-income populations.

Mitigation

Since implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would not disproportionately impact minority and/or low-income populations, no environmental justice impact mitigation is either needed or proposed.

Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources (DOT Section 4(f) and 6(f)) Impacts and Mitigation

Impacts

Two historical sites, 50023 and 80094, were identified in the 1995 FHWA EA as potentially significant and possibly eligible for inclusion in the State or National Register of Historic Places. The two historic sites were included in the 1995 Memorandum of Agreement (1995 MOA) that was signed among the FAA's Chicago Airports District Office, the Advisory Council on Historic

Preservation, and the IAA. The MOA allowed the acquisition of the parcels and removal of the structures (see Appendix D, of the FSEIS, *Historic Properties Consultation*) if impacted by the Proposed project. Only the outbuildings associated with historical site 80094, an unnamed I-House, would be impacted by the proposed midfield interchange. However, the structure itself would not be impacted by the Proposed Project. It was also found that the Proposed Project would have no impact on the other historical site, 50023, as that site would be avoided entirely.

Two additional historical sites, 50026 and 50035, are located within the 65 DNL and greater noise contour of the 2005 No-Build and the 2005 Proposed Project conditions. The proposed Midfield Terminal portion of the Proposed Project would create no new ambient noise impacts to these historic sites. Both of the sites would be avoided entirely by the construction of the proposed project. Historic site 50026 was also included in the 1995 MOA and is now the property of the IAA. Land use mitigation in the form of sound insulation has been offered to the owners of site 50035.

The 1995 FHWA EA also identified three archaeological sites as potentially significant in the midfield interchange construction area. At the time of their identification, these sites were denoted as possibly eligible for inclusion in the State and/or National Register of Historic Places. Further testing and avoidance was recommended for the three archeological sites. Phase II test excavations were done and a summary report prepared. The report determined that the cultural resources found at the sites are not in fact eligible for nomination to either the State or National Register of Historic Places.

Construction activities associated with the proposed Midfield Terminal will occur in an area adjacent to, but not within the confines of, the Lick Creek Friends Cemetery. Any disturbance of ground within 100 feet of a recorded cemetery requires the submission of a development plan to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) to ensure that the cemetery remains undisturbed. The required development plan will be prepared by the IAA for submission to IDNR, and this plan will provide assurance that the cemetery will remain undisturbed. A second unnamed cemetery in the east airfield area was also identified in the IDNR coordination letter. This second cemetery is, however, entirely outside of the construction area and will be undisturbed by Proposed Project construction activities.

Mitigation

One of two historic sites, site 80094, was included in the 1995 MOA and is impacted by the Proposed Project. It was determined earlier that the outbuildings associated with historical site 80094 would be removed as part of the proposed midfield interchange. Site 80094 has already been removed (see archaeologically report, Appendix D, of the FSEIS, *Historic Properties Consultation)*.

The FAA and IAA consulted with the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) as per the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) (NHPA) to make the determination that the three sites subjected to Phase II test excavations are non-significant in terms of historical objects (see Appendix D of the FSEIS, *Historic Properties Consultation*). The Indiana SHPO has concurred with the finding of the study. No further consultation was needed in regard to these sites.

The IAA has and will continue to maintain both the Lick Creek Friends Cemetery and the unnamed cemetery and provide access to interested parties. Coordination with the IDNR (See Appendix B of the FSEIS, *Federal Scoping*, for letter) is also being conducted to ensure that no impacts to the Lick Creek Friends Cemetery would occur. As the other unnamed cemetery is outside the construction area no further coordination is needed for it.

Air Quality Impacts and Mitigation

Impacts

Potential air quality impacts were considered and assessed, and it was determined that air quality impacts would be negligible. While no increase in aircraft operations will occur, there will be a small increase in facility emissions. All applicable air quality standards will be complied with.

Mitigation

In view of negligible air quality impacts, no mitigation for air quality was proposed.

Water Quality and Wetlands Impacts and Mitigation

Impacts

Maintenance and enhancement of water quality levels in the waterbodies in and around the airport's environs will rightly be a matter of ongoing concern both as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project and as a result of routine airport operations, such as aircraft maintenance and deicing. Project-related water quality impacts would result primarily from an increase in the airport's impervious surface area, and a consequent increased stormwater volume. The impervious area of the airport is expected to increase by about 10 percent due to implementation of the Proposed Project. Routine airport operations, however, are not expected to either increase or decrease due to implementation of the Proposed Project.

Implementation of the Proposed Project will result in the filling and culverting of a portion of the East Fork of White Lick Creek. In addition, approximately nine acres of wetlands will be filled as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation

The sponsor is required to provide all measures necessary and appropriate to mitigate water quality impacts. Moreover, the IAA is and will be subject to the substantive NPDES permitting requirements of the Clean Water Act. Currently, all the existing outfalls from the Airport are permitted and monitored as part of the existing NPDES permit. The Proposed Project incorporates specific elements designed to maintain and improve both existing and future water quality.

As of the time of this ROD, all of the necessary stormwater engineering work for the Midfield Terminal has not yet been completed and will not be for at least another year or so. Basically, however, the entire watershed will be re-engineered to insure that the Airport's glycol-containing runoff will not go into the East Fork of the White Lick Creek. All glycol-containing runoff will be diverted to the already operating Seerley Creek facility.

In accordance with longstanding requirements under both State and Federal pollution abatement statutes, the IAA will shortly update both its NPDES permit and its Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan. In addition, construction-related water quality impacts would be further mitigated by application of the Indiana Department of Transportation Standard Specifications and Special Provisions guidelines. Required NPDES permit revisions will be based on compliance with the applicable Indiana water quality standards.

IAA has committed to provide all measures necessary and appropriate to mitigate Proposed Project-related wetland and stream impacts, and these measures have either already been, or will shortly be, designed into the Proposed Project. In addition, the IAA has an ongoing, enforceable obligation to comply with all such measures as set forth in any existing or forthcoming Section 401 Water Quality Certification document and/or Section 404 permit, specifically including any required wetlands mitigation program.

An individual permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act was obtained from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE, the Corps) for project components originally assessed under the 1992 FEIS, including Wetlands 9, 11, and 12. The permit for completing construction activities that would impact these wetlands expired on July 31, 1997. The Corps has granted an extension to this time frame until July 31, 2003. A portion of the North Collector Channel did not exist in 1992. Construction activities in the new portion of the North Collector Channel are now covered in this permit extension.

All the wetland mitigation required within the existing Section 404 permit has been completed, and the permit extension did not require any additional mitigation.

An Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) NPDES permit, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, Stormwater Management Plan, and Spill Prevention and Countermeasure Plan will all be updated in the immediate future. Any permit and/or plan

revisions will be based on achieving/maintaining compliance with the applicable Indiana Water Quality Standards. The IAA has committed to implement all requirements set forth in its existing or forthcoming NPDES permits.

The North Collector Channel is and will be permitted for a specific peak stormwater discharge amount, not to be exceeded, to the East Fork of White Lick Creek. The Midfield Terminal will be designed and constructed so as to stay under this peak stormwater discharge amount. Previously permitted discharge rates will therefore be reassessed, and be adjusted as necessary, by the State, the city of Indianapolis, and the Indianapolis Department in order to comply with the applicable permit discharge limitation.

Mitigation for potential impacts to Wetlands 4 and 5 is being addressed through a Section 404 permit and related Section 401 water quality certificate developed in response to that portion of the Proposed Project originally identified within the 1995 FHWA EA. The proposed mitigation on behalf of the Proposed Project component will be located south of the airport, adjacent to existing wetlands and the East Fork of White Lick Creek. It is anticipated that mitigation for potential impacts to Wetlands 4 and 5 will be paid for and overseen by the FHWA. If, for any reason, FHWA involvement does not provide for full mitigation of these wetlands impacts, however, the IAA is required independently, by virtue of its USACE Section 404 permit, to fully mitigate the wetland impacts associated with both the Midfield Terminal and midfield interchange portions of the Proposed Project.

The access/egress ramps of the midfield interchange will cross Center Creek. If the crossings impact less than 300 feet of the channel, the crossings can be permitted under the USACE Regional General Permit. A Section 401 Water Quality Certification determination will also be required. According to the 1995 FHWA EA, pollutants associated with highways, such as the midfield interchange ramps and roadway, come from a wide variety of sources. Metals and hydrocarbons generally come from vehicle wear, exhaust, spills, and leakage. Salts come from road deicing operations. Particulates come from tire and pavement wear, atmospheric deposition, and construction activity (including non-highway related nearby development projects). Nitrogen, phosphorus, fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides come from both atmospheric deposition and highway maintenance. In general, normal ecosystem processes are most likely to be affected in areas immediately adjacent [(0-5 meters) (0-16.4 feet)] to the road, especially on highways with a high average daily traffic. However, the grassy areas adjacent to these roads substantially reduce the migration of pollutants.

Biotic Communities and Threatened and Endangered Species Impacts and Mitigation

Impacts

The potential environmental impacts originally disclosed in the 1992 FEIS and the 1995 FHWA EA have not changed. The 1992 FEIS and the 1995 FHWA EA did not separate the potential impacts associated with development of the Midfield Terminal from the rest of the Project components assessed in each study. A total of approximately 65 acres of wooded and non-wooded uplands, wooded and emergent wetlands, and small streams will be converted to transportation land uses for all of the Project components assessed in the 1992 FEIS. In addition, the proposed roadway components of the Proposed Project will result in the acquisition and

conversion to transportation land use of approximately 570 total acres: about 464 agricultural acres, about 62 wooded acres (including about 2 acres of wetlands), about 37 residential-use acres, and about seven acres of emergent wetlands.

Construction of the Proposed Project will likely result in an increased abundance of grassland habitat species, while correspondingly somewhat decreasing the abundance of forest habitat species. Most of the Proposed Project's land area has been previously disturbed or is currently used in agricultural activities; thus the existing habitat currently supports a lesser total amount of wildlife than a similarly sized, undisturbed parcel would typically support.

The construction of the midfield interchange would result both in the relocation of temporary Indiana Bat habitat and the loss of naturally occurring Indiana Bat habitat. The proposed Midfield Interchange would also impact two woodlots, identified as Woodlots 5 and 7 in the 1995 FHWA EA.

Approximately 65 acres of Indiana Bat habitat would be lost as a result of constructing the proposed Midfield Terminal.

Mitigation

The mitigation program identified in and subsequently provided following the 1992 FEIS resulted in planting approximately 300 acres of hardwood seedlings and constructing approximately 2,800 artificial roost structures for the Federally-listed endangered species, the Indiana Bat. Mitigation has been completed for the Indiana Bat and the wetland habitat impacts to Wetlands 9, 11, and 12, which would result from the Midfield Terminal and part of the Midfield Interchange components of the Project. The Indiana Bat mitigation program included species monitoring within the Conservation Management Area for five years. This five-year period ended in the 1999, and a report of findings was submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS, the Service) in February 2000. The report was subsequently approved by the USFWS.

The provision of appropriate bat habitat mitigation not previously addressed on behalf of the Midfield Interchange has been and continues to be coordinated actively with the USFWS, the FHWA, InDOT, IDNR, the IDEM, the city of Indianapolis, and the Corps.

