

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM
FOR
AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
JACKSON AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE
SOUTHERN REGION AIRPORTS DIVISION

Airport Name:	Golden Triangle Regional Airport
Proposed Action:	Airbus Helicopters, Inc. – Solar Array
This Environmental Assessment becomes a Federal document when evaluated and signed by the responsible FAA official.	
Responsible FAA Official:	
Date:	



This Environmental Assessment (EA) Form is intended for use in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Jackson Airports District Office (JAN/ADO) only, and with the approval of a JAN/ADO Environmental Protection Specialist (EPS). The Airport Sponsor must discuss the use of this EA Form with a JAN/ADO EPS before beginning the EA scoping and environmental analysis process. An electronic version of this EA Form is available upon request from a JAN/ADO EPS.

APPLICABILITY

The purpose of an EA is to determine whether a proposed action has the potential to significantly affect the human environment (see FAA Order 1050.1F, Paragraph 4-3 for more information on determining significance). An EA is a concise public document that briefly provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significance (FONSI). An EA, at a minimum, must be prepared when the proposed action does not normally require an EIS (see Paragraph 3-13, Actions Normally Requiring an Environmental Impact Statement) and:

- 1) Does not fall within the scope of a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) (see FAA Order 1050.1F, Paragraph 5-6 *The Federal Aviation Administration’s Categorical Exclusions*);
- 2) Falls within the scope of a CATEX, but there are one or more Extraordinary Circumstances (see FAA Order 1050.1F, Paragraph 5-2 *Extraordinary Circumstances*).

See FAA Order 1050.1F, Paragraph 3-1.2. Actions Normally Requiring an Environmental Assessment.



INSTRUCTIONS

Introduction: This EA Form is based upon the guidance in FAA Order 1050.1F – *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, and the related publication FAA Order 1050.1F Desk Reference (1050.1F Desk Reference). The Order provides the FAA policies and procedures to ensure agency compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] §§ 4321-4335), the requirements set forth in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), parts 1500-1508, *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act* (CEQ Regulations), and Department of Transportation (DOT) Order 5610.1C, *Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts*. The CEQ Regulations establish procedures for complying with NEPA. In accordance with 40 CFR § 1507.3 of the CEQ Regulations, the Order contains the FAA's implementing procedures, which supplement those regulations. The 1050.1F Desk Reference provides details on current guidance and updated technical information. This includes information about permits, licenses, consultations, and other forms of approval or review; up-to-date details on technical information such as FAA-approved tools for analyzing noise and air emissions; overviews of special purpose laws and requirements; and specific responsibilities and guidance for gathering data, assessing impacts, consulting other agencies, and involving the public.

Early Planning: Environmental issues should be identified and considered early in a proposed action's planning process to ensure efficient, timely, and effective environmental review. Preparation for any applicable permit application and other review process requirements should be part of the planning process to ensure that necessary information is collected and provided to the permitting or reviewing agencies in a timely manner. The Airport Sponsor should identify known environmental impact categories that the Action and alternatives (if any) could affect, including specially protected resources. These tasks should be completed at the earliest possible time during Action planning to ensure full consideration of all environmental impact categories and facilitate the FAA's NEPA process. Sufficient planning and Action justification must be available to support the environmental review.

****IMPORTANT****

The Airport Sponsor must contact their JAN/ADO Program Manager if the Proposed Action is not depicted on the Airport's conditionally-approved ALP. The JAN/ADO will determine if an update to the ALP is required. If an interim ALP update is required, coordination and approval can take up to 90 days and must be finalized prior to an environmental decision.

A Proposed Action's pre-application for federal funding (design or construction) must include an environmental finding in accordance with NEPA. The Airport Sponsor should allow 6-12 months prior to submitting a pre-application to the JAN/ADO for federal funding to complete the EA process.



1. **PROPOSED ACTION LOCATION**

Airport Name and Identifier:	Golden Triangle Regional Airport (GTR)		
Airport Address:	2080 Airport Road		
City:	Columbus	County:	Lowndes
State:	Mississippi	Zip Code:	39701

2. **AIRPORT SPONSOR INFORMATION**

Point of Contact:	Adam Creamer, Airbus Helicopters, Inc.		
Address:	1782 Airport Rd, Columbus, MS 39701		
Business Phone:	662-244-6201	Cell:	662-681-5104
FAX:		EMAIL:	adam.creamer@airbus.com

3. **PREPARER INFORMATION**

Point of Contact:	Lang Kirkwood – Headwaters, Inc.		
Address:	PO Box 2836 Ridgeland, MS 39158		
Business Phone:	601-634-0097	Cell:	
FAX:		EMAIL:	lang@headwaters-inc.com

4. **PROPOSED ACTION**

Describe the Proposed Action with sufficient detail in terms that are understandable to individuals who are not familiar with aviation or commercial aerospace activities. List and describe all components of the Proposed Action including all connected actions. Summarize how the Proposed Action fits into the Airport’s ALP. **Attach an exhibit of the Airport’s conditionally approved ALP depicting the Proposed Action, and an exhibit of the Proposed Action on a recent airport aerial.** Summarize costs, including any mitigation costs, if applicable. Discuss how the Proposed Action will be funded. Provide a timeframe identifying when the Proposed Action is to be constructed and operational.

Airbus Helicopters, Inc. is proposing to construct a 2MW fixed tilt solar ground mount system located on approximately 10 acres on the leased property of the Golden Triangle Regional Airport. The line layouts of this project will follow existing rights-of-way and easements. The proposed Project area is indicated on maps in Appendix A.



5. PURPOSE AND NEED

(1) Describe the underlying purpose and need for the Proposed Action. Present the problem being addressed, describe what the Airport Sponsor is trying to achieve with the Proposed Action, and take into account the FAA’s primary mission to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in the world. The purpose and need of the Proposed Action must be clearly explained and stated in terms that are understandable to individuals who are not familiar with aviation or commercial aerospace activities. The purpose and need must be supported by recent data. To keep this section brief, incorporate by reference any supporting data, inventories, assessments, analyses, or studies. This can include but is not limited to FAA compliance or standard changes, letters from users showing need per FAA design standards, letters of commitment from current or prospective tenants, based aircraft data, fuel data, scheduled service, critical aircraft needs, TAF and Master Plan forecasts, capacity issues (actual use/need of aircraft or airline, or scheduled commercial service.) **IMPORTANT: If the Airport Sponsor intends to request Federal funding, the purpose and need for the Proposed Action must be justified by recent airport planning analysis and concurred with by ADO management before initiating the EA.**

The purpose of this project is to provide the existing facility with sustainable and reliable electrical generation near the facility. At this time, the existing facility is supplied by a single electrical source. With the implementation of the proposed project, the facility would have a source of sustainable energy with supplemental back-up from the utility.

(2) Identify the Airport Sponsor’s requested FAA Federal action in the space below. For the FAA Office of Airports (ARP), a Federal action may include one or more actions (See FAA Order 5050.4B, Paragraph 9.g.). *Note: The information provided in this EA Form allows the FAA to determine if a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) can be issued because the proposed action’s environmental impacts, with no additional mitigation, would not be significant, or a mitigated FONSI can be issued because the proposed action’s environmental impacts, with additional mitigation, would not be significant (see FAA Order 1050.1F, Paragraph 6-2.3a). FAA environmental findings on an Action do not constitute FAA decisions or approvals regarding Federal funding of the Action.*

The information provided in this EA Form allows the FAA to determine if a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) can be issued because the proposed action’s environmental impacts, with no additional mitigation, would not be significant.

6. ALTERNATIVES (INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION)

There is no requirement for a specific number of alternatives or a specific range of alternatives to be included in an EA. Alternatives are to be considered to the degree commensurate with the nature of the proposed Action and agency experience with the environmental issues involved. The Sponsor’s preferred alternative, if one has been identified, should be indicated. For alternatives considered but eliminated from further study, the EA should briefly explain why these were eliminated. *Note: An EA may limit the range of alternatives to the proposed action and no action when there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. This means that you may limit the range of alternatives to the proposed action and no action if you can establish consensus based on input from interested parties that there are no unresolved conflicts, or if there are no reasonable alternatives that would be substantially different in design or effects. If you are able to do this, you must document the basis for concluding consensus and identify the parties that participated; and,*



you must discuss why there are no reasonable alternatives that would be substantially different in design or effects. This is why the Purpose and Need is important in helping define the range of alternatives.

(1) Discuss in comparable format to that listed below the Proposed Action and alternatives. Discuss how the Proposed Action and alternatives were developed e.g. recent planning study or Master Plan Update. Attach figures for the Proposed Action and alternatives to aid in understanding the physical layout and differences in the alternative configurations.

For each alternative:

- a. Discuss to what extent an alternative meets the Purpose and Need.**
- b. Discuss if an alternative is technically and economically feasible e.g. operational considerations/regulations, safety considerations, constructability, infrastructure requirements, property acquisition requirements, and costs.**
- c. Discuss potential social, socioeconomic, and/or environmental resource impacts for each alternative e.g. business or residential relocations, road relocations or closures, environmental resources protected under federal statutes (wetlands, floodplains, and listed species, and Section 4(f), or Section 106 resources).**
- d. For each alternative considered but eliminated from further study, summarize why it is not considered reasonable. Note: *To be reasonable, an alternative must respond to the purpose and need, be technically and economically feasible, and be reasonably consistent with the land use plan for management of the area.***

No other feasible alternatives were considered for the proposed project. Due to the available land and size of the parcel adjacent to the existing facility, no other alternatives were considered. With the proposed project location, there are no impacts to airport operations, minimal environmental impacts, no structural or road relocations/closures, and no negative social or socioeconomic impacts.

(2) Although the No Action alternative does not meet the purpose and need, NEPA, and it's implementing regulations requires consideration of the No Action alternative. The No Action alternative, when compared with other alternatives, enables the identification of the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives. Describe the consequences of the No Action alternative e.g. what are the operational, safety, efficiency, economic effects, and environmental effects of taking no action.

The no action alternative would not provide a sustainable source of electricity to the existing facility. Without the proposed project, the facility will continue to lose production when power outages occur. This equates to lost time, efficiency, and production.

(3) You must provide a summary table depicting the alternatives analysis that compares the Proposed Action, alternatives considered, and the No Action alternative based on the screening criteria discussed in (1) a. through d.



Provide summary table of alternative analysis

As previously discussed, there were no other alternatives considered. The proposed action on the proposed location was able to meet the screening criteria for parcel size, airport operations, safety, constructability, environmental concerns, and cost.

7. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Succinctly describe the existing conditions in the Proposed Action’s *direct impact area* (construction footprint) and airport vicinity (land use and cover, terrain features, level and type of urbanization, biotic resources, noise sensitive sites (residential, churches, schools, parks, recreational facilities, etc.)). This *indirect impact area* should be large enough to include the area within the composite DNL 65 dB noise contour for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any). The discussion of the affected environment should be no longer than is necessary to understand the impacts of the alternatives; data and analyses should be presented in detail commensurate with the importance of the impact. Discuss any actions taken or issues raised by the local community or citizen groups pertinent to the Proposed Action. If not already provided, attach a graphic and recent aerial of the area with the Proposed Action’s and retained alternatives direct and indirect impact areas clearly identified.

The construction footprint of the proposed project will impact approximately 10 acres. This area is a relatively flat maintained area adjacent to the existing facility as indicated on the attached figures. The area surrounding the airport is largely industrial/commercial use. Once constructed, the project will not produce any noise.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES –IMPACT CATEGORIES

Environmental impact categories that may be relevant to FAA actions are identified below in sections (1) through (14). Construction and secondary (induced) impacts should be addressed within the relevant environmental impact category. FAA-specific requirements for assessing impacts are highlighted in FAA Order 1050.1F, Appendix B *Federal Aviation Administration Requirements for Assessing Impacts Related to Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. § 303)*. Methodologies for conducting the analyses are discussed in detail in the 1050.1F Desk Reference. The latest FAA-approved models must be used for both air quality and noise analysis. A list of approved models for each type of analysis is available in the 1050.1F Desk Reference.

Note: *The Desk Reference may be cited only as a reference for the methodologies and processes it contains, and may not be cited as the source of requirements under laws, regulations, Executive Orders, DOT or FAA directives, or other authorities. It further notes that you should cite the original source when citing requirements from laws, regulations, or other authorities.*

FAA Order 1050.1F, paragraph 4-3.3, Significance Thresholds and Exhibit 4-1, provide a significance determination table for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) based on the analysis in sections (1) through (14) below. Note: *Quantitative significance thresholds do not exist for all impact categories; however, consistent with the CEQ Regulations, the FAA has identified factors that should be considered in evaluating the context and intensity of potential environmental impacts.*



****IMPORTANT****

Environmental impacts for the following categories must be calculated for the year of project implementation and the planning horizon year in this EA Form. The implementation year represents the first year in which the Proposed Action would be fully operational. The planning horizon year typically represents the implementation year plus five years. Sometimes if appropriate due to project phasing or if requested by a reviewing agency, impact analysis may need to be conducted for intermediate years. Coordinate with an FAA JAN/ADO environmental specialist before conducting an intermediate year impact analysis.

Significance determination table

Attached in Appendix A.

(1) AIR QUALITY

The FAA has a responsibility under NEPA to include in its EA's sufficient analysis to disclose the extent of a project's impact on the attainment and maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and any applicable state air quality standards. Thus, a project's impact on air quality is assessed by evaluating whether it would cause a new violation of a NAAQS or contribute to a new violation in a manner that would increase the frequency or severity of the new violation. Very small projects sometimes can be evaluated qualitatively or by comparison to a previous project for which a quantitative air quality analysis is available. However, if a project requires the preparation of an EA, it is likely that a quantitative, project-specific air quality assessment would be needed. This can be accomplished by first identifying the emissions sources associated with a project, and then estimating the emissions for each retained alternative. Knowing the emissions may help to characterize a project's impact for the EA. The FAA's *Air Quality Handbook* provides information on how to conduct an air quality analysis.

https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/policy_guidance/envir_policy/airquality_handbook/

(a) Compared to the No Action alternative, will the Proposed Action or any of the retained alternatives cause or create a reasonably foreseeable increase in air emissions due to implementation? If the action will not cause a reasonably foreseeable emission increase, a *qualitative* air quality assessment is justifiable for disclosure purposes under NEPA. Provide an explanation of the conditions and rationale upon which this finding is based along with any supporting data, reasoning and/or justification. The assessment should explain how or why implementation of the Proposed Action or any of the retained alternatives will not cause or create a reasonably foreseeable increase in air emissions. **Note:** *Examples of projects and actions that will likely cause or create a reasonably foreseeable increase in emissions include those that will cause or create an increase in aircraft operations and/or ground access vehicle trips. Other projects such as runway/taxiway improvements, roadway modifications, and/or parking facility expansions, may cause or create reasonably foreseeable increases in emissions by changing aircraft and vehicle travel patterns. By comparison, examples of projects and actions that will not likely cause or create increases in emissions include land acquisition programs or the upgrading of airfield lighting systems.*

Discuss the potential for a reasonably foreseeable increase in air emissions:

The Proposed Action is not anticipated to cause or create significant air quality impacts. The project is in an attainment area for NAAQS. The proposed project will not cause or contribute to an increase in air emission. When in use, the solar generation could help reduce emissions from larger generation sources.