A Draft Habitat Conservation Plan (DHCP, the Plan) has been prepared for all of the Six Points Road Interchange Project components and other associated development within the Proposed Project area. This DHCP was prepared in consultation and informal coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service). The IAA and the City have signed this DHCP, and it has been forwarded to the Service. When finalized by the Service, following public review and commentary, the approved Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) will identify all appropriate mitigation activities for both direct and indirect impacts to Indiana Bat habitat as a result of all of the remaining Proposed Project components, including the construction of the midfield interchange. The acreage that may experience Project-related impacts, and for which mitigation is required, will be fully identified in the approved HCP. Contents of the DHCP are expected to be very similar, if not identical to, the contents of the approved HCP. In this regard, the approved Plan provides definitive specification of the mitigation activities to be required due to all of the Proposed Project elements of the Six Points Road Interchange, including the proposed midfield interchange, and private development including AmeriPlex. Appropriate mitigation for potential impacts due to the construction of the midfield interchange will be provided in accordance with the approved Plan. If, for any reason, participation by the FHWA does not itself provide full mitigation for the Six Point Road Interchange-associated loss of Indiana Bat habitat, the IAA is independently obligated to provide full Indiana Bat mitigation for Proposed Project impacts associated with both the Midfield Terminal and midfield interchange components. Extensive coordination by FAA and the IAA with the Service is, and will remain, ongoing in order to ensure that sufficient mitigation will be provided on a timely basis.

Mitigation measures in the Plan have been designed (and in the approved HCP will be designed) to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Project on the Indiana Bat. These measures contained in the DHCP are summarized below:

1. Seasonal tree cutting restrictions – no trees will be cleared between April 15 and September 15, the dates during which the bats typically occupy maternity roosts in the Proposed Project area;
2. Permanent protection of existing Indiana Bat habitat within the HCP boundary – some existing bat habitat (exact acreage to be determined in the future) that is owned by the IAA will be protected in perpetuity;
3. Permanent protection of existing Indiana Bat habitat outside of the HCP boundary – some existing habitat (exact acreage to be determined in the future) will be permanently protected;
4. Mitigation plantings –hardwood seedlings will be planted and protected in perpetuity;
5. Monitoring and research program – the response of the Indiana Bat population to the proposed construction and mitigation activities will be monitored for 15 years, and mitigation plantings will be monitored for five years; and
6. Public Outreach/Educational Program – The applicants will work with the USFWS Bloomington Field Office to develop and implement an outreach program to educate the public regarding the Indiana Bat.

To minimize potential impacts to the Upland Sandpiper, construction activities that could impact young birds would be avoided as much as possible from early May to mid-July. Construction activities that could completely remove localized populations of the Kirtland Snake will be similarly avoided. To minimize potential impacts to the Red-Shouldered Hawk, construction activities in areas populated by young hawks will be avoided as much as possible from April through August.

Construction Impacts and Mitigation

Impacts

Temporary construction impacts resulting from the proposed development, including surface transportation-related improvements, may include soil erosion, construction safety, increased air emissions, water quality degradation, noise disturbance, and disrupted surface transportation patterns.

Mitigation

Construction impacts are temporary and short term in nature and can be minimized through the establishment and utilization of environmental controls and best management practices (BMPs).

To minimize construction impacts, environmental controls as specified in Advisory Circular 150/5370.10A will be included throughout the preparation of the plans and specification for each of the proposed construction projects. The IAA will also incorporate all applicable State of Indiana and City of Indianapolis construction and environmental control provisions into the plans and specifications developed for all roadway and off-site airport-related improvements. Construction and environmental control measures will be developed as part of the preparation of the plans and specifications for each airport development project and will be implemented with the initiation of demolition and construction activities.

As a means to minimize traffic flow/access impacts associated with the proposed roadway improvements, the IAA, in coordination with the city of Indianapolis and the InDOT, will develop a staged implementation plan. This staged implementation plan will identify which specific portions of the proposed roadway improvements will be constructed during each phase of Proposed Project implementation, what the overall sequence of construction activities will be, and how traffic flow/access can best be maintained during the individual construction phases. This staged construction plan will be developed and coordinated with the appropriate State and City agencies prior to construction startup.

Potential construction impacts will also be reduced through the development and implementation of a project-specific erosion and sediment control plan. These temporary control measures will be specifically identified in the Project's design stage, as required by FAA AC 150/5370-10, *Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports,* and the current *Indiana Handbook for Erosion Control in Developing Area,* published by the Division of Soil Conservation, IDNR. Implementation of this plan will ensure that there are no long-term sediment/erosion impacts to the existing drainage systems or to the area's water quality. Elements contained within the required erosion and sediment control plan will include an interconnected system of erosion and stormwater runoff controls, including best management practices and structural erosion control methods, such as phased clearing and grading, confining construction to the dry season whenever possible, sediment traps and ponds, interceptor dikes and swales, mulching, filter fabric fence, hydro seeding, and terracing. FAA's extensive major project construction experience has amply shown that although implementation of an effective erosion and sediment control plan will not remove all total suspended solids (TSS), implementation of a suitable sediment/erosion control plan will significantly reduce TSS loadings to, and temporary construction impacts on, project-area water resources.

The airport's NPDES stormwater permit will be updated and reissued. The IAA commits to take all actions on its part, as determined necessary by IDEM to update/reissue IAA's NPDES permits. The updated/reissued permit will include specific, enforceable requirements to be met by contractors during construction to control erosion and to minimize water quality impacts. In addition to the NPDES permit requirement, the state of Indiana now also requires the preparation and submission of a Rule 5 plan (specification of various best management practices and the like) for construction projects involving land modifications of more than five acres. The Rule 5 plan submission process involves consultation with of local soil conservation managers. Coupling a Rule 5 process to the NPDES permit requirements further ensures that the proposed control methods will be custom-fit to the specific conditions found at the proposed construction site.

The IDNR also requires a series of permits for construction of waterway bridges and the placement of fill for roadway embankments. The purpose of these permits is to ensure the protection of waterways from flooding either upstream or downstream from the construction site.

A construction management plan will be prepared which, based on the contractor's haul plan, specifying hours of operation, haul routes, and similar controls. To minimize the stirring or entrapment of fugitive dust already on roads, mitigation measures

will include frequent sweeping and/or flushing of the roads with water. In order to minimize fugitive dust transport, unpaved roads and inactive portions of the construction site will either be watered (achieving a 50 percent reduction in fugitive dust) or otherwise chemically stabilized (achieving an 80 percent reduction). The exact method or combination of methods for inclusion within the construction management plan will be determined prior to construction startup.

Solid waste disposal coordination will continue through IDEM's Office of Solid Waste, as previously specified in the 1992 FEIS. A waste recycling area will be set up during construction. In addition, the use of the recycled products will be encouraged in the construction of the Project. In the 1992 FEIS no environmental audit requirement was included. According to FAA Order 1050.19, however, an environmental due diligence audit (EDDA) is now also required in order to evaluate subject properties for potential hazardous substances contamination that could result in future FAA liabilities.

Airport Traffic Control Tower Relocation Impact and Mitigation

Impacts

Environmental impacts of ATCT relocation are identical to construction impacts (see previous construction impacts and mitigation discussion in this ROD, and Table 5-1 of the FSEIS). The IAA has conducted a planning study to evaluate and recommend a location for a new ATCT. The study, done in coordination and cooperation with FAA, recommended a preferred site as discussed in Chapter One, Introduction. This preferred site turns out, however, to have line-of site drawbacks.

Mitigation

Mitigation of the line-of-sight impacts due to construction of the relocated ATCT was described in Section 5.2.5 of the FSEIS. To meet applicable line-of-sight requirements for the southeastern end of Runway 14/32, the Proposed Project Alternative includes modifications that will have to be made to structures attached to the FedEx building, and displacement of Runway 32 landing and takeoff thresholds by up to 582 feet. These measures are being coordinated with the FAA and the airline tenants. The FSEIS assessed and considered these actions as necessary for maximizing the functionality of the ATCT, and the attached ALP shows the preferred siting alternative. The FSEIS assesses the impacts of the ATCT including its location, and displacement of the runway threshold as stated above and reflected on the ALP. The IAA has committed to implementing, and this ROD constitutes approval of these actions to support relocation of the ATCT.

Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation

Cumulative Impacts

The FSEIS states that regional and local master plans of development were consulted in order to identify future land use trends that may contribute cumulative environmental impacts. As a result of consulting these development plans, four independent projects near the airport were identified as noteworthy within the context of a cumulative impact assessment. These projects were shown on Exhibit 6-1 and Table 6-1 of the FSEIS.

Mitigation

Mitigation of the cumulative impacts associated with the Ameriplex Development is covered under the HCP developed as a part of the 1995 FHWA EA. Mitigation for the cumulative impacts associated with the Six points Road Interchange project is covered in the 1995 FHWA EA. Cumulative Impact mitigation as associated with the Heartland Crossing mixed use project is beyond the scope of the FSEIS and this ROD, as is the mitigation potentially associated with the proposed North-South Corridor Highway project.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

Impact Summary

Table T-2 shown at the end of this chapter, provides a matrix showing the major environmental impacts to each resource category for the No-Build and the Proposed Project Alternative (FAA's Preferred Alternative).

Mitigation Summary

The FAA, both by itself and through the IAA, has provided for a comprehensive mitigation program, which establishes measures to mitigate the adverse effects of construction and operation of the proposed development. This comprehensive mitigation program was specifically developed to meet applicable Federal and State of Indiana requirements. The mitigation program was also developed in consideration of applicable local guidelines. The concerns and interests of the public as well as those of interested governmental agencies were also extensively addressed. The mitigation program is also described in Chapter Five, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation of the FSEIS.

The mitigation measures set forth in this ROD, and more fully considered in the FSEIS, are conditions of approval of the projects in this ROD, and they will also be reflected, as appropriate, in forthcoming grant award documents. The FAA will monitor implementation of the required mitigation actions as necessary to assure they are carried out as anticipated.

In recognition of all of the above, the FAA hereby finds that these mitigation measures constitute all reasonable steps to minimize harm by including all practicable means to avoid/or minimize environmental harm from implementing the selected alternatives.

Accordingly, having considered: 1) the policies set forth at 49 U.S.C. Sections 40104 and 47101; 2) the ability of the alternatives to meet the purpose and need; and 3) all documents used which concerns these development projects, the FAA hereby approves for implementation the proposed Project as described, disclosed, and analyzed in the FSEIS.

The FAA's approval of the expansion and improvement projects set forth both in the FSEIS and in this ROD signifies that these projects meet FAA standards for agency approval discussed in Chapter 2 of this ROD. It does not, however, signify an FAA commitment to provide a specific level of financial support for these projects, which must await future decisions under separate funding criteria prescribed by 49 U.S.C. 47115 (d) and 49 U.S.C. 40117.

Summary of Environmental Consequences

Although the No-Build Alternative has fewer developmental and environmental impacts (wetlands, biotic communities, threatened and endangered species, and construction-related impacts) than the Proposed Project and is the "environmentally preferred" alternative, it failed to achieve the purposes and needs for this project. However, implementation of the Proposed Project will improve Airport safety, public access, and passenger-handling efficiency. For the reasons summarized in this ROD, and supported by detailed discussion in the FSEIS, the FAA, therefore, finds that the Proposed Project Alternative is FAA's preferred alternative. As noted on page 21 of this ROD, there will also be a small increase in facility emissions, but all applicable air quality standards will be complied with and the project's air quality impacts will be negligible.