[Empty yellow box]

(b) Is the Proposed Action located in a nonattainment or maintenance area for any of the NAAQS established under the Clean Air Act? **If the Proposed Project is in a nonattainment or maintenance area, identify for what pollutant(s), and do not complete this EA Form without first contacting a JAN/ADO EPS for further guidance. Note: To review the current list of areas designated nonattainment, see the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reference book, The Green Book Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants at <https://www.epa.gov/green-book>.**

Document area status:

The project is located in an attainment area for NAAQS.

(c) If the action is located in an attainment area and will cause a reasonably foreseeable emission increase, you must prepare an emissions inventory for NAAQS priority pollutants and Green House Gases (GHG's) and disclose the results. **You must contact a JAN/ADO EPS before conducting an air quality analysis.**

******IMPORTANT******

As of May 29, 2015, the FAA accepted modeling tool for predicting air emissions is the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT). The most current version of this model, currently AEDT2b *must* be used for any new analysis started after that date. Please contact a JAN/ADO Environmental Specialist if you have any questions regarding the emissions analysis or the current version of the model to use in your analysis.

Provide the emissions inventory for the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action and Retained Alternatives for the EA Study Years including both direct and indirect emissions that are reasonably foreseeable which includes operational as well as construction emissions.

No Action Alternative – No emissions
Proposed Action – No emissions

Discuss the results of the emissions inventory and make a determination if the impacts are considered significant.

The project will not generate air emissions.

(2) BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (INCLUDING FISH, WILDLIFE, AND PLANTS)

(a) Using the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's IPaC site (<https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/>), provide an assessment of the Proposed Action's and retained alternatives (if any) direct impact area (construction footprint) and indirect impact area (area indirectly impacted through facility lighting, noise contours, air emissions, and changes to water quality or quantity caused by construction equipment or facility operations). Attach a figure and table (for direct and indirect impact areas) with acreages per land use cover type to assist in the explanation. If NOAA fisheries has species or



critical habitat in the area consult through:

<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/content/how-submit-consultation-request-southeast> .

Quantitatively discuss potential direct and indirect impacts:

In November 2023, an online IPAC assessment/species list was requested. This assessment indicates the federally listed bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) as well as the threatened Price’s potato-bean (*Apios priceana*), candidate monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*), and proposed threatened alligator snapping turtle (*Macrochelys temminckii*) as having potential habitat in the proposed project area. There is no suitable habitat on site for any of the listed species. There would be no direct or indirect impacts to listed species or their habitat. The IPaC and habitat assessment is attached in Appendix B.

(b) Describe the potential for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) to result in long-term or permanent loss of plant or wildlife species, to directly or indirectly affect plant communities, and/or involve the displacement of wildlife. Cross reference Category (14) Water Resources, if jurisdictional water bodies or wetlands are present.

Quantitatively discuss potential direct and indirect impacts:

No adverse effects to these species would be anticipated with the implementation of the proposed action. The proposed action would not adversely impact any species of concern or their habitat. The proposed action would occur in portions of the Airport that are currently disturbed and graded landscape. The proposed action would not result in substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species habitats or populations.

(c) Using U.S. Fish and Wildlife (FWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) flora and fauna species lists for the Action vicinity, describe the potential for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) to directly or indirectly affect any federally-listed or candidate species of flora or fauna or designated critical habitat protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), or affect Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) identified under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. You must attach records of consultation with FWS and NMFS, as appropriate, in an appendix to the EA. **Note:** *If the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) would potentially affect federally protected or candidate species, or designated critical habitat, do not complete this EA and contact an FAA JAN/ADO EPS.*

Quantitatively discuss the potential for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives to directly or indirectly impact federally-protected species and designated critical habitat:

The proposed project does not contain habit suitable for the presence of any of the listed species.

(d) If the project is in MS, use Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks website at: <https://www.mdwfp.com/museum/seek-study/natural-heritage-program/request-natural-heritage-information/> flora and fauna species lists for the Action vicinity, describe the potential for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) to directly or indirectly affect any state-listed species protected in the State of Mississippi. You must attach records of consultation with state jurisdictional agencies in an appendix to the EA.

Quantitatively discuss the potential for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives to directly or indirectly impact state-protected species and designated critical habitat:

The proposed project does not contain habitat suitable for the presence of any of the listed species.



(e) Describe the potential for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) to directly or indirectly affect species protected under the Migratory Bird Act. You must attach a record of consultation with FWS in an appendix to the EA.

Quantitatively discuss the potential impacts:

Potentially affected species protected under the Migratory Bird Act that may be present at the proposed project site include: American kestrel (*Falco sparverius Paulus*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), chimney swift (*Chaetura pelagica*), lesser yellowlegs (*Tringa flavipes*), marbled godwit (*Limosa fedoa*), painted bunting (*Passerina ciris*), pectoral sandpiper (*Calidris melanotos*), prothonotary warbler (*Protonotaria citrea*), and rusty blackbird (*Euphagus carolinus*). The area is currently maintained. There would be no significant impacts to the species or any habitat.

(f) Discuss any operational, avoidance, minimization or compensatory measures (including construction mitigation measures) that have been considered in the siting of the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) to mitigate impacts to biological resources. Identify all required federal, state or local permits. **Note:** Analyses for undisturbed areas including water bodies must be conducted in consultation with FWS, other Federal agencies (NMFS, EPA, USACE), and state agencies (DEP, FWC, and water management districts), having expertise on potentially affected biotic resources and their habitats. Federal and state-listed species lists must be consulted and the potential for occurrence in the Proposed Action area must be documented. Include an analysis of construction impacts and measures to avoid and minimize impacts to ensure that this document properly addresses both permanent and temporary, constructed-related impacts on these resources.

Quantitatively discuss any operational, avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures:

Due to the nature of the maintained property, no additional measures are necessary.

(3) CLIMATE

(a) Affected Environment - For airport actions, the study area is defined by the extent of the project changes (i.e., immediate vicinity of the airport) and should reflect the full extent of aircraft movements as part of the project changes. Consult the FAA's Air Quality Handbook for more information on defining the study area. As explained in the 1050.1F Desk Reference, analysis of GHG emissions should be quantitatively assessed in certain circumstances, but otherwise may be qualitatively assessed. Where the analysis is quantitative, the affected environment section for climate should provide the quantitative data for the existing condition, which provides the baseline of existing GHG emissions in the study area. The affected environment section should also discuss the current level of preparedness in the study area with respect to the impacts of climate change. This involves describing current measures that are in place within the study area to adapt to the impacts of climate change (e.g., sea level rise, stronger or more frequent storms, etc.). This discussion should be concise and may be quantitative or qualitative, depending on the nature of the project area.

Describe the current Climate and level of preparedness conditions in the Study Area:

The project area is in the humid subtropical climate region, characterized by temperate winters; long, hot summers; and rainfall that is fairly evenly distributed through the year. It is subject to drought, flood, tornados, and hurricanes. These conditions are common with local and state officials that are prepared for these events.

(b) Environmental Consequences - If GHG's and climate are not relevant to the Proposed Action and alternative(s) (i.e., because there would be no GHG emissions), this should be briefly noted and no further analysis is required.



Qualitatively discuss the reasons that the Proposed Action and retained alternatives would not affect GHG's or Climate Change:

The proposed action would not result in a significant increase in emissions of GHG. Energy sources used to power the facility would change to energy provided by renewable solar power provided by the proposed project. Under the proposed action, it is anticipated that energy consumption for the facility operation would emit fewer emissions than the No Action alternative due to the use of the proposed solar ground mount system array. The proposed project would also not result in a long-term increase in vehicle traffic or aircraft operations. Construction activities would result in minor, short-term emissions from construction vehicle exhaust.

(c) Where the Proposed Action or alternative(s) would not result in a net increase in GHG emissions (as indicated by quantitative data or proxy measures such as reduction in fuel burn, delay, or flight operations), a brief statement describing the factual basis for this conclusion is sufficient and no further analysis is required.