Table T-2

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SUMMARY MATRIX

Indianapolis International Airport

Environmental Category	2005 No-Build	2005 Proposed Project	2010 No-Build	2010 Proposed Project

Land Use	contour for the 2005 No-Build encompasses 18.7 square miles. Approximately 281 houses and 855 people would be in the 65 DNL and greater noise contour for the 2005 No-Build. One historic structure would be located within the 2005 No-Build 65 DNL and greater noise contour (has been sound insulated). No significant impact.	the arrival spike off Runway 5L/23R. No net change in square miles (18.7 square miles). Approximately 266 houses and 814 people in the 65 DNL noise contour. Eleven houses would be newly impacted by the 65 DNL and greater noise contour, one of which was not eligible for land use mitigation programs. This one home would be addressed as part of a separate noise analysis at a more appropriate time prior to construction of the midfield terminal. One historic structure in the 65 DNL and greater noise contour. The proposed roadway projects would result in the acquisition and conversion to transportation land use of 570 total acres: 464 agricultural acres, 62 wooded acres, 37 residential acres, and seven commercial /industrial acres. Three houses (total of 2.56 acres) near Bridgeport Road and I-70 would be acquired for midfield interchange. No conflict with local development plans.	noise contour for the 2010 No-Build encompasses 12.9 square miles. Approximately 68 houses and 183 people would be in the 65 DNL and greater noise contour for the 2010 No-Build. No historic structures would be located in the 65 DNL and greater noise contour for 2010 No-Build. No significant impact.	arrival spike off Runway 5R/23L and an increase in the size of the arrival spike off Runway 5L/23R. 12.9 square miles. Approximately 41 houses and 106 people would be in the Proposed Project condition 65 DNL noise contour. No houses would be newly impacted by the 2010 65 DNL and greater noise contour. No historic structures in the 65 DNL and greater noise contour for the 2010 Proposed Project. No change to land use as discussed for 2005 Proposed Project. The three houses (total of 2.56 acres) near Bridgeport Road and I-70 would have been acquired for midfield interchange before 2010

Social Impacts	No impact.	Three houses would be displaced and relocated. The IAA owns the four undeveloped properties identified in the 1995 FHWA EA. Environmental justice: no impacts.	Same as 2005 No-Build	Same as 2005 Proposed Project
Induced Socioeconomic	The total economic impact of the airport, in 1991 dollars, would be approximately $1.4 trillion.	Approximately 530 jobs would be created. No significant population movement expected. The additional economic impact of the midfield terminal, in 1991 dollars, would be an approximately $464 million. The construction of the midfield interchange would cost approximately $47 million, in 1995 dollars. The development of the Midfield Terminal and midfield interchange would accelerate commercial and industrial development around the interchange.	Proportional increase in economic impact anticipated.	Proportional increase in economic impact anticipated.
Air Quality	No impact.	The construction of a new terminal, large apron area, and proposed new taxiways would result in a net increase in emissions during the years 2001-2006. These increases would be *de minimis*. The emissions of NOx and HC would increase with the implementation of the proposed project because the larger terminal would result in a net increase in emissions due to heating plants. However the de minimis thresholds given under the General Conformity Rule would not be exceeded.	No impact.	The larger terminal would result in a net increase in emissions due to heating plants. The emissions of NOx and HC would increase with the implementation of the proposed project; however the de minimis thresholds given under the General Conformity Rule would not be exceeded**.**
Water Quality	No impact.	Approximately 160 million gallons of water would be consumed by the airport under 2005 conditions. The NPDES permit, Section 401 water quality certification, Stormwater Prevention Plan and	No impact.	Approximately 165 million gallons of water would be consumed by the airport

		certification, Stormwater Prevention Plan and Spill Prevention and Countermeasure Plan will be updated. Construction water quality issues would be addressed by using the Indiana Department of Transportation Standard Specifications and Special Provisions guidelines. The Midfield Terminal development would increase the amount of impervious surface area on airport property, thus increasing stormwater discharges. Increases in pollutant, heavy metals, mineral, and salt discharges. The increased stormwater drainage from midfield interchange would be relative to normal stormwater drainage amount and discharge of pollutants from vehicle traffic. Aircraft fueling, aircraft and pavement deicing, and vehicle parking activities resulting from the development of the Proposed Project would increase stormwater runoff pollution to the East Fork of White Lick Creek. The level of propylene glycol discharged to the East Fork of White Lick Creek would increase. The North Collector Channel is permitted for a specific peak stormwater discharge amount to the East Fork of White Lick Creek. The Midfield Terminal would be constructed to stay under this peak stormwater discharge amount. Previously permitted discharge rates would be reviewed by the city of Indianapolis and the Indianapolis Department of Capital Asset for development of the Midfield Terminal. There would be no impacts to the local sewage handling system.		the airport under 2010 conditions. All other water quality impacts would be as described under the 2005 Proposed Project.
Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Section 4(f) (re-codified as Section 303c)	No impact.	Three non-significant archaeology sites would be impacted. One cemetery, Lick Creek Friends Cemetery, is in the midfield terminal area but not impacted. Another, unnamed cemetery is located in the east airfield area and also would not be impacted.	No impact.	Same impacts as 2005 Proposed Project.

Biotic Communities	No impact.	Approximately 65 acres of wooded uplands, wooded and emergent wetlands, and small streams would be converted to grassed infields, runways, and other support facilities for all of the projects assessed in the 1992 FEIS. The proposed Six Points Road Interchange projects, which includes the midfield interchange, would result in a total habitat loss of 344.8 total acres: scattered trees or immature woodlot, vegetative drainage way or fencerow, open field, and mature forest. The acquisition of portions of wooded habitat may increase the edge habitat, a beneficial impact. Species living in a grassland habitat would increase in number, while species in other habitats would decrease. Construction activities could cause mortality in some species.	No impact.	Same impacts as 2005 Proposed Project.
Threatened and Endangered Species	No impact.	The following endangered and threatened species have been documented in airport environs: Upland Sandpiper (Bartramia longicauda) – state endangered; Kirtland Snake (Clonophis kirtlandii) - state threatened; Eastern Sand Darter (Ammocrypta pellucida) - state special concern; Red-Shouldered Hawk (Buteo lieatus) - state special concern; and Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) – Federally endangered. Indiana bat habitat would be lost for the proposed Midfield Terminal development. The construction of the midfield interchange would result in the relocation of temporary Indiana bat habitat. The Six Points Road Interchange projects would impact potential Indiana bat habitat.	No impact.	Same impacts as 2005 Proposed Project.
Wetlands and Streams	No impact.	The Midfield Terminal would impact wetlands 9, 11, and 12 identified in the 1992 FEIS. Wetland 9 is adjacent to the North Collector Channel. A concrete box culvert would be installed in this channel when the taxiway is constructed. Wetland 12 is the same as Wetland 3 identified in the 1995 FHWA EA. Wetlands 4 and 5 identified in the 1995 FHWA EA would be impacted by the midfield interchange. Approximately 0.6 acres of Wetland 4 and 0.5 acres of Wetland 5 would be impacted. Section 404/401 permit to be	No impact.	Same impacts as 2005 Proposed Project.

		be impacted. Section 404/401 permit to be applied for in Fall 2001. The midfield interchange would impact Center Creek and two unnamed ephemeral tributaries and have already received a permit for the impacts. Three intermittent streams would be in the midfield terminal area: Center Creek, Pound Creek, and Silver Branch. The manmade North Collector Channel would also be in the midfield terminal area. All of these impacts have been permitted.		
Floodplains	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.
Coastal Zone Management/ Barriers	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.
Farmland	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.
Energy Supply and Natural Resources	No impact.	Increases in energy use. Not significant impact.	No impact.	Increases in energy use. Not significant impact.
Light Emissions	No impact.	Modification in location of lights. No significant impact.	No impact.	Modification in location of lights. No significant impact.
Solid Waste Impacts	No impact.	Estimated solid waste level in 2010: 3,700 tons. This would not impact the local solid waste handling system. No impacts were identified in the Environmental Site Assessment. An Environmental Due Diligence Audit may be necessary if the Environmental Site Assessment is not sufficient.	No impact.	Estimated solid waste level in 2010: 3,700 tons. This would not impact the local solid waste handling system. No impacts were identified in the Environmental Site Assessment. An

				An Environmental Due Diligence Audit may be necessary if the Environmental Site Assessment is not sufficient.
Surface Transportation	No impact.	No significant impact.	No impact.	No significant impact.
Construction	No impact.	The total annual construction related economic impact for the proposed Midfield Terminal in 2001 would be $6,692,400. The construction related impacts would result in short-term changes in runway usage, taxiing patterns, and surface transportation patterns. Construction emissions were estimated to be less than 100 tons per year each of NO_x and HC for each construction year 2001-2006.	No impact.	Same impacts as 2005 Proposed Project.

7. PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

On November 24, 2000 a Federal Scoping document was sent to all the still-involved recipients of the 1999 SEIS. This distribution, in turn, included many if not all of the recipients of the 1992 FEIS. The scoping document and list of recipients is provided in Appendix B of the FSEIS, *Federal Scoping.* Responses were received from the following agencies: the Federal Emergency Management Agency; the U.S. Department of Agriculture; the USFWS; the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO); the city of Indianapolis; the IDNR; the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA); and the Indiana State Budget Agency (withdrawing from the review process). The comments provided additional information for the analysis of impacts, requests for more information, notification of required procedures, and in some cases concurrence with preliminary findings. All responses from the Federal Scoping process are included in Appendix B of the FSEIS, *Federal Scoping*.

In addition to the public meeting and Federal Scoping document, the public was further informed of the proposed Midfield Terminal through a number of sources. When the 1992 FEIS was prepared, a public hearing was held to inform the public of the proposed Midfield Terminal and associated developments. The InDOT on March 19, 1996 conducted a public hearing on the 1995 FHWA EA, which provided the public the opportunity to review plans and potential impacts for the midfield interchange. In general, the comments from the 1995 FHWA EA public hearing focused on the Millhouse Road area where residents were requesting that the alignment of the road be modified. No general opposition was expressed against the midfield interchange. Numerous newspapers and other local media reports have recently been prepared regarding the development of the Midfield Terminal over the past two years. Appendix I of the FSEIS, *Agency and Public Coordination,* provides recent articles and news releases regarding the development of the Midfield Terminal.

A formal public hearing is not required for the preparation of an SEIS. However, a public meeting was held on April 19, 2001 at the Holiday Inn Airport, 2501 S. High School Road, to provide the public the opportunity to gather information and make oral and written comments on the Proposed Project. No written or oral comments were made at the public meeting. A number of agency comments were received regarding the Draft SEIS (DSEIS). A number of the comments were editorial in nature and those changes have been made in the FSEIS. Other comments of note related to the completion of wetland mitigation from the

1992 FEIS. The transcript, public meeting sign-in sheets, agency comments, and responses to comments are included in Appendix I of the FSEIS, *Agency and Public Coordination*.

ADDITIONAL CONSULTATIONS AND MEETINGS

Wetland Consultation

On April 20, 2001, a meeting was conducted at the airport regarding the status of the wetland mitigation from the 1992 FEIS. The meeting was attended by the USEPA, USFWS, the FAA, InDOT, IDNR, IDEM, and the IAA. The USACE was invited but unable to attend. The purpose of the meeting was to identify if the IAA had successfully completed the mitigation set forth in the 1992 FEIS for wetlands, in particular forested wetlands. After a field visit, several of the resource agencies USEPA, IDEM, and the USFWS indicated that the actual amount of forested wetlands successfully mitigated appears to be less than what was expected. Nevertheless, a review of IAA/USACE correspondence shows that the Corps had clearly determined that the IAA had complied with all its Section 404 permit requirements regarding the wetlands mitigation from the 1992 FEIS. USEPA, the USFWS, and IDEM agreed that their compensatory wetlands concerns would best be addressed on a programmatic basis, separately from the IND FSEIS NEPA process. Briefly stated, resolution of this particular issue may involve redelineation of wetlands at the IND compensatory wetlands site. (see Appendix I of the FSEIS, *Agency and Public Coordination*, for USEPA comment letter May 3, 2001 and IDEM comment letter May 30, 2001).

8. RELATED/ONGOING PLANNING ISSUES

As of the date of this ROD, several related planning issues remain ongoing. The FAA does not anticipate that any of the related ongoing planning issues would result in significant unassessed environmental consequences with respect to the Proposed Project. The following is a list and description of each ongoing related planning issues:

1. **Habitat Conservation Planning.**

   The City of Indianapolis and the IAA have signed an Incidental Take permit (ITP) application and, as a part of this application, they have also delivered a DHCP to the USFWS. The Service is anticipated to issue (likely within the next 30-60 days) a Public Notice in the Federal Register seeking public review/comment on the ITP and the DHCP. In response to the comments received (if any) to the Public Notice, the Service is anticipated to proceed to prepare an approved (i.e., a final) HCP and will also proceed toward issuance of the ITP. As a matter of law, the IAA and the City are required to comply with the requirements in the ITP, including the approved HCP, as a condition to receipt and/or utilization of Federal funding assistance. In addition, FAA will also include appropriate grant conditions in any forthcoming awards to IAA requiring full compliance with requirements of the ITP and/or the approved HCP. In, what FAA considers to be, the very unlikely event that the ITP and/or the approved HCP require changes to the Proposed Project, FAA will undertake any required environmental reviews on the environmental consequences, if any, associated with the HCP.

2. **Air Traffic Control Tower Relocation-Displaced Runway 14/32 Threshold.**

   The 1992 FEIS identified the need for, and assessed the impact of, relocating the ATCT to a new location on the airfield. The 1992 FEIS did not, however, identify the exact location of the relocated ATCT. Following release of the 1992 FEIS, an ATCT siting study was conducted. This study identified a preferred site (Site B) southwest of the Midfield Terminal, based upon line-of-site and airfield view. While ATCT utilization of this site was evaluated for its environmental consequences in the FSEIS, it was also recognized that Site B would not provide an unobstructed view of the southeastern end of Runway 14/32 as required by FAA order 5300.13. In order to meet this requirement, a plan was developed which required that structures attached to the FedEx building be removed and that displacement of takeoff and landing thresholds be displaced by up to 582 feet. This plan was environmentally assessed as a part of the Proposed Project in the FSEIS. Subsequent to the FSEIS, the IAA identified an alternative potentially involving a taller ATCT in concert with no threshold displacement for Runway 14/32. As of the date of this ROD, the taller ATCT alternative is under analysis by IAA. Should this alternative of a higher tower ever be submitted to FAA for review/concurrence, FAA will undertake any environmental review that may be required of that alternative. As of the

date of this ROD, however, FAA considers it unlikely that increasing the tower height

would in fact result in any unassessed environmental impacts. The environmental impacts associated with relocation of the ATCT were fully assessed within the FSEIS as a portion of the Proposed Project. In addition, the environmental impacts related to operation of Runway 14/32, with no threshold displacements, were assessed within the FSEIS as a portion of the No-Build/No-Action Alternative.

3. **Compensatory (Forested) Wetlands Issue**

In review letters for the DSEIS and FSEIS, USEPA noted that the amount of compensatory wetlands, most particularly forested compensatory wetlands, already provided by IAA for the wetlands impacts associated with projects described in the Draft EIS (DEIS), DSEIS, and FSEIS appeared to be less than the amount of such wetlands required by IAA's already issued USACE Section 404 permit. The Corps, however, provided written notification to IAA that all Section 404 permit conditions requiring provision of compensatory wetlands have been complied with. USEPA subsequently concluded that its mitigation concerns would best be addressed between USEPA and Corps on a programmatic, as opposed to on a project, basis. Therefore, the results, if any, of such further discussion between USEPA and the Corps, are anticipated to have no impact on the Proposed Project and the assessment of environmental impacts provided in the FSEIS.

4. **NPDES Effluent Limitations Issue**

As of the date of this ROD, the NPDES stormwater and wastewater permits as necessitated by implementation of the Proposed Project have neither been drafted nor issued by IDEM. The permits, when issued, will specify the treatment technologies and the specific effluent limitations that IAA must provide in order to meet applicable water quality standards. Adherence by IAA to the enforceable requirements of the forthcoming NPDES permits, therefore, will assure that water quality standards, including the designated beneficial uses thereto, in the Proposed Project's receiving waters will be attained and protected as required under both state and Federal law. The permits themselves implement requirements of both state and Federal law, and, if necessary, they are directly enforceable by either IDEM or by USEPA. In addition, FAA will require IAA's ongoing compliance with its NPDES permits as a condition of grant award.

9. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES RAISED ABOUT THE FSEIS

During the 30-day period following the issuance of the FSEIS, comments were received from the following in response to the FSEIS:

Federal Agencies:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The USEPA indicated a continuing concern that adequate compensatory wetlands to fully mitigate airport project impacts on wooded wetlands may not be present at the airport's designated wetlands compensation site. However, USEPA also noted that, in light of the Corps' finding that the airport is in compliance with its Section 404 permit, these mitigation concerns would best be addressed between USEPA and the USACE on a programmatic (as opposed to on a project) basis.

U.S. Department of the Interior

With regard to the FSEIS, the Department of the Interior (DOI) (reflecting comments developed by the USFWS) indicated concerns for impacts of the Proposed Project on Indiana Bat habitat and water quality impacts. Specifically, the DOI stated "To ensure that all projects effects on federal threatened and endangered species are fully considered, we recommend that the Record of Decision not be signed until the HCP has been approved by the FWS and an incidental take permit issued and any consultation determined to be necessary to address water quality impacts has also been completed." The FAA provided the

DOI with additional information related to potential water quality impacts and delivered IAA's commitment to sign the incidental take permit. In its subsequent letter to the FAA on October 1, 2001, the DOI stated "The USFWS has reviewed the letter and informed the Department that the USFWS' concerns regarding the HCP requirement, as well as concerns about potential project-related water quality impacts in the East Fork of White Lick Creek, have been satisfactorily addressed by the commitments made by the FAA in the letter. Accordingly, the Department would not object to the FAA signing the ROD once the IAA has signed the ITP and has provided to the FAA its commitment to implement the approved HCP." Both the IAA commitment to the FAA and the signature on the ITP application has been completed.

State Agencies:

The IDNR indicated that adequate treatment of glycol-containing wastewaters will need to be provided in accordance with an NPDES permit to be issued to the IAA. IAA will be required, under both State and Federal law, to comply with any NPDES permit issued by IDEM.

Indiana Department of Transportation

The InDOT (1) noted that funding for relocation of a navigational aid and the pillars for a future taxiway bridge should be from airport sources; (2) noted that the midfield interchange will be funded by Airport sources; (3) noted that the exact amount and location of land to be released in a land swap with InDOT is not yet known; and (4) expressed concern that runoff from the I-70 Interchange could be detrimental to bat habitat. These comments have been noted.

The ROD shows that items (1) and (2) will be funded from airport sources and that the exact amount and location of land to be swapped in response to IDNR comment (3) will be determined at the appropriate time in the project's planning and design process; and (4) roadway discharges will be addressed as part of the water quality impact mitigation for the project described in the 1995 FHWA EA.

Indiana Historic Preservation Office

The Indiana SHPO noted that it will be necessary to review any portion of the Proposed Project pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA that has not already been so reviewed. This comment is noted for the record. As of the time of this ROD, all known Section 106 impacts have already been presented and assessed in the FSEIS, Chapter Four.

Local Agencies/Interest Groups:

Indianapolis

The city offered comments as follows: (1) the potential for high speed rail service should be evaluated; (2) alternatives to demolition should be evaluated for the existing terminal and parking structures; (3) asked if demolition areas will be converted to other airport uses; (4) referenced the appropriate city/county building codes; (5) indicated the current status of the Official Thoroughfare Plan for Indianapolis/Marion County; (6) commented on Marion County's 2000 population totals; and (7) offered suggestions for minor corrections in the FSEIS.

In terms of responses, FAA notes (1) the FSEIS states that while destinations under 250 miles from the city might be adequately served via high speed rail, destinations beyond 250 miles would not be well served; (2) at this time no alternatives to demolition have been identified; (3) the areas in question would continue to be owned by the airport; (4) comment was noted; (5) comment was noted as applicable to the city and the county; (6) the FSEIS used the best available data at the time of its preparation-using the new totals would not diminish the need for the Proposed Project; and (7) the minor corrections have been made and noted.

Potentially Significant Issue Identification:

The only potentially significant issue raised during review of the FSEIS was the issue of provision of necessary mitigation for

Indiana Bat habitat impacts, as identified by the DOI. The DOI had two comments concerning impacts to Indiana Bat habitat.

First, the DOI commented that an approved HCP is required for the project. A DHCP has been signed by IAA and the city of Indianapolis. The DHCP has been delivered to USFWS and, as of the time of this ROD, is under USFWS review. Following successful completion of this review, a DHCP will be released for public review and comment by the USFWS. The approved HCP will reflect any changes/additions to the DHCP necessitated by comments received on the DHCP. Grant conditions applicable to any future awards by FAA to IAA for the Proposed Project will provide that no construction activity may be undertaken on airport Indiana Bat properties, except in accordance with the requirements of the approved HCP. In its letter of October 1, 2001, the DOI indicated its satisfaction with HCP-related developments to date.

The DOI's second FSEIS comment raised an issue with regard to the need to avoid adverse Proposed Project-related water quality impacts on the East Fork of White Lick Creek. IAA commits, and FAA will enforce via grant award conditions, that all glycol-containing stormwater runoff from the Airport's apron area will be collected and pumped to the Seerley Creek and Mars Ditch basins. Thereafter, the basins will release their glycol-containing wastewaters to the existing Indianapolis Southport Treatment Facility. Treatment at that facility will be provided to a level fully consistent with applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards, as required by the Clean Water Act. The DOI's letter of October 1, 2001 indicated the DOI's satisfaction with the applicable commitments to comply with State and Federal water quality requirements.

The FAA has carefully assessed and considered comment letters received on the FSEIS in making its decision. Appendix A, *Comments and Responses to Comments on the Final SEIS,* provides copies of each letter received on the FSEIS. In addition, the comments received on the FSEIS are summarized in the Response to Comments Chart (Appendix A, *Comments and Responses to Comments on the Final SEIS*).

10. FEDERAL AGENCY FINDINGS

In accordance with applicable law, the FAA makes the following determinations for this project, based upon the appropriate information and data contained in the FSEIS.

A. The project is reasonably consistent with existing plans of public agencies for development of the area surrounding the airport *(49 U.S.C. 47106(a)(1)*), and Executive Order 12372.

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of airport project funding applications. It has been the long-standing policy of the FAA to rely heavily upon actions of MPO's to satisfy the project consistency requirement of *49 U.S.C. 47106 (a) (*1) [see, e.g., *Suburban O'Hare Com'n* v. *Dol*e, *787 F.2d 186, 199 (7th Cir., 1986*)]. Furthermore, both the legislative history and consistent agency interpretations of this statutory provision make it clear that reasonable, rather than absolute consistency with these plans is all that is required.