Describe the basis for "no-effect" conclusion:

The proposed action would result in the net decrease of GHG given that the solar array would provide power and would emit fewer emissions than the No Action alternative which relies upon the electrical grid. No change to Airport operations would occur as a result of the proposed action.

(d) Where the Proposed Action or alternative(s) would result in an increase in GHG emissions as compared to the No Action alternative for the same study year, the emissions should be assessed either qualitatively or quantitatively using the methodology described in FAA's 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 3.3.2 (Data Analysis). **Note:** Contact a JAN/ADO EPS prior to undertaking a quantitative analysis.

Explain:

The proposed action would not result in a net increase in GHG emissions given that the facility would utilize energy from the solar array and would emit fewer emissions than the No Action alternative which relies upon the electrical grid. No change to Airport operations would occur as a result of the proposed action.

(e) Documentation - When CO2e is quantified, the metric tonnes (Mg) CO2e results should be provided in a table or similar format that compares the alternatives directly. When fuel burn is computed, the Mg CO2 equal to that fuel content should be documented and discussed. See Section 3.3.3 of 1050.1F.

Provide a discussion of the analysis including data tables comparing the No Action and retained alternatives for each study year:

No CO2e would be produced by the proposed action.

(f) Reducing Emissions - Reduction of GHG emissions resulting from FAA actions contributes towards the U.S. goal of reducing aviation's impacts on climate. For NEPA reviews of proposed FAA actions that would result in increased emissions of GHGs, consideration should be given to whether there are areas within the scope of a project where such emissions could be reduced. GHG emission reduction can come from measures such as changes to more fuel efficient equipment, delay reductions, use of renewable fuels, and operational changes (e.g., performance-based navigation procedures). However, GHG emission reduction is not mandated and will not be possible in all situations.

Discuss measures to reduce emissions associated with the Proposed Action:



NA

(g) Climate Adaptation - The environmental consequences section should include a discussion of the extent to which the proposed action or alternatives(s) could be affected by future climate conditions, based on published sources applicable to the study area. For example, a project area’s ability to sustain impacts caused by climate changes should be described (e.g., identify current robustness and height of seawalls for coastal airports). This discussion should include any considerations to adapt to forecasted climate change conditions.

Discuss potential climate conditions relevant to the Proposed Action:

NA

(4) COASTAL RESOURCES

(a) Is the Proposed Action located within the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS), as delineated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Official CBRS maps? If the Proposed Action is located within the CBRS, **do not complete this EA** and contact an FAA JAN/ADO EPS.

Explain:

The proposed project is not located within the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

(b) Coordinate a consistency review of the Proposed Action under the following authorities: Presidential Executive Order 12372; § 403.061 (42), the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1464, as amended; the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4347, as amended; and Mississippi or Alabama Statutes.

The Mississippi Department of Marine Resources (MDMR) is the point of contact for wetlands permits in the Mississippi Coastal Zone, which includes Hancock, Harrison and Jackson counties at: <https://dmr.ms.gov/permitting/>.

Projects having the potential to impact Alabama's coastal resources in Baldwin and Mobile counties are subject to review pursuant to ADEM's Coastal Rules, found at: <https://adem.alabama.gov/programs/coastal/coastalPermitting.cnt>.

N/A

(5) DOT SECTION 4(f)

(a) Describe and identify on an attached figure all DOT Section 4(f) resources both on-airport and within the airport’s vicinity (or area encompassed by the composite DNL 65 dBA noise contour for the Proposed Action, reasonable alternatives (if any) and No Action alternative). Resources that are protected by Section 4(f) are publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance; and publicly or privately owned land from an historic site of national, state, or local significance. Cross-reference Category (11) Noise and Compatible Land Use, as applicable.

Describe 4(f) resources and attach a figure if applicable:

There are no 4(f) resources on or near the proposed project area.

(b) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) have a direct impact (physical use or “taking”) or indirect impact (constructive use) on any of



any Section 4(f) sites or facilities? To assess constructive use refer to "FAR Part 150, Appendix "A", Table 1, Land Use Compatibility With Yearly Day-Night Average Sound Levels" If YES, do not complete this EA and contact the FAA JAN/ADO EPS.

Discuss the results of the analysis:

NA

(6) FARMLANDS--PRIME, UNIQUE OR STATE-SIGNIFICANT FARMLAND

(a) Compared to the No Action alternative does the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) involve the acquisition of Prime, Unique or statewide and locally important farmland, or the conversion/use of these types of farmlands that are protected by the Federal Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA)? For more information see:

<https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>

Note: Farmland subject to FPPA requirements does not have to be currently used for cropland. It can be forest land, pastureland, cropland, or other land, but not land used for water storage or urban built-up land. Also, the "Part 523-Farmland Protection Policy Manual" notes that lands identified as "urbanized area" (UA) on Census Bureau maps are not subject to the provisions of the FPPA.

Discuss analysis and add tables and graphics as appropriate:

The proposed project area does include areas of prime farmland; however, there are no farm uses on Airport property and the proposed action would not require the acquisition of any land.

(7) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SOLID WASTE, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION

(a) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action and reasonable alternatives (if any) violate applicable Federal, state, tribal or local laws or regulations regarding hazardous materials and/or solid waste management?

Explain:

The operation and/or construction of the proposed alternative would not generate significant amounts of solid waste. The proposed facility would generate a small amount of solid waste during construction. No demolition of existing structures is proposed. All construction would comply with federal, state, and local laws. The operation of the solar array would not generate waste.

(b) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) involve a contaminated site (including but not limited to a site listed on the National Priorities List)? Describe how the Proposed Action site was evaluated for hazardous substance contamination. Reference electronic database searches and attach in an appendix any record of consultation with appropriate expertise agencies.

Explain:

A review of an electronic database search was conducted. There are no contaminated sites associated with the proposed project. The EDR report and associated maps are attached in Appendix C.



[Empty yellow box]

(c) Does the Proposed Action include land acquisition? A qualified Environmental Professional must prepare an Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) in accordance with FAA Order 1050.19C, *Environmental Site Assessment in the Conduct of FAA Real Property Transactions*. In particular, a Phase I ESA must be conducted prior to the acquisition of real property. The Phase I ESA must be attached to the EA.

Explain:

There will be no land acquisition.

(d) Compared to the No Action alternative would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) produce an appreciably different quantity or type of hazardous waste?

Explain:

The operation of the proposed solar array would not generate waste.

(d) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) generate an appreciably different quantity or type of solid waste or use a different method of collection or disposal and/or would exceed local capacity? If **YES**, are local disposal facilities capable of handling the additional volumes of solid waste resulting from the Action? A letter from the local waste management handling facility may be necessary.

Explain:

The proposed action would not generate solid waste after project construction.

(e) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) adversely affect human health and the environment with regards to hazardous materials or solid waste?

Explain:

The proposed action would not generate solid or hazardous waste.

(f) Is there a sanitary landfill containing municipal solid waste (MSW) located within 10,000 feet of a runway serving turbo-powered aircraft, or 5,000 feet of a runway serving piston-powered aircraft?

Note: A sanitary landfill containing municipal solid waste (MSW) is incompatible with airport operations if the landfill is located within 10,000 feet of a runway serving turbo-powered aircraft, or 5,000 feet of a runway serving piston-powered aircraft. Refer to FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200.33 "Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports," and FAA Order 5200.5B, "Guidance Concerning Sanitary Landfills on or Near Airports."

Explain:

There is no landfill within 10,000 ft. of a runway.

(8) HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL, ARCHEOLOGICAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES



(a) Describe and identify on an attached figure any *known* sites listed-in or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the Proposed Action’s and retained alternatives (if any) Area of Potential Effect (APE), which is defined as “the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties”. The APE includes the direct impact area (limits of ground disturbance) and as applicable the indirect impact area encompassed by the composite DNL 65 dBA noise contour of the Proposed Action, No Action, and retained alternatives (if any). Protected resources include historic sites, districts, objects, archaeological remains, historic structures, public parks, publicly-owned recreation areas, and wildlife or waterfowl refuges. Accomplish this review through searching the NRHP database, consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), local historic groups, local jurisdictions, federally recognized tribes in the APE, and airport staff. Historic airport facilities (50 years or older) must be included. **Note:** *If any known listed or eligible NRHP sites are identified within the Proposed Action’s APE (direct or indirect), you must immediately contact the JAN/ADO Environmental Specialist for further instruction regarding Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).*

Describe and identify on attached figure (as applicable) any known sites in the direct and indirect impacts APE:

A survey report titled *A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Proposed Airbus Solar Project in Lowndes County, Mississippi* is included in Appendix D. The Phase I survey did not reveal any cultural resources. No historic properties exist within the project area. A one-mile (1.6 kilometers [km]) radius search was conducted around the proposed project area for previously recorded archaeological sites and previous cultural resource surveys. The search area was also inspected for historic structures recorded within MDAH’s historic property files and in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (National Park Service 2024). Background research revealed two previously recorded sites, 15 previous surveys, and two historic resources within a mile of the study area. Two of the surveys, #02-293 and #06-293, overlap with the current project area. There are no NRHP-listed properties within one mile of the project area. The proposed action would have no direct or indirect impacts to the APE.

(b) Consultation with the SHPO and tribes should be conducted early in the process and prior to submittal of the preliminary Draft EA to the JAN/ADO EPS. Discuss SHPO and tribal consultation responses below. **Records of consultation with the SHPO and federally recognized tribes and their responses must be included in an appendix to the EA.** All public out-reach efforts should apply to these groups as well. **Note:** *Letters to the Alabama SHPO and federally recognized tribes must come from the FAA. Draft letters for FAA signature. Discuss the proposed action and attach a figure identifying the area of potential effect (APE) on a recent aerial. Include in the discussion whether a cultural resource assessment study (CRAS) has been done for the APE. Provide a written effects determination along with supporting documentation to the SHPO/THPO and the consulting parties (see 36 CFR § 800.5). Make one of the following conclusions: (1) no historic properties present in the APE; (2) no adverse effect on historic properties; or (3) adverse effect on historic properties. If any known listed or eligible NRHP sites are identified within the Proposed Action’s APE, you must immediately contact the JAN/ADO Environmental Specialist for further instruction regarding Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).*

Discuss SHPO and tribal consultation responses.

Consultation letters (Appendix E) were sent to seven tribes that may have tribal interests in the project area. Two tribes requested a copy of the Phase I cultural resources survey. The report was sent for their review. There was no opposition to the proposed action. All correspondence is included in Appendix.



(c) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action or retained alternatives (if any) result in *direct effects* (physical disturbance or destruction, damage, alteration, isolation of the property from its surroundings, or moving a property from its historic location), or *indirect effects* (introduction of visual, auditory, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property or that would diminish the integrity of the property’s setting), on any NRHP property or NHRP-eligible property? Cross reference your response with other applicable impact categories such as noise and compatible land use, air quality and Section 4(f)/6(f) resources.

Discuss direct or indirect effects on NRHP or NHRP-eligible properties.

There would be no impacts to archeological resources as a result of the proposed action.

(9) LAND USE

(a) Compared to the No Action Alternative, would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) result in any impacts to off-airport land uses and/or require a change to the local comprehensive plan and zoning map?

Discuss any impacts to off-airport land uses or changes to a local comprehensive plan or zoning.

The proposed project is within the current commercial/Industrial land use.

(b) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) be located near or create a potential wildlife hazard as defined in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33, "Wildlife Hazards on and Near Airports"?

Discuss potential wildlife hazards.

The proposed action would not create a potential wildlife hazard.

(c) If the Airport Sponsor is filing a federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant application for construction of the Proposed Action, an executed letter from the Airport Sponsor to the FAA with the land use assurance language noted below must be attached as an appendix to this EA.

“Per 49 USC Section 47107(a)(10), that appropriate action, including adopting zoning laws, has been or will be taken to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations, including the landing and takeoff of aircraft.”

Note: *The Sponsor’s assurance letter must be related to existing and future planned land uses in the airport vicinity.*

Identify Draft EA Appendix that contains the Airport Sponsor’s land use assurance letter or explain why one is not required.

Appendix H

(10) NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY SUPPLY

(a) Identify suppliers of energy resources found in the area such as power plants, water utilities, sewage disposal utilities, and suppliers of natural gas and petroleum, as applicable. Identify the approximate amount of other resources such as water, asphalt, aggregate, and wood a project would use in the construction, operation, and maintenance of a project and identify where the suppliers are located.

Discuss:



No additional natural or energy resources would be necessary for the proposed project once constructed. When in operation, the proposed project would generate electricity.

(b) Compared to the No Action alternative, what effect would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) have on energy supplies or other natural resource consumption? Would demand exceed supply?

Explain:

When in operation, the proposed project would generate electricity.

(c) Identify whether the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) would incorporate sustainable design features such as conservation of resources, use of pollution prevention measures, minimization of aesthetic effects, and address public (both local and traveling) sensitivity to these concerns.

Explain:

The solar array is a sustainable project that reduces reliance upon other sources.

(11) NOISE AND COMPATIBLE LAND USE

(a) Determine if a noise analysis should be conducted per FAA Order 1050.1F, Appendix B. Airport operations must not exceed the threshold for both existing and forecast years (with and without the Proposed Action). If operations exceed the threshold, coordinate with the JAN/ADO EPS prior to conducting a noise analysis. **Note:** *No noise analysis is needed for projects involving Design Group I and II airplanes (wingspan less than 79 feet) in Approach Categories A through D (landing speed less than 166 knots) operating at airports whose forecast operations in the period covered by the NEPA document do not exceed 90,000 annual propeller operations (247 average daily operations) or 700 annual jet operations (2 average daily operations). These numbers of propeller and jet operations result in DNL 60 dB contours of less than 1.1 square miles that extend no more than 12,500 feet from start of takeoff roll. The DNL 65 dB contour areas would be 0.5 square mile or less and extend no more than 10,000 feet from start of takeoff roll. Also, no noise analysis is needed for projects involving existing heliports or airports whose forecast helicopter operations in the period covered by the NEPA document do not exceed 10 annual daily average operations with hover times not exceeding 2 minutes. These numbers of helicopter operations result in DNL 60 dB contours of less than 0.1 square mile that extend no more than 1,000 feet from the pad. Note that this rule applies to the Sikorsky S-70 with a maximum gross takeoff weight of 20,224 pounds and any other helicopter weighing less or producing equal or less noise levels. Airport forecasts must be consistent with the most recent FAA Terminal Area Forecast (TAF).*

Document the most recent TAF for the airport, the existing and forecast annual operations in the EA study years for the No Action alternative, the Proposed Action and any retained alternatives. Discuss whether the thresholds described above would be exceeded or not and whether a quantitative or qualitative noise analysis is appropriate for the Proposed Action.

The proposed project would not generate noise.

(b) Aircraft noise screening may rule out the need for more detailed noise analysis if screening shows no potential for significant noise impacts. The Area Equivalent Method (AEM) can be used in evaluating proposed actions and alternative(s) at an airport which result in a general overall increase in daily aircraft operations or the use of larger/noisier aircraft, as long as there are no



changes in ground tracks or flight profiles. If the AEM calculations indicate that the action would result in less than a 17 percent (approximately a DNL 1 dB) increase in the DNL 65 dB contour area, there would be no significant impact over noise sensitive areas and no further noise analysis would be required. If the AEM calculations indicate an increase of 17 percent or more, or if the action is such that use of the AEM is not appropriate, then the noise analysis must be performed using the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) to determine if significant noise impacts would result. See the Area Equivalent Method (AEM) Version 7.0c User's Guide, October 2012 for further information on conducting an AEM screening procedure. **Note:** *If more detailed noise analysis is required, the model must be used to determine if significant noise impacts would result from implementation of the Proposed Action. Information regarding the FAA's AEDT 2b can be found in the 1050.1F Desk Reference and at <https://aedt.faa.gov/> .*

Explain the results of the AEM analysis if used.