Under the provisions of both Federal and state law, the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (IMPO) has been designated as the MPO for the IMA and given primary responsibility for transportation planning in the region. On December 19, 2000, the IMPO notified the FAA that it supported expansion at the airport. On March 6, 2001, the IMPO stated that it "is currently updating the Regional Transportation Plan to extend the horizon year to 2025 to maintain a minimum required 20 year planning horizon. The proposed Six Points Road interchange and the proposed midfield terminal ramps are accounted for in this update in the same 2000-2006 time period."

The FAA finds that the project is reasonably consistent with the existing plans of public agencies authorized by the state in which the airport is located to plan for the development of the area surrounding the airport. The FAA is satisfied that it has fully complied with *49 U.S.C. 47106 (a)(1).*

The proposed expansion is also reasonably consistent with comprehensive plans that have been adopted by jurisdictions in the vicinity of the airport as described in Section 4.2.7 of the FSEIS. However, the FAA has also reviewed and considered the substantial documentation in the administrative record demonstrating that throughout the environmental process the IAA has shown concern for the impact of the proposed development actions on surrounding communities.

In making its determination under 49 U.S.C. 47106 (a) (1), the FAA has considered the fact that local governments have been represented and have participated in its decision to authorize the projects. The FAA has also recognized the fact that none of these jurisdictions has regulatory authority over airport operations, since long-established doctrines of Federal preemption preclude these communities from regulating aircraft operations conducted at IND.

B. The interest of the communities in or near where the project may be located was given fair consideration (49 U.S.C. 47106(b)(2).

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of airport development project funding applications. The regional planning process that started with the 1992 FEIS, and the environmental process for this project-specific FSEIS, which began in 2000 and extended to this point of decision, provided numerous opportunities for the expression of and response to issues put forward by communities in and near the project location. Nearby communities and their residents have had the opportunity to express their views during the DSEIS public comment period, at a public meeting, as well as during the review period following public issuance of the FSEIS. The FAA's consideration of these community views is set forth in Chapter 1 and Appendix I of the FSEIS, and in Chapter 7 and Appendix A of this ROD.

Thus, the FAA has determined that throughout the environmental process, beginning at its earliest planning stages, fair consideration was given to the interest of communities in or near the project location.

C. Effect on Natural Resources (49 U.S.C. Section 47106 (c) (1) (c))

Under this statutory provision, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the USEPA, the FAA may approve airport project funding applications involving the location of an airport, a new runway, or a major extension of a runway having a significant adverse effect on natural resources, only after determining that no possible and prudent alternative to the project exists, and that every reasonable step has been taken to minimize the adverse effect.

FAA has consulted extensively with both the DOI and the USEPA. Although the FSEIS does not involve the location of an airport, a new runway, or a major runway extension, given the inability of other alternatives discussed in the FSEIS to satisfy the purpose and needs of the project, we have concluded that no possible and prudent alternative exists to development of the proposed alternative. As discussed in detail in Section 5.2 of the FSEIS and Chapter 6 of this ROD, and documented throughout the FSEIS and the administrative record, every reasonable step has been taken to minimize significant adverse environmental effects resulting from the project.

The FAA has decided to condition approval of the proposed alternative upon the mitigation measures described in Chapter 5 of the FSEIS and in Chapter 6 of this ROD. The FAA has determined that all reasonable steps have been taken to minimize any significant adverse effects on natural resources through mitigation.

D. Appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken to the extent reasonable to restrict the land use next to or near the airport to uses that are compatible with normal airport operations (49 U.S.C. section 47107 (a) (10)).

The sponsor assurance prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of airport development project funding applications. In addition to the actions described in Section A in this chapter, the IAA has worked extensively with local jurisdictions to develop and implement plans and policies to ensure compatible land use in the airport vicinity.

FSEIS Section 4.2 describes the current status of zoning and land use planning for lands near the airport. The airport has an existing noise compatibility program, designed to either reduce noise at the source or mitigate the noise received by sensitive land uses in the airport vicinity. As explained in the FSEIS, with planned mitigation, development of the project will not result in any increased significant impacts on non-compatible land uses.

The FAA requires satisfactory assurances, in writing, that appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken to restrict, to the extent reasonable, 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.

Based upon the administrative record for this ROD, the FAA has concluded that existing and planned noise reduction programs at IND provide for appropriate action to ensure compatible land use in the airport vicinity.

E. For this project, involving new construction which will directly affect wetlands, there is no practicable alternative to such construction. The proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands that may result from such use (Executive Order 11990, as amended).

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition for Federal Agency support or approval of airport development projects. The USEPA regulations governing the General Conformity determination process are found at 40 CFR Part 93, Subpart B, Sections 93.154 through 93.160, 40 CFR Part 50, and 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix W.

An Individual Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act was obtained from the Corps for projects assessed under the 1992 FEIS, including Wetlands 9, 11, and 12. Wetland 12 is the same as Wetland 3. The permit for completing construction activities that would impact these wetlands expired on July 31, 1997. The USACE has granted an extension to this permit until July 31, 2003. A portion of the North Collector Channel did not exist in 1992. Construction activities associated with the Midfield Terminal and interchange in the new portion of the North Collector Channel are covered in this permit extension. All the required wetland mitigation for this permit has been completed and the permit extension did not request additional mitigation. An IDEM certification was also obtained for activities assessed under the 1992 FEIS.

The Section 404/401 permit for Wetlands 4 and 5 was coordinated with the Corps and IDEM, and was submitted on October 22, 2001 and is currently being reviewed. The permit identifies the mitigation for emergent and forested wetlands. The wetland mitigation would be located south of the airport between the lower cells of existing wetlands and the bank of the East Fork of White Lick Creek. Mitigation for potential impacts to Wetlands 4 and 5 will be paid for and conducted by the FHWA. If the FHWA does not mitigate these wetlands, the IAA would commit to the mitigation at a location to be determined.

In order for the FAA to make a wetland finding under FAA Order 5050.4A, it must be demonstrated that all attempts to avoid, minimize and mitigate wetlands impacted by the project have occurred and that there is no other practicable alternative. The location, configuration, and geometry of the proposed midfield interchange represents the preferred choice by the FHWA for meeting the stated need for the interchange, because other alternatives failed to meet applicable safety criteria and/or those alternatives would have greater wetlands impacts. The impact to wetlands would be minimized by removing only the portions of the impacted wetlands that are required to be taken for the Proposed Project. Mitigation for impacted wetlands will be coordinated through a Section 404 permit filed for the 1995 FHWA EA. Therefore, the Proposed Project attempts to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and where it would not be possible to avoid impacts, mitigation is being proposed. The FAA also finds that there is no other practicable alternative to the Proposed Action for meeting the stated purpose and need (see Chapter 5).

F. Relocation assistance, if any, will be provided in accordance with 42 U.S.C. Section 4601, et seq. (The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970).

These statutory provisions, imposed by Title II of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, require that state or local agencies, undertaking Federally-assisted projects which cause the involuntarily displacement of persons or businesses, must make relocation benefits available to those persons impacted.

As detailed in Chapter 5 of the FSEIS, the selected development alternative will displace three houses (total of 2.56 acres).

The FAA will require the IAA to provide fair and reasonable relocation payments and assistance payments pursuant to the provision of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. Comparable decent, safe, and sanitary replacement properties are available on the open market.

G. For any use of lands with significant historic sites, there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using the land; the Proposed Project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to historic structures from land use (49 U.S.C. Section 303 (c)).

The selected alternative would not have significant adverse impacts on historic properties. However, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, consultation with the SHPO to determine if any historic properties are located in the geographic area of the proposed project was conducted.

Construction of the midfield interchange would impact three archaeology sites. These sites are non-significant in terms of historical objects because the sites are not eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The FAA and IAA are consulting with the SHPO as per the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA to make this determination (see FSEIS Appendix D, *Historic Properties Consultation*).

In addition, any disturbance of ground within 100 feet of a recorded cemetery requires the submission of a development plan to the IDNR to ensure that the cemetery remains undisturbed. Coordination with the IDNR (See FSEIS Appendix B, *Federal Scoping*, for letter) is being conducted to ensure that no impacts to the Lick Creek Friends Cemetery would occur. A second cemetery in the east airfield area was identified in the IDNR coordination letter. This cemetery is outside of the construction area and therefore no further coordination is needed.

Based upon the planned mitigation (discussed in the FSEIS, Chapter Seven Summary), the FAA concludes that there has been all possible planning to minimize any harm resulting from the actual and constructive use of historic properties.

H. There are no disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental impacts from the Proposed Project on minority or low-income populations (Executive Order 12898).

Environmental justice concerns were addressed in Chapter Four *Environmental Consequences*, Section 4.3 *Social Impacts* of the FSEIS, and it was concluded that no minority or low-income group would be disproportionately affected by displacements occurring as a result of the proposed project. The FSEIS contains a discussion of environmental justice issues relative to the selected alternative. It was concluded that the impacts from the selected alternative will not have a disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income communities.

I. The FAA has given this proposal the independent and objective evaluation required by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 C.F.R. Section 1506.5).

Environmental justice concerns were addressed in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS, and it was concluded that no minority or low-income group would be disproportionately affected by displacements occurring as a result of the selected alternative. The FSEIS contains a discussion of environmental justice issues relative to the selected alternative. It was concluded that the impacts from the selected alternative will not have a disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income communities.

As the FEIS outlined, a lengthy process led to the ultimate identification of the selected alternative, disclosure of potential impacts, and selection of appropriate mitigation measures. This process began with the FAA's competitive selection of an independent EIS contractor, continuing throughout the preparation of the DEIS, the FEIS, the FSEIS, and culminating in this ROD. The FAA provided input, advice, and expertise throughout the planning and technical analysis, along with administrative direction and legal review of the project. From its inception, the FAA has taken a strong leadership role in the environmental evaluation of this project and has maintained its objectivity.

J. Clean Air Act, Section 176 (c) (1) General Conformity and Transportation Conformity Determinations Regarding the Indianapolis International Airport Preferred Alternative actions (42 U.S.C. Section 7506(c)).

Since the Proposed Project is not exempt from general conformity review as defined under 58 FR 63229, a review was conducted. The review conducted for the FSEIS demonstrated that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in only *de minimus* emissions as defined in 40 CFR Part 93 Subpart B and the emissions would not be regionally significant. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not require any further general conformity analysis under the Clean Air Act.

In terms of Transportation Conformity, the new interchange included within the IAA Proposed Project is shown in the FSEIS to

be regionally significant. Projects which are regionally significant must comply with 40 CFR Part 51, Subpart T, and a transportation conformity determination must be made, unless the project is already included within a conforming Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The FSEIS presented documentation that the new interchange component of the Proposed Project complies with 40 CFR Part 51, Subpart T, and it is included in a conforming TIP. Therefore, no additional analysis or coordination would be required.

K. The Proposed Project includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to endangered species in as much as such harm may result from implementation of the Proposed Project (Endangered Species Act of 1974, PL 93-205, 16 U.S. C. 1531, as amended).

To comply with Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), as amended, agencies overseeing Federally funded projects are required to obtain from USFWS information concerning any species, listed or proposed to be listed, which may be present in the area of concern.

As part of the review associated with the 1992 FEIS, a biological assessment and a biological opinion were developed for the Indiana Bat (there are no other endangered species in the project impact area). The draft HCP subsequently submitted to the Service by the city and the IAA was developed in response to the aforementioned biological assessment and biological opinion.