NA

(c) Describe the affected environment for noise and noise compatible land use. Refer to the 1050.1F Desk Reference section 11.2, Affected Environment, for necessary information. The steps generally required to describe the affected environment for noise and noise compatible land are as follows:

- *Determine the study area for noise analysis.* An airport environs study area must be large enough to include the area within the DNL 65 dB contour, and may be larger.
- *Identify noise sensitive areas in the study area and pertinent land use information;* A noise sensitive area is defined in Paragraph 11-5.b (8) of FAA Order 1050.1F.
- *Describe **current** noise conditions in the study area.* Noise exposure contours must include DNL 65, 70, and 75 dB levels. Identify the number of residences or people residing within each noise contour where aircraft noise exposure is at or above DNL 65 dB. Identify the location and number of noise sensitive uses in addition to residences (e.g., schools, hospitals, nursing homes, parks, recreation areas, historic structures) that could be significantly impacted by noise. Use recent aerial photographs, GIS mapping and other resources to depict land uses within the noise study area.

NA

(d) Describe the potential noise impacts of the proposed action and alternative(s), if any, for each timeframe evaluated. Use the AEDT to provide noise exposure contours for DNL 5 dB increments for the DNL 65, 70, and 75 dB levels. For all comparisons analyzed, the analysis needs to identify noise increases of DNL 1.5 dB or more over noise sensitive areas that are exposed to noise at or above the DNL 65 dB noise exposure level, **or** that would be exposed at or above the DNL 65 dB level due to a 1.5 dB or greater increase, when compared to the No Action alternative for the same timeframe. For each modeling scenario analyzed, disclose, quantify and discuss:

- number of residences or people residing within each noise contour interval where aircraft noise exposure is at or above DNL 65 dB,
- the net increase or decrease in the number of people or residences exposed to each increment of noise
- location and number of noise sensitive land uses in addition to residences (e.g., schools, hospitals, nursing homes, parks, recreation areas, historic structures) exposed to DNL 65 dB or greater
- when DNL 1.5 dB increases to noise sensitive land uses are documented within the DNL 65 dB contour, also identify the location and number of noise sensitive land uses within the



DNL 60 dB contour that are exposed to aircraft noise levels at or above DNL 60 dB but below DNL 65 dB and are projected to experience a noise increase of DNL 3 dB or more
- noise impact on noise sensitive areas within the DNL 65 dB contour.

Use multiple graphics to depict the noise contours and land uses and noise sensitive resources within the noise contours for all alternatives. Include arrival, departure and touch and go flight tracks. Graphics should be scaled and sufficiently large and clear to be readily understood.

NA

(e) Discuss whether there is a significant noise impact for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) compared to the No Action alternative. FAA Order 1050.1F Exhibit 4-1 provides the FAA’s significance threshold for noise i.e. *The action would increase noise by DNL 6 1.5 dB or more for a noise sensitive area that is exposed to noise at or above the DNL 65 dB noise exposure level, or that will be exposed at or above the DNL 65dB level due to a DNL 1.5dB or greater increase, when compared to the no action alternative for the same timeframe.* For example, an increase from DNL 65.5 dB to 67 dB is considered a significant impact, as is an increase from DNL 63.5 dB to 65 dB. The determination of significance must be obtained through the use of noise contours and/or grid point analysis along with local land use information and general guidance contained in Appendix “A”, Table 1 of 14 CFR part 150. If there is a potential significant noise impact for the Proposed Action, **do not complete this EA** and contact the JAN/ADO EPS for further guidance.

Explain:

NA

(e) For some noise analyses, it may be necessary to include noise sources other than aircraft departures and arrivals in the noise analysis. This can be determined by examining the action and determining the potential impacts caused by noise other than aircraft departures and arrivals. Some examples are engine run-ups, aircraft taxiing, construction noise, and noise from related roadway work and roadway noise. The inclusion of these sources should be considered on a case-by-case basis, as appropriate. Discuss whether the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) have the potential to cause noise other than aircraft related noise. See 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11.5 for additional information.

Discuss if analysis of other noise sources is warranted. If it is, conduct the analysis and describe the results here.

NA

(f) Discuss any mitigation measures that are in effect at the time of the proposal or are proposed to be taken to mitigate significant impacts resulting from the Proposed Action and/or the retained alternatives. See 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11.6 for common operational measures to mitigate noise, common mitigation measures related to noise and noise-compatible land use, and common construction mitigation measures. Local land use actions are within the purview of local governments. The FAA encourages local governments to take actions to reduce and prevent land uses around airports that are not compatible with airport operations and aircraft noise. Airports receiving federal grant funding have a compatible land use obligation, as described in 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11.5.3 Airport Actions. Discuss what is being done regarding compatible land use by the local jurisdiction(s) with land use control authority.

No mitigation measures are necessary.

(12) SOCIOECONOMICS, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND CHILDREN’S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY RISKS



(a) When compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Project and retained alternatives (if any) change business and economic activity in the community; impact public service demands; induce shifts in population movement and growth, or other factors identified by the public, etc.? If **YES**, describe how these impacts would be minimized or mitigated.

Explain:

The proposed project would have no impact to any other business or economic activity in the community. The project would not impact public service demands nor population movements/growth.

(b) When compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Project and retained alternatives (if any) result in the need to relocate any homes or businesses? If **YES**, do not complete this EA and contact the JAN/ADO EPS for further guidance.

Explain:

There would be no relocations.

(c) Cause an alteration in surface traffic patterns, or cause a noticeable increase in surface traffic congestion or a decrease in Level of Service (LOS) on local roadways?

Explain:

There would be no alterations in surface traffic patterns.

(d) Would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) have the potential to lead to a disproportionately high and adverse impact to an environmental justice population, i.e., a low-income or minority population (per: <https://screeningtool.geoplatform.gov/en>)? Consider impacts in other environmental impact categories (noise, air); or impacts on the physical or natural environment that affect an environmental justice population in a way that the FAA would determine are unique to the environmental justice population and significant to that population. See 1050.1F Desk Reference, Chapter 12 for guidance. If **YES**, do not complete this EA and contact the JAN/ADO EPS for further guidance.

Explain:

The proposed action would not have adverse impact to any environmental justice population.

(e) Would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) result in any environmental health risks and/or safety risks that may disproportionately affect children? Environmental health risks and safety risks include risks to health or to safety that are attributable to products or substances that a child is likely to come in contact with or ingest, such as air, food, drinking water, recreational waters, soil, or products they might use or be exposed to. It may be beneficial to determine the number of schools, daycares, parks, and children’s health clinics in the study area. Consider impacts to children’s health and safety in the context of other impact categories (air, noise, water quality).

Explain:

The proposed action would not result in any environmental health risks and/or safety risks that may disproportionately affect children. A fence would be placed around the proposed project area to protect the population and the facility.

(13) VISUAL EFFECTS INCLUDING LIGHT EMISSIONS



(a) Compared to the No Action alternative, describe any new lighting systems associated with the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any). Describe the new types of lighting, their intensity, height and direction of emissions that would be constructed and operational.

Explain:

A glint and glare study was conducted. It was determined that the proposed project would not interfere with airport operations. The study is attached in Appendix H.

(b) Would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) have the potential to create annoyance or interfere with normal activities for nearby residential areas or other light-sensitive resources or affect the visual character of the area due to the light emissions, including the importance, uniqueness, and aesthetic value of the affected visual resources? If appropriate, provide a graphic depicting the location of residential areas or other light-sensitive resources in the airport vicinity in relation to the Proposed Action’s and retained alternatives (if any) new lighting system.

Explain:

Due to the industrial setting of the surrounding area, it is not anticipated that the proposed action would interfere with normal activities or affect the visual character of the area.

(c) Identify whether a local community, government or jurisdictional agency would consider visual effects from the Proposed Action’s (and retained alternatives) lighting objectionable to people’s properties and people’s use of resources covered by DOT Section 4(f), LWCF Section 6(f), and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106. Consider the potential extent the proposed action would have to: affect the nature of the visual character of the area, including the importance, uniqueness, and aesthetic value of the affected visual resources; contrast with the visual resources and/or visual character in the study area; and block or obstruct the views of visual resources, including whether these resources would still be viewable from other locations.

Explain:

The proposed action is located in an industrial area would not affect the visual character of the area.

(14) WATER RESOURCES - WETLANDS, FLOODPLAINS SURFACE WATERS, GROUNDWATER, AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

WETLANDS

(a) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) impact federal or state jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional wetlands? If **YES**, provide an assessment of the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) wetland impacts. **Quantify both** acreage and Functional Loss in accordance with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and state agency (water management district (WMD)). If protected species or habitat resources are affected, USFWS and FWC must be consulted and consultation must be attached as an appendix to this EA. Cross-reference with Category (2) Biotic Resources, as applicable.

Provide assessment of wetland impacts:

There are no wetlands on the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would not impact any wetlands. A wetlands assessment was conducted and is attached in Appendix F.

(b) If the Proposed Action would unavoidably impact a wetland, explain why the wetland is the only practicable location for the Proposed Action. Consider the purpose and need, FAA design standards, engineering, environmental, economic, technical feasibility or any other applicable



factor. FAA will consider this information in its independent evaluation of alternatives (see 40 CFR 1506.5.) **Note:** *Federal regulations require “that no discharge shall be permitted if there is a practicable alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact to the aquatic ecosystem, so long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences” (per Memorandum of Agreement between The Department of the Army and Environmental Protection Agency, The Determination of Mitigation under the Clean Water Act Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines, February 1990.*

Discuss:

NA

(c) If the Proposed Action would affect federal and/or state jurisdictional wetlands, discuss all practicable means to avoid and minimize wetland impacts through modifications or permit conditions. FAA will consider this information in its independent evaluation of measures that will be used to minimize harm to wetlands (see 40 CFR 1506.5).

Discuss avoidance and minimization measures evaluated and unavoidable wetland impacts:

NA

(d) Discuss appropriate and practicable compensatory mitigation for unavoidable adverse impacts which remain after all appropriate and practicable minimization has been provided. Identify the location of proposed compensatory mitigation, including acreage, Functional Gain, and estimated cost. USACE and WMD or FDEP consultation must be attached in an appendix to this EA that includes acknowledgement of required permits and proposed mitigation.

Discuss compensatory mitigation and attach record of jurisdictional agency consultation:

NA

(e) List all required permits that will be obtained for wetland impacts (USACE Section 404, WMD, FDEP or local). USACE Standard Individual Permits require public notice. For NEPA purposes, this is conducted during public and agency review of the Draft EA. **Note:** *Nationwide General Permits authorize a category of activities throughout the U.S., Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands that are similar in nature and cause only minimal individual and cumulative environmental impacts. Nationwide General Permits may authorize minor filling, roads, utility lines, maintenance of existing structures and other minor activities; they may require mitigation. Standard Individual Permits are required for activities which may cause more than minimal adverse effects to the aquatic environment and exceed the terms and conditions of a general permit; they require public notice and review by state and federal resource agencies; most require mitigation.*

List all wetland permits:

NA

(f) Attach a statement from the Airport Sponsor committing to the implementation of a mitigation plan developed to the satisfaction of the USACE in consultation with state and local agencies having an interest in the affected wetland.

NA

FLOODPLAINS

(a) Compared to the No Action alternative, would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) be located in, or encroach upon, any base/100-year floodplains, as designated by the Federal



Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)? If **YES**, you must quantify the encroachment and attach the corresponding FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and proceed to (b) and (c).

Explain and quantify the floodplain encroachment and attach FEMA FIRM Map, if applicable:

The proposed project site is not located within any base/100-year floodplains (FEMA). A floodplain map is attached in Appendix G.

(b) In accordance with Executive Order 11988, explain why the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) must be located in or affect the base/100-year floodplain. Include (1) a description of significant facts considered in making the decision to locate the Proposed Action in or to affect the floodplain, including alternative sites and actions; (2) a statement indicating whether the Proposed Action (and retained alternatives if any) conforms to applicable state or local floodplain protection standards; (3) a description of the design steps taken to modify the Proposed Action to minimize potential harm to or within the floodplain; and (4) a statement indicating how the Proposed Action affects the natural or beneficial values of the floodplain.

Explain:

N/A

(c) If the Proposed Action or retained alternative would cause an encroachment of a base/100-year floodplain, the Airport Sponsor must provide an opportunity for early public review during the EA process, in accordance with Section 2(a)(4) of Executive Order 11988 and Paragraph 7 of DOT Order 5650.2. For NEPA purposes, this is conducted during public and agency review of the Draft EA.

Discuss what actions were taken to make the Draft EA available for early public review and what notification of floodplain impacts was made.

N/A

SURFACE WATERS AND GROUND WATERS

(a) When compared to the No Action alternative, will the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) require a Section 401 water quality certificate (WQC) for construction activities or impacts to navigable waters, including jurisdictional wetlands? Explain the status of and/or any issues associated with obtaining this certificate. Attach any correspondence from the issuing agency. Cross reference your response with Wetlands, as applicable.

Explain:

The proposed action will not require a Section 401 WQC.

(b) Is a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit required for the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any)? If **YES**, explain the status and attach any comments received from the issuing agency or a copy of the permit.

Explain:

A NPDES Large Construction Permit will be required for activities that disturb more than 5 acres of soil. The permit will be obtained once the project design is complete. The Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) will be the issuing agency.

(c) Would the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) affect a public drinking water supply, a sole source aquifer, or a Comprehensive State Groundwater Protection Program



(CSGWPP)? If **YES**, attach records of consultation with EPA and state, local or tribal water quality agencies responsible for protection programs.

Explain:

No. The nearest sole source aquifer is approximately 140 miles away near Vicksburg, MS.

(d) Provide sufficient description of the mitigation measures the Airport Sponsor will carry out for the Proposed Action to: meet WQC terms or the conditions of any applicable NPDES permits; protect public drinking water supplies or comply with applicable CSGWPPs; develop response plans to contain any potential spills of oil or oil-based products associated with the Proposed Action; meet any other substantial water quality concerns that water quality agencies identify; or, use best management practices (BMPs) or best available technologies (BATs).

As part of the NPDES permit, the sponsor will be required to file a Large Construction Notice of Intent (LCNOI). The sponsor will also be required to develop and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. This plan details the measures and BMPs that will be used to minimize storm water impacts and spills. The permit also requires weekly inspections until stabilization is achieved.