Because of the new I-70 interchange location described in FHWA's 1995 EA, approximately 65 acres of additional Indiana Bat habitat will be lost. The mitigation of impacts has been and is continuing to be coordinated with the USFWS, the IDNR, the IDEM, and the Corps. A draft HCP has now been prepared for all of the Six Points Road Interchange projects under the 1995 FHWA EA and identifies the mitigation for direct and indirect secondary impacts to the Indiana bat habitat as a result of all of the proposed projects in the 1995 FHWA EA, including the construction of the midfield interchange. The acreage that may experience potential impacts will be identified in the approved HCP when that plan is complete. The plan will outline the mitigation due to all of the projects in the Six Points Road Interchange, including the proposed midfield interchange, as well as private development including AmeriPlex. Within the HCP area, forested land and Indiana Bat habitat would be preserved both inside and outside of the Habitat Conservation area. The majority of this mitigation would be located on the perimeter of and within the interchange areas of the Six Points Road interchange.

While the HCP has not been finalized, mitigation for potential impacts due to the construction of the midfield interchange would be conducted in accordance with the final plan, approved by the USFWS. Only a small portion of the impacts that will be addressed in the HCP would result from the proposed development of the Midfield Terminal and midfield interchange in the FSEIS. Coordination with the USFWS (See FSEIS Appendix I, *Agency and Public Coordination*, for the agency letter) has indicated that the USFWS would review this FSEIS to determine if all impacts to Indiana Bats would be covered in the HCP. If the USFWS finds that all impacts to the Indiana Bat have already been addressed in the HCP they will provide that determination in writing. However, if the USFWS finds that all impacts to the Indiana Bat have not been addressed in the HCP or if the HCP is not implemented, the FAA would be required to address those impacts through ESA section 7 consultation with the USFWS. In either case the location of the mitigation would likely remain the same, due to the fact that most of the Habitat Conservation mitigation is anticipated to occur on or adjacent to IAA property.

With regard to the FSEIS, the Department of the Interior (DOI) (reflecting comments developed by the USFWS) indicated concerns for impacts of the Proposed Project on Indiana Bat habitat and water quality impacts. Specifically, the DOI stated "To ensure that all projects effects on federal threatened and endangered species are fully considered, we recommend that the Record of Decision not be signed until the HCP has been approved by the FWS and an incidental take permit issued and any consultation determined to be necessary to address water quality impacts has also been completed." In its letter of September 12, 2001, the FAA provided the DOI with additional information related to potential water quality impacts and delivered IAA's commitment to sign the incidental take permit and commitment to perform the necessary mitigation. In its subsequent letter to the FAA dated October 1, 2001, the DOI stated "The USFWS has reviewed the letter and informed the Department that the USFWS' concerns regarding the HCP requirement, as well as concerns about potential project-related water quality impacts in the East Fork of White Lick Creek, have been satisfactorily addressed by the commitments made by the FAA in the letter. Accordingly, the Department would not object to the FAA signing the ROD once the IAA has signed the ITP application and has provided to the FAA its commitment to implement the approved HCP." Both the IAA commitment to the FAA and the signature on the ITP application has now been completed.

11. APPROVAL AND FAA ORDER

FAA APPROVAL AND ORDER

Having determined that the agency's preferred alternative, Proposed Project Alternative, is the only possible, prudent, and practicable alternative, the remaining decision is whether to approve or not approve the agency actions necessary for implementation of the project. Approval would signify that applicable Federal requirements relating to airport development planning have been met, and would permit the IAA to proceed with the proposed development and possibly receive Federal funding for eligible items. Not approving these actions would prevent the IAA from proceeding with Federally supported development in a timely way.

I have carefully considered the FAA's goals and objectives in relation to various development aspects of the proposed development actions discussed in the FSEIS. These include the purposes and needs to be served by the projects, 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 in terms of effective and fiscally responsible expenditure of Federal funds. I have also considered comments received by the FAA on the social, environmental, and economic impacts of the proposed actions.

Therefore, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the FAA, I find that the projects in the ROD are reasonably supported and approved. For those projects I, therefore, direct that action be taken to carry out the agency actions discussed more fully in Section 3 of this ROD, including:

A. Approval under existing or future FAA criteria of project eligibility for Federal grant-in-aid funds and/or PFC, including the following elements:

    1. Land Acquisition/Land Transfer
    2. Site Preparation
    3. Taxiway Construction
    4. Landside Developments, including Roadways
    5. NAVAIDS
    6. Terminal Facility Improvements and New Terminal Facilities
    7. Environmental Mitigation

A. Approval of a revised ALP, based on determinations through the aeronautical study process regarding obstructions to navigable airspace and no FAA objection to the airport development proposal from an airspace perspective.
B. Approval for relocation and/or upgrade of various NAVAIDS.
C. Review and subsequent approval of an amended Airport Certification Manual for IND (14 CFR Part 139).
D. Selection by the FAA of the Proposed Project Alternative, even though the No-Build Alternative is the environmentally preferred alternative because, as documented throughout the FSEIS, FAA has determined that there is no other reasonable and prudent alternative that meets the applicable Purpose and Need criteria.

Finally, I certify, as prescribed by 49 U.S.C. 44502 (b), that implementation of the Proposed Project is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce.

Concur:

Larry Ladendorf
Acting Manager Airports Division, Great Lakes Region

11/29/01
Date

Approved:

Cecelia Hunziker
Regional Administrator, Great Lakes Region

11/29/01
Date

RIGHT OF APPEAL

This decision constitutes the Federal approval for the actions identified above and any subsequent actions approving a grant of Federal funds to the IAA. Today's action is taken pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Subtitle VII, Parts A and B, and constitutes a final order of the Administrator subject to review by the Courts of Appeals of the United States in accordance with the provisions of 49 U.S.C. Section 46110.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AAQS Ambient Air Quality Standards

AIP Airport Improvement Program

ALP Airport Layout Plan

ARFF Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting Facility

ATCT Airport Traffic Control Tower

BMP Best Management Practices

CAA Clean Air Act

CAAA Clean Air Act (including 1990 Amendments)

CEQ Council on Environmental Quality

CFR Code of Federal Regulations

DEIS Draft Environmental Impact Statement

DNL Day-Night Average Sound Level

DOI Department of the Interior

DOT Department of Transportation

DHCP Draft Habitat Conservation Plan (the Plan)

DSEIS Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

EA Environmental Assessment

EDDA Environmental Due Diligence Audit

EIS Environmental Impact Statement

ESA Endangered Species Act

FAA Federal Aviation Administration

FAA Order 1050.1D Policies and Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts

FAA Order 5050.4A Airport Environmental Handbook

FAR Federal Aviation Regulation

FEIS Final Environmental Impact Statement

FHWA Federal Highway Administration

FR Federal Register

FSEIS Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

FTA Federal Transit Act

FY Fiscal year

HC Hydrocarbons

HCP Habitat Conservation Plan

HUF Terre Haute Airport

IDEM Indiana Department of Environmental Management

IDMD Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development

IDNR Indiana Department of Natural Resources

InDOT Indiana Department of Transportation

IMA Indianapolis Metropolitan Area

IMPO Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization

IND Indianapolis International Airport

INM Integrated Noise Model

IRTIP Indianapolis Regional Transportation Improvement Program

ITP Incidental Take Permit

MOA Memorandum of Agreement

MPO Metropolitan Planning Organization

NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards

NAVAIDS Navigational aids

NCP Noise Compatibility Program

NEM Noise exposure map

NEPA National Environmental Policy Act

NHPA National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

NOx Nitrogen Oxides

NPDES National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

PFC Passenger Facility Charges

ROD Record of Decision

SEIS Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

SHPO Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer

SPCC PLAN Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan

TAF Terminal Area Forecast

TIP Transportation Improvement Program

TSS Total suspended solids

USACE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps)

U.S.C U.S. Code

USEPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

USFWS U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service)

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

A-Weighted Sound (dBA) - A measurement representing a sound generally as the human ear hears it by filtering out as much as 20 to 40 decibels of sound below 100 hertz (Hz). Used for aircraft noise evaluations.

Aircraft Operations - The total number of movements in landings (arrivals) plus takeoffs (departures) from an airport.

Airport Elevations - The highest point on an airport's usable runways expressed in feet above mean sea level (MSL).

Airport Improvement Program (AIP) - A Federal funding program for airport improvements. Funds are derived from sources such as airline tickets, aviation fuel, etc.

Airport Layout Plan - An airport plan (ALP) is a scaled drawing of existing and proposed land and facilities necessary for the operation and development of the airport. Any airport will benefit from a carefully developed plan that reflects current FAA design standards and planning criteria. The ALP shows boundaries and proposed additions to all areas owned or controlled by the sponsor for airport purposes, the location and nature of existing and proposed airport facilities and structures, and the location on the airport of existing and proposed non-aviation areas and improvements thereon.

Airport Surveillance Radar (ASR) - A radar system which allows air traffic controllers to identify an arriving or departing aircraft's distance and direction from an Airport.

Annual Service Volume (ASV) - A planning term which describes the number of annual aircraft operations which are possible at an airport with an acceptable amount of delay. The measure is specific to individual airports because it is derived from their own particular capacity characteristics.

Automated Radar Terminal System (ARTS) - Computer-aided radar display subsystems capable of associating alphanumeric data with radar returns.

Base Floodplain - That area subject to a one percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year (i.e., the 100-year floodplain).

Baseline Condition - The existing conditions or conditions prior to future development, which serve as a foundation for analysis.

Best Management Practices - Methods employed during construction and included in the development for ensuring environmental management to the greatest possible extent.

Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) - The oxygen used in meeting the metabolic needs of aerobic microorganisms in water rich in organic matter.

Building Restriction Line (BRL) - A line that identifies suitable building area locations on airports. The BRL encompasses the runway protection zones, the runway visibility zone areas required for ATCT clear line of sight, and all airport areas with less

than 35 foot (10.5 m) clearance under the FAR Part 77 surfaces.

Capacity - The number of aircraft operations possible at a particular airport. When a continuous demand of activity is assumed, regardless of delay, it is described as ultimate capacity. When a limit on the number of operations is considered based on an acceptable level of delay, it is described as practical capacity.

CAT I - Precision Approach Category I Runway - A runway with an instrument approach procedure which provides for approaches to a decision height of not less than 200 feet (60 m) and visibility of not less than 1/2 mile (800 m) or Runway Visual Range (RVR) 2400.

CAT II - Precision Approach Category II Runway - A runway with an instrument approach procedure which provides for approaches to a minima less than CAT I to as low as a decision height of not less than 100 feet (30 m) and s Runway Visual Range (RVR) of not less than RVR 1200.

CAT III - Precision Approach Category III Runway - A runway with an instrument approach procedure which provides for approaches to a minima less than CAT II.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) - A Federal law enacted in 1980 that governs the cleanup of hazardous, toxic, and radioactive substances. Under this act the Department conducts remedial investigations and feasibility studies to determine the sources and extent of contamination and ultimately the cleanup alternatives.

Commercial Service Airport - A public airport which is determined by the Secretary of Transportation to enplane annually 2,500 or more passengers and receive scheduled passenger service of aircraft.

Commuter Aircraft - Commuters are those carriers that provide regularly scheduled passenger or cargo service or aircraft predominantly seating fewer than 66 passengers or holding cargo with 18,000 pounds of payload or less. A typical commuter flight operates over a trip distance of 100 to 300 miles and is flown at lower altitudes than those operated by the long-haul carriers.

Connecting Passenger - An airline passenger who transfers from an arriving aircraft to a departing aircraft at a hub airport in order to reach their ultimate destination.

Constructive Use - Refers to the possible indirect impacts to DOT Section 4(f) properties such as parks. Constructive use is considered to occur when a transportation project does not incorporate land from a Section 4(f) resource but the project's proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Substantial impairment occurs only when the protected activities, features or attributes of the resource are substantially diminished. For example, a substantial increase in noise levels at a park due to transportation project may represent a constructive use, even though the park is not directly affected through acquisition or development.

Day-Night Equivalent Sound Level (DNL or Ldn)- A noise measure used to describe the average aircraft noise levels over a 24-hour period, typically an average day over the course of a year. DNL considers aircraft operations that occur between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. to be 10 decibels louder than they actually are to account for increased annoyance. DNL may be determined for individual locations or expressed contours. DNL is currently the accepted measure for aircraft noise analysis.

Decibel (dB) - A unit of noise level representing a relative quantity. This reference value is a sound pressure of 20 micronew tons per square meter.

Delay - The difference, in minutes, between the scheduled time and actual time of an aircraft arrival or departure. For airport planning purposes, it is often expressed as an annual average.

Displaced Threshold - A threshold that is located at a point on the runway other than the designated beginning of the runway.

The portion of pavement behind a displaced threshold may be available for takeoffs in both direction and landings from the opposite direction.

Enplanements - Domestic, territorial, and international revenue passenger boarding passengers in scheduled and nonscheduled service of aircraft in intrastate, interstate, and foreign commerce.

Environmental Assessment (EA) - An environmental assessment is a concise document that assesses the environmental impacts of a proposed Federal action. This document discusses the need for, and environmental impacts of, the Proposed Project and alternatives. A listing of agencies and persons consulted is also included. An environmental assessment should provide sufficient evidence and analysis for a Federal determination whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) - An EIS is normally required for a first time airport layout plan approval or airport location approval for a commercial service airport located in a standard metropolitan statistical area and Federal financial participation in or airport layout plan approval of, a new runway capable of handling air carrier aircraft at a commercial service airport in a standard metropolitan statistical area. Even though these actions normally require an environmental impact statement, the preparation of the environmental impact statement will usually be preceded by an environmental assessment. If the environmental assessment demonstrates that there are no significant impacts, the action shall be processed as a FONSI instead of an EIS.

Farmland Conversion Impact Rating - A form (AD-1006) used by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service to evaluate soils which are potentially eligible for protection as Prime or Unique (or Statewide Important) farmland under the Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981.

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) - The FAA constructs, operates, and maintains the National Airspace System and the facilities which are a part of the system; allocates and regulates the use of the airspace; ensures adequate separation between aircraft operating in controlled airspace; and through research and development programs, provides new systems and equipment to improve utilization of the nation's airspace.

Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 150 - Established by Congress under the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 for the purpose of developing a balanced and cost effective program to reduce the effects of aircraft noise on local communities.

Finding of No Significant Impact - Following the preparation of an environmental assessment, the Federal Agency determines whether to prepare an EIS or FONSI. If the proposed project is determined not to result in any significant environmental impact, a finding (FONSI) is made by the Federal Agency.

Flight Track Utilization - The use of established routes for arrival and departure by aircraft to and from the existing runways at the airport.

General Aviation (GA) - All civil aviation operations other than scheduled air services and nonscheduled air transport operations.

Grid Analysis - A type of aircraft noise analysis which evaluates the noise levels at individual points rather than generate noise contours.

Hub - An airport which serves airlines that have hubbing operations.

Hubbing - A method of airline scheduling that times the arrival and departure of several aircraft in a close period of time in order to allow the transfer of passengers between different flights of the same airline in order to reach their ultimate destination. Several airlines may conduct hubbing operations at an airport.

Hubbing Complex - The period of time in which an airline times the arrival and departure of several aircraft to accomplish hubbing. An airline may operate several complexes at an airport each day.

Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) - Flight procedures used during weather conditions when visibility is less than three miles and/or cloud ceiling is less than 1,000 feet above the ground (from FAR Part 91).

Instrument Landing System (ILS) - An electronic system installed at some airports which helps to guide pilots to runways on landing during periods of limited visibility or adverse weather. A pilot must have proper training and his aircraft property equipped to use an ILS. Most major airports have at least one of their runways equipped with an ILS.

Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) - Meteorological conditions expressed in terms of visibility, distance from cloud and ceiling which is less than the minimums specified for visual meteorological conditions.

Integrated Noise Model (INM) - A computer model developed and maintained by the FAA to predict the noise impacts generated by aircraft operations.

Land Use Compatibility - The ability of land uses surrounding the airport to coexist with airport-related activities with minimum conflict.

Landing and Takeoff (LTO) Cycle - The time that an aircraft is in operation at an airport. An LTO cycle begins when an aircraft starts its final approach (arrival) and ends after the aircraft has made its climb-out (departure).

Localizer Directional Aid (LDA) - A navigation aid used for instrument approaches that operates similarly to and provides the same accuracy as an ILS localizer.

Local Passenger - A passenger who either enters or exits a metropolitan area on flights served by the area's airport. The opposite of a connecting passenger.

Location Impact Analysis - An analysis conducted to determine if noise level increases associated with projected development would approach the FAA threshold of a 1.5 dBA of DNL increase within the 65 DNL or greater noise contours over any noise-sensitive land use.

Loudness - The subjective intensity of sound.

Mitigation Measure - An action taken to alleviate negative impacts.

Navigational Aid (NAVAID) - Any visual or electronic device airborne or on the surface that provides point-to-point guidance information or position data to aircraft in flight.

Master Plan - A comprehensive plan to guide the long-term physical development of an airport.

NEPA - The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) is the original legislation establishing the environmental review process.

Noise - Noise is defined as unwanted sound. Whether a sound is considered noise is based on human perception.

Noise Contour Map - A map representing average annual noise levels summarized by lines connecting points of equal noise exposure.

Noise Exposure Map (NEM) - A map of an airport and its environs which identifies the area impacted by various aircraft noise levels. The FAA has specified criteria for presentation of Part 150 Noise Exposure Maps.

Noise Level Reduction (NLR) - The amount of noise level reduction achieved through incorporation of noise attenuation (soundproofing) in the design and construction of a structure.

Obstacle Free Areas (OFA) - An area on the ground centered on a runway, taxiway, or taxilane centerline provided to enhance the safety of aircraft operations by having the are free of objects, except for objects that need to be located in the OFA for air navigation or aircraft ground maneuvering purposes.

Part 139 - This part prescribes rules governing the certification and operation of land airports which serve any scheduled or unscheduled passenger operation of an air carrier that is conducted with an aircraft having a seating capacity of more than 30 passengers.

Part 150 - Prescribes the procedures, standards, and methodology governing the development, submission, and review of airport noise exposure maps and airport noise compatibility programs, including the process for evaluating and approving or disapproving those programs. It prescribes single systems for-- (a) measuring noise at airports and surrounding areas that generally provides a highly reliable relationship between projected noise exposure and surveyed reaction of people to noise; and (b) determining exposure of individuals to noise that results from the operations of an airport. This part also identifies those land uses which are normally compatible with various levels of exposure to noise by individuals.

Precision Approach Procedure/Precision Approach - A standard instrument approach procedure in which an electronic glideslope/glidepath is provided, e.g., ILS/MLS and PAR.

Public-use Airport Any public airport, any privately owned reliever airport, any privately owned airport which is determined to enplane annually 2,500 or more passengers and receive scheduled passenger service of aircraft, and which is used or to be used for public purposes.

Regional Jet (RJ) - A smaller jet powered aircraft, typically 50 seats or less.

Reliever Airport - An airport having the function of relieving congestion at a commercial service airport and providing more general aviation access to the overall community.

Rotational Runway Use - Variance in the particular runways in use over a specific time period to prevent constant use of one runway.

Run-Up - Stationary aircraft engine maintenance test that produces high aircraft noise levels.

Runway - A defined rectangular area on an airport prepared for the landing and takeoff run of aircraft along its length. Runways are normally numbered in relation to their magnetic direction rounded off to the nearest 10 degrees, e.g., Runway 14, Runway 32.

Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) - An area (formerly the clear zone) trapezoidal in shape and centered about the extended runway centerline, is used to enhance the safety or aircraft operations. It begins 200 feet (60 m) beyond the end of the area usable for takeoff or landing. The RPZ dimensions are functions of the design aircraft, type of operation, and visibility minimums.

Runway Safety Area (RSA) - A defined surface surrounding the runway prepared or suitable for reducing the risk of damage to airplanes in the event of an undershoot, overshoot, or excursion from the runway.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106) - Governs the identification, evaluation, and protection of historical and archeological resources affected by state and Federal transportation projects. Principal areas identified include required evaluations to determine the presence or absence of site, the eligibility based on National Register of Historic Places criteria and the significance and effect of a proposed project upon such a site.

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (Section 401) - The State Water Quality Certification program, requires that states certify compliance of federal permits or licenses with state water quality requirements and other applicable state laws. Under Section 401, states have authority to review any federal permit or license that may result in a discharge to wetlands and other waters under state jurisdiction, to ensure that the actions would be consistent with the state's water quality requirements.

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Section 404) - authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) to issue permits regulating the discharge of dredged or fill material into the waters of the United States, including wetlands.

SIMMOD - Airport and Airspace Simulation Model. FAA's simulation model used for calculating capacity and delay information.

Sound - Sound is the result of a sound source vibration in the air. The vibration produces alternating bands of relatively dense and sparse particles of air, spreading outward from the source in the same way as ripples do on water after a stone is thrown into it. The result of the movement is a fluctuation in the normal atmospheric pressure or sound waves.

Taxiway - A defined path established for the taxiing of aircraft from one part of an airport to another.

Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) – The Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) contains historical and forecast data for enplanements, airport operations and instrument operations. The data covers the 315 FAA towered airports, 128 Federal contract tower airports, 175 radar approach control facilities, and 2,962 non-FAA airports. Data in the TAF are presented on a U.S. government fiscal year basis (October through September). The TAF is prepared to assist the FAA in meeting its planning, budget, and staffing requirements. In addition, many state aviation authorities and other aviation planners use the TAF as a basis for planning future airport improvements.

Time Above A Threshold Sound Level - The time in minutes at a specific location that a preselected sound level is exceeded due to aircraft operations (e.g., time in minutes that the sound level is above 75 dBA).

Visual Approach - An approach by an IFR flight when either part or all of an instrument approach procedure is not completed and the approach is executed in visual reference to terrain.

Visual Flight Rules (VFR) - Rules that govern the procedures for conducting flight under visual conditions. In addition, it is used by pilots and controllers to indicate type of flight plan.

Visual Meteorological Conditions (VMC) - Meteorological conditions expressed in terms of visibility, distance from cloud, and ceiling equal to or better than specific minimum. Typically, these conditions occur whenever the cloud ceiling is at least 1,000 feet above ground level, distance to cloud is 1 statute mile, and the visibility is at least 3 statute miles.

APPENDIX A

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE FINAL SEIS

FAA's RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON

THE FINAL SEIS FROM AGENCIES, GROUPS, AND INDIVIDUALS

This appendix contains the comments received by the Federal Aviation Administration on the Final SEIS preceded by the FAA's responses to the environmental issues on matters within its jurisdiction and authority raised by those comments.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment	Commentator	Response

1. It will be necessary to review any portion of the project pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA (16 U.S.C. § 470f) and 36 C.F.R. Part 800, that has not already been reviewed.	Larry D. Macklin (State Historic Preservation Officer), June 28, 2001	Comment Noted. At this time, all known impacts have been presented in the FSEIS, Chapter Four, Historic, Architectural, and Archaeological Resources.
2. The National Institute of Environmental Health Services has no input or function regarding any EIS.	Bill Grigg (National Institute of Environmental Health Services), July 2, 2001	Comment Noted. This recipient has been removed from the mailing list.
3. A task force has been composed to develop a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) addressing the potential impacts to the Indiana Bat (*Myotis Sodalis*) that will result from several projects in the vicinity of the Airport including the midfield terminal interchange. As the task force has not yet completed the HCP, the FWS cannot further comment on the adequacy of the project at this time. The Department also requests that FAA signature on the project's ROD be withheld pending issuance by the USF&WLS of the approved HCP and the Incidental Take Permit (ITP).	Willie R. Taylor (Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, US Department of the Interior), July 25, 2001.	With regard to the FSEIS, the Department of the Interior (DOI) (reflecting comments developed by the USFWS) indicated concerns for impacts of the Proposed Project on Indiana Bat habitat and water quality impacts. Specifically, the DOI stated "To ensure that all projects effects on federal threatened and endangered species are fully considered, we recommend that the Record of Decision not be signed until the HCP has been approved by the FWS and an incidental take permit issued and any consultation determined to be necessary to address water quality impacts has also been completed." The FAA provided the DOI with additional information related to potential water quality impacts and delivered IAA's commitment to sign the incidental take permit. In its subsequent letter to the FAA on October 1, 2001, the DOI stated "The USFWS has reviewed the letter and informed the Department that the USFWS' concerns regarding the HCP requirement, as well as concerns about potential project-related water quality impacts in the East Fork of White Lick Creek, have been satisfactorily addressed by the commitments made by the FAA in the letter. Accordingly, the Department would not object to the FAA signing the ROD once the IAA has signed the ITP and has provided to the FAA its commitment to implement the approved HCP." Both the IAA commitment to the FAA and the signature on the ITP application has been completed.
4. The degradation, as stated in Table 6-1, of the water quality in the White Lick Creek has the potential to adversely impact Indiana bats. Therefore, the FAA should provide FWS a through characterization of the water quality impact as soon as	Willie R. Taylor (Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, US Department of the Interior), July 25, 2001.	The Record of Decision (Chapter 6) provides a revised discussion of the potential water quality impacts related to glycol runoff and roadway discharges. All glycol-containing wastewaters will be collected and pumped to the Seerley

the water quality impact as soon as possible and not wait until renewal of the NPDES permit in 2002.		collected and pumped to the Seerley Creek facility, which is where glycol currently is pumped and processed. The roadway discharges were identified in the 1995 FHWA EA and will be addressed as part of the water quality mitigation for that project. DOI's October 1, 2001 letter states "concerns about potential project related water quality impacts…have been satisfactorily addressed." Accordingly, this issue is resolved.
5. With reference to cumulative impacts to wetlands, the FWS notes that there are still unresolved issues. The FWS and other interested agencies continue to work with project consultants on resolving the issues, primarily related to stream relocations.	Willie R. Taylor (Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, US Department of the Interior), July 25, 2001.	Comment noted. The stream relocations are not required for the proposed midfield interchange ramps in this FSEIS. As noted in response to Comment 3, the FAA coordinated with the USFWS regarding water quality concerns. This coordination and commitments made by the FAA resulted in the DOI stating that they had no objections to the FAA signing the ROD and that their concerns had been met.
6. Page 4.8-4 incorrectly states, "This plan was submitted to the USFWS in November 2001." Coordination between the applicants and the FWS has been ongoing and several drafts of the plan have been reviewed, but the applicants have not yet submitted their HCP or their application for an Incidental Take Permit.	Willie R. Taylor (Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, US Department of the Interior), July 25, 2001.	Comment Noted. The HCP application has now been signed by both the IAA and by the City and the IAA has committed to the HCP mitigation and the USFWS has accepted this. The signed HCP has been submitted to the USFWS for approval.
7. The statement of page 5-9, "Mitigation has been completed for the Indiana Bat and the wetland habitat impacts that would result from the midfield terminal interchange development" is not accurate. There are impacts to the Indiana Bats that have not previously been addressed. It is anticipated that most of these impacts will be addressed by the HCP, which is currently under development.	Willie R. Taylor (Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, US Department of the Interior), July 25, 2001.	The HCP application has now been signed by both the IAA and by the City. As stated in the October 1, 2001 letter, DOI and the Service do not object to FAA signing the ROD.
8.There are also additional wetland impacts, as discussed in Sections 4.10.4 and 4.10.5 of the FSEIS, for which mitigation has not been completed but is being planned.	Willie R. Taylor (Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, US Department of the Interior), July 25, 2001.	Comment Noted. The Airport Authority has committed to provide any and all wetlands compensation as may be required in any forthcoming Section 404 permit issued to it.
9. In our letter of May 3, 2001 we provided a rating of EC-2 on behalf of the SDEIS. In this regard, our specific environmental concerns related to the possibility of a shortfall in the provision of forested	Kenneth A. Westlake (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), July 25, 2001.	Comment Noted. The issue of forested wetlands compensation from the 1992 FEIS was discussed in depth as part of an interagency meeting held at the Airport on April 20, 2001. At that meeting

shortfall in the provision of forested compensatory wetlands as related to the wetlands impacts attributable both to this project and the previous major construction projects at the Airport.		Airport on April 20, 2001. At that meeting it was determined that additional consultation among the USACE, USEPA, and IDEM will be necessary to resolve this issue. The ACOE has informed the IAA that it has fully complied with all applicable USACE permit requirements, including the provision of compensatory wetlands. These comments do not require any changes to the ROD.
10. The previous comments and recommendations remain in effect.	Stephen H. Jose (Division of Water, IDNR), July 27, 2001.	Comment Noted. These comments relate to the need for an appropriate NPDES permit which is anticipated to be issued under the jurisdiction of the State of Indiana (IDEM).
11. In Chapter One, on page 1, the statement, "In addition, the relocation of a navigational aid and the pillars for a future taxiway bridge would be constructed as part of the I-70 relocation." The timing should be concurrent; however, the funding should be from airport sources.	Chris Baynes (Indiana Department of Transportation), July 31, 2001.	Comment Noted. The Record of Decision (Chapter 6) has been revised to specify the funding sources.
12. In Chapter Four, Environmental Consequences, the Interchange Justification Study that was approved included the Midfield Interchange, which will be designed and funded by the airport.	Chris Baynes (Indiana Department of Transportation), July 31, 2001.	Comment Noted. The Record of Decision (Chapter 6) has been revised to specify the funding sources.
13. In Chapter Six, Cumulative Impacts, the land swap that is discussed with the Indiana Department of Transportation, will require that the FAA authorize the release of airport owned land for non-airport use. At this time, the amount and the exact location of the land that would be released is unknown.	Chris Baynes (Indiana Department of Transportation), July 31, 2001.	Comment Noted. The exact location and amount of land, if any, to be released will be determined at the appropriate time in the Project's engineering and design phase. Any additional environmental review that may be required will be completed at that time.
14. The Indiana Department of Transportation is concerned that the runoff from the new I-70 interchange/airport could be detrimental to bat feeding areas.	Chris Baynes (Indiana Department of Transportation), July 31, 2001.	Comment noted. The roadway discharges were identified in the 1995 FHWA EA and will be addressed as part of the water quality mitigation activity required for that project. This issue was also resolved in the DOI letter of October 1, 2001.
15. Concerning other modes of transportation, was the potential high-speed rail service in Indianapolis, that has federal designation for further study, considered as an alternative mode of transportation during the life of the midfield airport terminal?	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	The discussion of alternative modes of transportation (FSEIS, page 2-1) identifies that destinations under 250 highway miles may be served by other modes of transportation. However, locations greater than 250 highway miles from Indianapolis would not be as well

airport terminal?		from Indianapolis would not be as well served by other modes of transportation, due to cost and time factors. Both Cincinnati and Chicago are within 250 miles, but 26 of the 28 top market cities fall outside of this air mile range. Therefore, the use of other transportation modes is an inadequate alternative to the Project.
16. Are any alternatives being considered to the demolition of the existing terminal and parking structures? This issue affects the northeast corner of the airport nearby land uses outside the airport property.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	This matter was considered, but no such alternatives known to exist for the existing terminal and parking structures.
17. Will the demolition areas be converted to other airport-related uses? This issue affects the northeast corner of the airport nearby land uses outside the airport property.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	At this point, it appears that the area in question will in fact continue to be owned by the IAA and therefore will remain an airport-related use.
18. Concerning page 3-7, 3-8 building codes, a provided attached sheet indicates the codes in effect with the City of Indianapolis/Marion County. The one and two family code now administered by the City of Indianapolis is the Indiana Residential Code 2001.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	Comment Noted. These codes will be provided to the Airport Authority for its use and information.
19. Concerning page 3-17, thoroughfare plans; The Indianapolis Regional Transportation Plan was updated on March 21, 2001. The Official Thoroughfare Plan for Indianapolis/Marion County was updated June 7, 1999 and was most recently amended on January 19, 2000.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	Comment Noted. These comments do not relate to any required revisions to the FSEIS.
20. Concerning page 3-22, Table 3-3 Population Trends and Forecasts, Marion County's 2000 population totals are higher than the forecasts shown on this table.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	Comment noted. The FSEIS used U.S. Census data as the basis for population trend forecasts. Even if Marion County's figures were to prove accurate, the purpose and need of the project would not be changed.
21. Concerning page 4.2-16, there are three corrections to this page.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	Comment Noted. These changes have been made as part of the Record of Decision.
22. Concerning page 4.17-1, There is a correction of this page.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	Comment Noted. These changes have been made as part of the Record of Decision.

23. Morgan County is now in the process of reestablishing a county plan commission and attendant planning and zoning authority for the unincorporated area of the county. The FSEIS was being prepared while Morgan County had suspended these activities.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	Comment Noted.
24. The base map information for Marion County and Hendricks County appears to be dated by several years.	Carolyn M. Coleman (The City of Indianapolis), August 1, 2001.	Comment Noted. The base map information was obtained from the latest FAA approved study at Indianapolis International Airport. While the base map may have some minor discrepancies due to the area's constantly changing land uses, the specific land uses potentially impacted by the proposed Project are in fact unaffected.
25. The DOI would not object to the FAA signing the ROD once the IAA has signed the Incidental Take Permit application and has provided to the FAA its commitment to implement the approved HCP.	Willie R. Taylor (Department of Interior, Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance), October 1, 2001.	With regard to the FSEIS, the Department of the Interior (DOI) (reflecting comments developed by the USFWS) indicated concerns for impacts of the Proposed Project on Indiana Bat habitat and water quality impacts. Specifically, the DOI stated "To ensure that all projects effects on federal threatened and endangered species are fully considered, we recommend that the Record of Decision not be signed until the HCP has been approved by the FWS and an incidental take permit issued and any consultation determined to be necessary to address water quality impacts has also been completed." The FAA provided the DOI with additional information related to potential water quality impacts and delivered IAA's commitment to sign the incidental take permit. In its subsequent letter to the FAA on October 1, 2001, the DOI stated "The USFWS has reviewed the letter and informed the Department that the USFWS' concerns regarding the HCP requirement, as well as concerns about potential project-related water quality impacts in the East Fork of White Lick Creek, have been satisfactorily addressed by the commitments made by the FAA in the letter. Accordingly, the Department would not object to the FAA signing the ROD once the IAA has signed the ITP and has provided to the FAA its commitment to implement the approved HCP." Both the IAA commitment to the FAA and the signature on the ITP application has been completed.

		application has been completed.

APPENDIX B

AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN

This appendix (1.2MB) contains the IND Airport Layout Plan.