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

(a) Is the Proposed Action’s project study area within any Wild and Scenic Rivers System (WSRS), study rivers, National Rivers Inventory (NRI), or otherwise eligible rivers or river segments under Section 5(d)? If no Wild and Scenic Rivers, study rivers, NRI, or Section 5(d) rivers are found within the study area, no further analysis is needed. If **YES**, contact an FAA JAN/ADO EPS for further guidance. **Note:** *The study area should be defined as the entire geographic area with the potential to be either directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed action and alternative(s). For example, if construction of a new facility is part of the proposed action or alternative(s), the study area should include any areas directly impacted through any visual, audible, or other type of intrusion that is out of character with the river or alters the outstanding features of the river’s setting. The study area should also include any area indirectly impacted by the proposed action and alternative(s), such as rivers or river segments many miles downstream from the construction footprint of a project which may experience changes in water quality or quantity due to the proposed action and alternative(s). In addition, the default boundaries of Wild and Scenic Rivers as defined in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act extend to a maximum of one-quarter mile from the ordinary high water mark on each side of the river (an average of not more than 320 acres per mile). As a result, be sure to consider any area within this boundary as part of the study area. Alabama has the Sipsey fork of the West Fork River, and the Little River Canyon National Preserve. Mississippi has Black Creek. The NPS’s NRI website at: <https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1912/plan-your-visit.htm> provides a map which can assist in determining if any rivers in the study area are included on the NRI; and the National Wild and Scenic Rivers’ Designated Wild and Scenic Rivers’ website at: <https://www.rivers.gov/map.php> which provides a list of all designated Wild and Scenic Rivers in the National System as well as all study rivers.*

Explain:

The proposed action’s project study area is not within any Wild and Scenic River System study rivers, National Rivers Inventory, or otherwise eligible rivers or river segments.

9. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS



Cumulative impacts are impacts that a proposed action and retained alternatives (if any) would have on a particular resource when added to impacts on that resource from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions undertaken or proposed by the Airport Sponsor, the FAA, other Federal, state or local agencies, or a private entity. **Note:** List all sources of information including projects shown on an airport’s ALP or identified in an airport’s master plan, on airport projects approved by the FAA, the airport’s 5 year CIP, the local jurisdiction’s approved land use map and long range transportation plan, and substantial locally approved development projects. Identify off-airport projects that are within the same political jurisdiction or within approximately 5 miles of the airport, and the existing and future 65 DNL noise contour. For wetland and biotic resource impacts consider water management district basin boundaries.

(a) In order to determine whether the Proposed Action and retained alternatives (if any) would have a cumulative effect on any of the environmental impact categories discussed above, identify any on-airport projects that may have common timing and/or location; and any off-airport projects in the airport’s vicinity outside of the Airport Sponsor or FAA’s jurisdiction. Generally use 3 years for past projects and 5 years for future foreseeable projects. For each past, present, and future project, you must discuss environmental impacts and any required permits.

Explain:

The sponsor is not aware of any projects in the past, present, or future in the vicinity.

(b) Considering the impacts of the Proposed Action (and retained alternatives if any) together with the environmental impacts of past, present, and future projects discussed in 12(a) above, discuss whether cumulative impacts would exceed a significant impact threshold where one is provided. If no threshold is provided, discuss whether potential cumulative impacts would be considered substantial by any Federal, state, or local agency, or the public. Significant impact thresholds are provided in Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F and in 5050.4B Table 7-1 for each resource category.

Explain:

The proposed project does not have any significant cumulative impacts that would be considered substantial by any federal, state, or local entity.

10. MITIGATION MEASURES

(a) As defined in the CEQ Regulations at 40 CFR § 1508.20, mitigation includes avoiding the impact; minimizing the impact; rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the environment; reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; and compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources.

Summarize all mitigation measures discussed in the Environmental Impact Categories of this EA that will be taken to avoid creation of significant impacts to a particular resource as a result of the Proposed Action. Discuss any impacts that cannot be mitigated, or that cannot be mitigated below the threshold of significance. Significant impact thresholds are provided in Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F for each resource impact category and in 5050.4B Table 7-1.

The proposed action will not create significant impacts to any particular resources. Therefore, no mitigation measures are anticipated.



11. **PERMITS**

List all required permits for the Proposed Action, including the lead agency, status, and responsible entity. Discuss coordination with appropriate agencies and the expected time frame for receiving identified permits. Indicate whether any difficulties are anticipated in obtaining required permits.

Note: Even though the Airport Sponsor has/shall obtain one or more permits from the appropriate Federal, state, and local agencies for the Proposed Action, initiation of any construction activities shall **NOT** begin until the FAA has issued its environmental determination based on the information in this EA.

MDEQ - NPDES Large Construction Permit – issued 60 days – no difficulties anticipated

12. **CONSISTENCY WITH APPROVED PLANS OR LAWS**

(a) Is the Proposed Action consistent with existing environmental plans, laws, and administrative determinations of Federal, state, regional, or local agencies?

Explain:

The proposed action is consistent with existing environmental plans, laws and administrative determinations of federal, state, regional or local agencies.

(b) Are there any other Federal approvals or permits required?

Explain:

No.

(c) Is the Proposed Action consistent with plans, goals, policies, or controls that have been adopted for the area in which the airport is located?

Explain:

The proposed action is consistent with plans, goals, policies, or controls that have been adopted for the area.

13. **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY**

(a) Discuss whether any public meetings were held during development of the Draft EA. Provide a list of all agencies and persons consulted in the preparation of this EA. Discuss any input from local officials or public groups regarding the Proposed Action. Discuss whether a public hearing is warranted i.e. there is substantial environmental controversy concerning the Proposed Action or there is substantial interest in holding a hearing or another agency with jurisdiction over the action requests a public hearing.

Since there are no significant impacts to any of the resources, it was determined that a public meeting was not warranted.



(b) After review by the FAA JAN/ADO EPS, the EA must be issued by the Airport Sponsor as a Draft EA for a 30-day public and agency review period. Concurrent with the 30-day public review period, the Airport Sponsor must submit the Draft EA to Federal, state and local agencies (as determined by the JAN/ADO EPS). The Airport Sponsor must publish a notice of availability of the Draft EA for public review in the local newspaper and airport sponsor’s website, if available. **Note:** Certain special purpose environmental laws, regulations, or executive orders require public notice, and must be included as part of the Draft EA notice of availability. These include but are not limited to section 2(1)(4) of E.O. 11988, Floodplain Management, section 2(b) of E.O. 11990, Protection of Wetlands, Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and Order DOT 5610.2, Environmental Justice.

Discuss and acknowledge submittal of a Draft EA for public and agency review.

A draft EA was advertised for public comment. A public notice was published in the Commercial Dispatch newspaper in Columbus, MS. The EA was made available for review on the Airbus Helicopter’s, Inc. website. A copy of the document was placed in the Columbus Library for review as well. The proof of publication is attached in the Appendix.

(c) Comments on the Draft EA received from the Federal and state agencies, and the public must be attached to the Final EA. The Airport Sponsor must provide draft responses for FAA review by the JAN/ADO EPS.

Summarize comments received and identify an appendix to the EA within which the comments and responses are found.

14. LIST ALL ATTACHMENTS TO THIS EA

- Appendix A – Maps
- Appendix B – IpaC, MDWFP, USFWS
- Appendix C – EDR
- Appendix D – Phase I Cultural Survey
- Appendix E - Consultation Letters for Tribal & SHPO
- Appendix F - Wetlands Assessment
- Appendix G - Floodplain



15. PREPARER CERTIFICATION

I certify that the information I have provided above is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct.

Signature:	Lang Kirkwood
Name, Title:	Lang Kirkwood, Project Manager
Affiliation:	Headwaters, Inc.
Date:	4/3/24
Phone Number:	601-634-0097
Email:	lang@headwaters-inc.com

16. AIRPORT SPONSOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that the information I have provided above is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct. I also recognize and agree that no construction activity, including but not limited to site preparation, demolition, or land disturbance, shall proceed for the above proposed action(s) until FAA issues a final environmental decision for the proposed action(s), and until compliance with all other applicable FAA approval actions (e.g., ALP approval, airspace approval, grant approval) has occurred and all appropriate Federal, state and local permits and certifications have been obtained.

Signature:	
Name, Title:	Adam Creamer, Sr. Mgr. Facilities & Security, VS Operations
Affiliation:	Arbus Helicopters, Inc.
Date:	4.10.24
Phone Number:	662.686.5104
Email:	Adam.Creamer@Arbus.com



END NOTES: