

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Aviation Administration

Northwest Mountain Region

Finding of No Significant Impact/

Record of Decision

For the Improvements to the Harvey Field Airport

Snohomish, Washington

August 2025

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Background	3
III.	Proposed Action	4
IV.	Purpose and Need.....	5
V.	Agency Actions and Approvals.....	8
VI.	Alternatives	8
VII.	Affected Environment	9
VIII.	Environmental Consequences	10
A.	Air Quality	10
B.	Biological Resources.....	11
C.	GHG Emissions	12
D.	Coastal Resources	12
E.	Department of Transportation Act: Section 4(f).....	13
F.	Farmlands	14
G.	Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste	14
H.	Historical, Architectural, Archeological and Cultural Resources	14
I.	Land Use.....	15
J.	Natural Resources and Energy Supplies.....	16
K.	Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use	16
L.	Socioeconomic Impacts and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks	17
M.	Visual Effects.....	18
N.	Water Resources	18
IX.	Mitigation/Minimization	19
X.	Public Involvement	24
XI.	Agency Findings.....	26

I. Introduction

This document serves as the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) and provides the final agency determinations and approvals for the federal actions necessary to implement the proposed improvements at Harvey Field. This FONSI/ROD is based on the information and analysis contained in the Final Environmental Assessment (FEA) dated August 2025, which is hereby incorporated by reference. The FEA has been prepared pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*¹ and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. The FEA documents the evaluation of environmental impacts associated with the proposed improvements described below.

II. Background

Harvey Field (the “Airport” and location identifier S43) is in Snohomish County (the County), Washington, approximately 25 miles northeast of the city of Seattle (see Figure 1 1). The Airport is privately owned and operated by Kandace Harvey (Airport Sponsor) as a public use general aviation (GA) reliever airport.

The GA community at the Airport includes the following operations: private flying and recreational, flight training, scenic flights and air tours, hot air ballooning, government agency and public, and parachute drop (skydiving) operations. Currently, flight training operations and skydiving operations comprise the largest volume of operations at the Airport.

There are two parallel runways at the Airport. Runway 15L/33R is 2,672 feet long by 36 feet wide and is an asphalt surface, and Runway 15R/33L is 2,430 feet long by 100 feet wide and is a turf surface. The 2018 Master Plan (2018 MP) identified the Aircraft Design Group (ADG) II as the critical aircraft group at the Airport, which includes the Cessna Caravan Blackhawk (i.e., Cessna Caravan with the Blackhawk engine conversion) used for skydiving operations. The Runway Design Code (RDC) for Runway 15L/33R is B-II (small) and the RDC for Runway 15R/33L is A/B-I Small-Visual. The existing Runway 15L/33R does not meet current FAA standards for the

1

FAA Order 1050.1G, FAA National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures was published on June 30, 2025. Projects that commence after June 30, 2025 are required to comply with FAA Order 1050.1G, while those projects already underway by that date may follow FAA Order 1050.1F. This EA relies upon FAA Order 1050.1F, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023, and current applicable Executive Orders and case law.

Airport's critical aircraft grouping. The taxiway standards for width and separation are dictated by ADG and Taxiway Design Group (TDG) as described in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13B, *Airport Design*. The TDG is determined by the main gear width and the cockpit to main gear of the largest aircraft operating at an airport on a frequent basis (critical aircraft or critical aircraft grouping). The Airport's TDG as 1A.

Airport Way provides access to the Airport from State Route 9 (SR9), Lowell Snohomish River Road, and Springhetti Road, and bounds the Airport to the east and the south. Currently, vehicles travel on Airport Way directly under aircraft taking off and landing on the existing runways, which occurs when aircraft are at a low altitude. The edge of Runway 33R pavement is currently 10 feet from Airport Way, which results in a nonstandard condition per FAA runway design criteria. This nonstandard condition is mitigated by a displaced threshold at end of Runway 33R, which ensures vertical separation between airplanes and vehicles. Since 1982 there have been at least five incidents where aircraft have overrun the runway and crossed Airport Way.

Currently, the airfield facilities do not meet current standards in accordance with FAA guidance and regulations. Specifically, the runway and taxiway system does not meet standards as defined by the FAA in AC 150/5300-13B, *Airport Design*. In 2018, the Airport completed a Master Plan (2018 MP) that identified projects that are needed to correct the non-standard runway and taxiway conditions.

III. Proposed Action

The Airport Sponsor proposes constructing a new 2,400-foot runway west of the existing asphalt Runway 15L/33R, decommissioning the turf runway 15R/33L, and constructing a full parallel taxiway that meets FAA standards (Proposed Action). Chapter 1 and Figure 1-11 of the FEA provide a description and graphic depiction of the Proposed Action, which includes the following components:

- Construction of a new 2,400-foot asphalt Runway 15/33
- Removal of the existing asphalt Runway 15L/33R
- Construction of a new parallel taxiway with three runway connections
- Removal of about 450 linear feet of taxiway pavement
- Relocation of Airport Way to the south to remain on County right-of way and Harvey property
- Removal of about 600 linear feet of existing Airport Way from Airport property
- Installation of new PAPIs on Runway 15/33

- Installation of MIRL for Runway 15/33
- Installation of MITL for the new parallel taxiway
- Construction of a new perimeter fence on the south side the Airport
- Removal of about 850 linear feet of fence along existing Airport Way
- Removal of 21 trees from approach and departure surfaces of both runway ends
- Installation of a retaining wall with water passage infrastructure, including three sets of 20-foot span box culverts, on the Runway 33 end
- Relocation of the existing wind cone west of Runway 15/33

The Proposed Action would result in the Airport reducing the number of runways from two to one and reducing the length of the asphalt runway from 2,672 feet to 2,400 feet.

During construction, access to the Proposed Action's site would be via the Airport Service Road from the public parking lot at the main entrance to the Airport. The construction staging area for the airfield project components would be located on the western side of Harvey property, along the northern side of Airport Way. The construction staging area for the relocation of Airport Way project component would be in the field south of existing Airport Way with the exact location to be determined at the time of construction. The relocation of Airport Way would take about six months to complete.

The Proposed Action would add about 9.5 acres of new impervious surface. The airfield project components would add about 6.0 acres and roadway relocation would add about 3.5 acres of impervious surface. The Proposed Action would remove about 3.8 acres of impervious surface for a net addition of about 5.7 acres of impervious surface at the Airport. The airfield project components would need about 3.3 acres of fill that meets FAA specifications, and the roadway relocation would need about 6.0 acres of fill that meets FAA specifications.

IV. Purpose and Need

The FAA has the responsibility to maintain and enhance safety and security in air commerce (Title 49 USC § 40101(d)). To meet this responsibility, the FAA has developed standards and recommendations for the design of civil airports to promote safety and security (FAA AC 150/5300-13B, *Airport Design*). These standards and recommendations are updated to incorporate new standards and technical requirements.

The Purpose and Need is presented fully in Chapter 1 of the FEA. The Airport Sponsor's purpose for pursuing improvements at Harvey Field is to safely and efficiently accommodate current and projected aviation activity at the Airport by meeting current FAA standards for Runway 15L/33R

for RDC B-II (small) aircraft while providing for sufficient runway length for the Airport's critical aircraft grouping.

The Proposed Action is needed to bring the existing runway and taxiway conditions into compliance with current FAA standards, to provide safe and efficient takeoff and landing operations for the critical aircraft grouping. Specific safety concerns that need to be addressed are summarized below.

The 2018 MP determined there are existing runway and taxiway conditions that do not meet current FAA standards as described below:

- Runway standards
 - The current FAA standard for the RDC B-II (small) for runway width is 75 feet wide. Runway 15L/33R is only 36 feet wide and is deficient by 39 feet.
 - The Runway 15L/33R runway centerline to the partial parallel taxiway centerline separation is 110 feet for the Runway 15L end and 91 feet for the Runway 33R end. The runway is deficient by 130 feet for the Runway 15L end and 149 feet for the Runway 33R end
- Runway Safety Area (RSA)
 - The current FAA standard for the RSA for a RDC B-II (small) runway is 150 feet wide and extends 300 feet beyond the end of the runway. Runway 15L/33R's existing RSA is 150 feet wide but only extends 200 feet beyond the end of the runway.
- Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)
 - The RPZ at the Runway 33R end contains obstructions that penetrate the approach zone of landing aircraft and incompatible land uses: the Airport perimeter fence and Airport Way (a roadway) within 10 feet of the runway pavement. The RPZ at the Runway 15L end contains obstructions and incompatible land uses with the RPZ: the Burlington Northern Sante Fe (BNSF) railroad tracks and powerlines. Transportation facilities, such as rail and roadways, are considered incompatible land uses within an RPZ and airport sponsors should try to minimize and mitigate incompatible land uses.
- Runway Object Free Area (ROFA)
 - The ROFA at the Airport does not meet FAA requirements as there are structures, the perimeter fence, and aircraft parking areas currently inside the ROFA.
- Obstacle Free Zone (OFZ)

- The existing Runway 15L/33R OFZ meets the width and length beyond runway end requirements. However, the Airport does not allow for clear surfaces in the OFZ. The Airport has taxiways with runway hold markings within the OFZ.
- Taxiway Standards
 - The current FAA standard for TDG 1A is for taxiway width of 25 feet. The existing taxiways at the Airport are 20 feet wide, deficient by 5 feet.
- Taxiway Safety Area (TSA)
 - The TSA at the Airport meets the width requirements of 79 feet but there are two buildings inside the TSA that are a violation.
- Taxiway Object Free Area (TOFA)
 - The TOFA at the Airport meets the width requirements of 124 feet, but there are four buildings and helipads inside the TOFA, which are a violation.
- Taxiway Centerline to Runway Centerline
 - The taxiway centerline to runway centerline is 110 feet for Runway 15L and 91 feet for Runway 33R, nonstandard by 130 feet and 149 feet, respectively.
- Taxiway Centerline to Fixed or Moveable Object
 - The standard for the taxiway centerline to a fixed or moveable object is 62 feet. Building 7 is 36 feet from the taxiway centerline, Building 11 is 38 feet from the taxiway centerline, and Buildings 20 and 21 are 52 feet from the taxiway centerline.
- Airfield signage, lighting, and Navigational Aids (NAVAIDs)
 - The Airport has limited and/or non-standard signage, lighting, and NAVAIDs. Airfield signage for taxiways, runways, direction, etc. is not currently installed at the Airport.
 - The Airport recently purchased, but has not yet installed, a rotating beacon.
 - Runway 15L/33R currently has non-standard LIRL and the taxiways do not have lights.
 - The Airport currently has runway threshold lights with green lenses 360 degrees of the lens. According to FAA AC 150/5340-30J, *Design and Installation Details for Airport Visual Aids*, the standard light color is red for the 180-degree portion of the lens facing the runway and green for the 180-degree portion of the lens facing the approach.

- The Airport does not have visual guidance indicators for either runway end. The installation of precision approach path indicators (PAPIs) would enhance aircraft approaches at night and during periods of poor visibility.
- There is a Common Traffic Advisory Frequency (CTAF), which is a radio frequency, used to provide airport advisories, and for pilots to self-announce their position and intentions at airports without air traffic control towers, like at Harvey Field. It is recommended that the CTAF be used to activate the runway and taxiway lighting systems.
- There are no ground-based navigation NAVAIDs at the Airport. The nearest very high frequency omnidirectional range (VOR) transmitter is at Paine Field, located about seven nautical miles west, which can serve aircraft flying into and out of the Airport. However, most of the aircraft operating at the Airport use Global Positioning System (GPS) for navigation. The Airport has one published non-precision approach procedure, an Area Navigation/GPS-A. The approach provides a circle-to-land procedure to either 15L or 33R at the pilot's discretion. This type of a procedure does not allow a straight-in approach to either runway and, as a result, the approach is visual instead of non-precision. The lowest minimums are 1,220 feet (MSL) and 1,198 feet (MSL) for military aircraft.

V. Agency Actions and Approvals

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

- Unconditional approval of the Harvey Field Future Airport Layout Plan (ALP) to depict those portions of the Proposed Action and its connected actions subject to FAA review and approval pursuant to 49 United States Code § 47107(a)(16)(B).
- Determination that environmental analysis prerequisites associated with any future Airport Improvement Program funding application associated with the Proposed Action have been fulfilled pursuant to 49 United States Code § 47101-47144.
- Amendment to the one published non-precision approach procedure to accommodate the Proposed Action.

VI. Alternatives

The FEA identified and evaluated reasonable alternatives that may accomplish the objectives of the Proposed Action in accordance with NEPA, FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B, and current FAA design standards. In addition, in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F Section 6-2.1(d), the No

Action alternative was carried forward for analysis for comparison of impacts related to the proposed action. Chapter 2 of the FEA presents the alternatives analysis.

Section 2.2 of the FEA presents the alternatives that were considered, which were identified by the Airport in the 2018 MP, as well as other potentially reasonable alternatives. A total of 12 alternatives were considered. Of the 12, 10 alternatives did not fully meet the purpose and need (Step 1 of the alternatives screening process) and were not carried forward for further analysis. The remaining two alternatives (Alternative 1-A and 1-B) were carried forward for Step 2 of the alternatives screening process.

Step 2 of the analysis was to determine whether the alternatives were technically feasible and reasonable. Alternatives that met all elements of the Step 2 alternatives screening criteria were retained for a detailed evaluation of their environmental impacts in the FEA. Alternatives that would not be technically feasible and reasonable to construct were eliminated from further consideration. Alternative 1-B was the only alternative that met the Step 1 alternatives screening criteria and passed the Step 2 alternatives screening criteria. Therefore, the FEA identified and evaluated two alternatives:

No Action Alternative:

The No Action Alternative is defined as the continued operation of the existing Airport facilities, with no improvements, modifications, or upgrades to Airport facilities. The Airport would continue to operate under existing conditions with no improvements to enhance runway safety at the Airport by meeting the current FAA design standards.

Proposed Action Alternative:

Alternative 1-B is the Proposed Action. The Airport Sponsor would construct a new 2,400-foot runway west of the existing asphalt Runway 15L/33R, decommission the turf, Runway 15R/33L, and construct full parallel taxiway that meets current FAA standards. The Proposed Action supports the purpose and need as described in Chapter 1 of the FEA, is technically reasonable and feasible, brings the airfield into compliance with current FAA design standards, and enhances the safety of the Airport and the community.

VII. Affected Environment

Harvey Field (Airport) is located in Snohomish County, Washington, approximately 25 miles northeast of the city of Seattle. The Airport is about one mile south of the City of Snohomish's Central Business District and is part of the County's Urban Growth Area (UGA), which encourages urban growth within this area. The Airport Sponsor owns 204.48 acres, of which, 87 acres is Airport property. The original runway was first constructed in 1945 at what was known as Snohomish Airfield, Inc., along with hangars, a motel, and the fueling area. Additional structures, including the administration building, maintenance shop, and restaurant were added in 1947.

A Study Area was identified to describe the existing conditions and potential environmental effects at the Airport for resource categories that require site surveys as well as resources that would only be affected by the construction of the Proposed Action. The Study Area encompasses the entire Airport property, Harvey owned property, land owned by Snohomish County directly north of Harvey owned property, which the Airport Sponsor has a facility license agreement from the County for parking and vehicle storage, and land owned by Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), which the Airport Sponsor leases for Airport use.

Given the location of the Airport, the following resource is not present in the Study Area:

- Wild and Scenic Rivers

VIII. Environmental Consequences

Environmental impact categories identified in FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B were evaluated in the FEA. The reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect² environmental consequences of the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action are included in Chapter 3 of the FEA. Below is a summary of the findings.

A. Air Quality

Snohomish County is within attainment for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

Under the Proposed Action, there would be no increase or change in the number or type of aircraft operations and aviation emissions levels. There would be short term increases in emissions during construction activities. The FEA shows the result of an analysis of construction-related emissions from the Proposed Action. The *de minimis* threshold for maintenance and attainment areas is 100 tons per year for each criteria pollutant. The analysis demonstrates the Proposed Action would not cause an increase in construction air emissions

² Historically CEQ regulations required consideration of cumulative impacts. In 2023, Congress passed the Fiscal Responsibility Act directed agencies to consider “the reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of proposed agency actions” (42 USC 4332(2)©). Since the publication of the draft EA, the CEQ revoked its regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508) implementing NEPA, 42 USC 4321 *et seq.*, as amended, in response to Executive Order (E.O.) 14154, *Unleashing American Energy*. In addition, the Supreme Court issued the *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County*, 605 U.S. 975 (2025) ruling on May 29, 2025. As a result of these actions, it is no longer a legal requirement or the policy of the federal government to conduct cumulative impact analyses. In addition, the *Seven Counties* ruling reinforced the limited scope of NEPA reviews, holding that NEPA does not require an agency to consider environmental effects of other activities and projects “separate in time or place” from the proposed action. Therefore, this Final EA has removed the prior discussion of, and/analysis related to, cumulative impacts.

above the *de minimis* thresholds for any of the NAAQS during either construction year; and therefore, would not result in any significant impacts to air quality.

B. Biological Resources

Categories of biological resources relevant to the FEA include terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species; federally listed endangered or threatened species, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Species, environmentally sensitive or critical habitats, and migratory birds.

Under the Proposed Action, potential direct construction impacts to aquatic species and habitats would occur around the Study Area ditches and wetlands from construction activities including loss of food resources and habitat, turbidity, and stormwater runoff. The Proposed Action would have minor effects on water quality due to an increase in stormwater runoff from new pollution-generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) and potentially due to construction activities. Turbidity would temporarily increase during construction due to substrate disturbance from earthwork activities. Once construction is complete, no further causes of elevated turbidity would occur with the Proposed Action.

No fish species are present within the Study Area but amphibians and other aquatic species within the wetlands would be subject to behavioral disturbance and injury during Airport Way reconstruction. Stormwater runoff generated by the Proposed Action would enter surface waters and cause minor effects on aquatic species receiving runoff. An increase of PGIS would cause an increase in pollutants in stormwater runoff, which would affect water quality in the Snohomish River (potentially extending approximately 12 miles downstream to Puget Sound) and could affect Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species. Although overall impacts to species from stormwater runoff are anticipated to be minor, it is understood that no stormwater treatment methods are 100 percent effective at removing all contaminants from stormwater runoff. For this reason, stormwater runoff is anticipated to have effects on ESA-listed species.

A Biological Assessment (BA) was prepared to evaluate the Proposed Action's effects on ESA-listed species and critical habitats that potentially occur in the Study Area. Based on the analysis, the FAA determined that the Proposed Action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout and designated critical habitat. Under Section 7 of the ESA, on November 9, 2023, the FAA initiated informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The USFWS issued a Letter of Concurrence on October 2, 2024, for the effects on bull trout and designated critical habitat. However, NMFS held that the Proposed Action is likely to adversely affect ESA-listed salmonids, their critical habitat, and essential fish habitat for Pacific Coast salmon due to the effects from the pollutant N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine (6PPD) and, thus, required formal consultation. Therefore, a revised BA was prepared and submitted to NMFS on September 5, 2024, with an adverse effect determination. NMFS issued a Biological

Opinion (BO) on June 26, 2025. The BO includes information regarding the Proposed Action, species information, effects of the Proposed Action, and conservation recommendations.

Under the Proposed Action, trees that are in approach and departure surfaces and considered to be an obstruction would be removed. However, the trees are on private property and can only be removed if the landowner allows the Airport Sponsor access to the land and grants permission to remove the trees. Tree removal would occur outside of the breeding/nesting season. Therefore, the Proposed Action will have no significant effect on migratory birds.

C. GHG Emissions

The main source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions³ related to the Proposed Action would be carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions generated by combustion connected with construction equipment vehicles. Construction is a temporary activity and would not result in a new emissions source past the 24-month construction period. The Proposed Action would not change the number of aircraft operations or accommodate larger aircraft or aircraft that can fly further distances and therefore would not increase emissions. Given the design of the proposed improvements, the taxi-in and taxi-out time of aircraft is anticipated to have a minor increase after implementation of the Proposed Action. No significant or sustained increase in construction, vehicular, or aircraft traffic is anticipated because of the Proposed Action. The increase in emissions is expected to be negligible. Therefore, the Proposed Action will have no significant effect on climate.

D. Coastal Resources

The Study Area is in the state's coastal zone and the Snohomish River shoreline of statewide significance. Construction of the Proposed Action would implement construction stormwater facilities used to minimize erosion and transport of pollutants from stormwater runoff, including measures such as using silt fencing or other barriers. The Proposed Action would be designed and constructed to be consistent with the policies of the Snohomish County Shoreline Management Program (SMP). The Proposed Action would not limit water-oriented uses, require shoreline modifications, or alter visual aesthetics of the coastline.

The Airport would obtain a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit to document that operation of the Proposed Action would be consistent with the goals of the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) and Snohomish County SMP. The airfield project components outside

³ After the publication of the draft EA, Executive Order 13990, which was relied upon for the January 2023 CEQ draft GHG guidance, was revoked. In addition, CEQ revoked its regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508) implementing NEPA in response to Executive Order 14154. As a result of these changes, the qualitative climate evaluation that discussed the level of preparedness with respect to the impacts of climate change, the extent to which the alternatives could be affected by future climate conditions, and if the alternatives are consistent with national, state, and local climate goals has been removed from the final EA. GHG emissions are provided for disclosure purposes only.

of the designated UGA require a Shoreline Conditional Use Permit from Snohomish County, which would be coordinated with DOE for approval. Additionally, a Shoreline Variance Permit would be submitted to Snohomish County, which does allow for variance of Shoreline performance standards stating fill can only be placed in the floodplain for floodproofing / ecological restoration. Additional discussion on the Shoreline Conditional Use and Variance permits can be found in Section 3.17.2.4 of the FEA.

The FAA initiated consultation with the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) on March 8, 2024, to review the Proposed Action for a Coastal Consistency Determination under the Snohomish County Shoreline Management Program. On April 5, 2024, DOE concurred with the FAA's determination that the Proposed Action is consistent with Washington's Coastal Zone Management Plan (CZMP). Therefore, the Proposed Action will have no significant effect on coastal resources.

E. Department of Transportation Act: Section 4(f)

No Section 4(f) resources exist in the Study Area (see Figure 3-3 in the FEA). The closest City of Snohomish (City) Section 4(f) resource is Cady Park, over 1,500 feet northeast of the Airport and across the Snohomish River. The closest County Section 4(f) resource is the Centennial Trail, about one mile northeast of the Airport and across the Snohomish River. The closest Section 6(f) resource is the Skykomish River Boat Launch, over 2,000 feet east of the Airport and across the Snohomish River. The closest National Register of Historic Place (NRHP) resource is the Snohomish Historic District, which is roughly bounded by Avenue E, 5th Street, Union Avenue, the Northern Pacific Railroad (present day Centennial Trail) and Snohomish River. The Snohomish Historic District is also the closest Washington State historic site. The closest National Wildlife Refuge is the Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge, about 50 miles northwest of the Airport.

To identify potential historic resources, a cultural resources survey in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) was conducted in 2023. The APE is similar in size to the Study Area but excludes the northeast portion of the Airport (see Figure 3-6 in the Final EA). The survey identified five potentially eligible historic structures, the Hanson House, Hanson Barn, Harvey residence, 1908 Johnson residence, and 1931 Johnson residence. Only one, the Hanson Barn, is recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Construction of the Proposed Action would occur entirely within the Study Area and would not require the physical use (direct use) of any Section 4(f) property. There would be no effect to the Hanson Barn during construction as construction activity would take place elsewhere on Airport property. Additionally, there would be no constructive use (indirect use) of any Section 4(f) property during construction. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not significantly affect the area's air quality, climate, historic, natural resources, noise, visual effects, or water resources that could affect any Section 4(f) resources. The Hanson Barn would be outside the 2028- and 2033-day night average sound level (DNL) 65+ decibel (dB) noise

contours. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in any significant impacts to any Section 4(f) properties.

F. Farmlands

According to the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey, the Study Area contains prime farmland and prime farmland if drained and either protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season (see Figure 3-4 in the FEA). Portions of the Study Area are actively farmed (hay production) by a local farmer with permission from the Airport Sponsor.

Construction of the Proposed Action would convert about five acres of prime farmland to a non-agricultural use for the Airport Way relocation (see Figure 3-5 in the FEA). The remaining farmland in the Study Area would keep the current designation from the NRCS Web Soil Survey. The Airport Sponsor coordinated with the NRCS using the USDA Form AD-1006. The NRCS completed the USDA Form AD-1006 on September 26, 2023, with a total score of 147 confirming that there would be no significant impact to farmlands. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in any significant impacts to farmlands.

G. Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste

Construction of the Proposed Action would result in temporary increases in storing hazardous materials at the Airport. The hazardous materials would be stored and used at the designated construction staging areas. The materials would be stored in compliance with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements and permit conditions requiring pollution prevention measures. Fill materials would be brought to the Airport for construction and any excess fill would be removed from the Airport after construction. Additionally, all other construction debris and waste would be disposed of at the appropriate authorized disposal facility. The construction contractor would be required to obtain a Construction Stormwater General Permit (CSWGP) from DOE, which will have a construction SWPPP, and will provide non-structural control measures (i.e., spill prevention/countermeasures). Operations resulting from the Proposed Action would not significantly change the type or quantity of hazardous materials stored and used at the Airport, or solid waste disposed from the Airport. Under the Proposed Action, the materials currently used at the Airport would be stored and used as they currently are today. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no effect on hazardous materials and significance thresholds would not be exceeded.

H. Historical, Architectural, Archeological and Cultural Resources

The APE is similar in size to the Study Area but excludes the northeast portion of the Airport (see Figure 3-6 in the Final EA). A site survey conducted in 2023 evaluated five historic structures and one was recommended as NRHP-eligible, the Hanson Barn. Construction of the Proposed Action would not demolish any structures. Additionally, implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in any significant impacts from noise or changes to setting that could affect the characteristics that qualify historic structures for listing on the NRHP. The

FAA determined that there were no historic properties affected and consulted accordingly with Washington State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) and the Tribes on December 20, 2023. The DAHP concurred with the FAA's no historic properties affected determination on December 27, 2023. The tribes did not respond. Therefore, there would be no effect to historic, architectural, archeological, or cultural resources from implementation of the Proposed Action.

I. Land Use

Construction of the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport and Harvey properties, and County right-of-way and would be compatible with the City land use and zoning policies and plans. As described in Section 3.12.3 of the FEA, the portion of the Study Area that falls within the City boundary has a current City land use designation of Airport/Industry and City zoning of Airport Industrial. There is no need for the Airport Sponsor to change its existing property boundaries to include incompatible land uses and the Proposed Action does not require the acquisition of land. The new runway would remove incompatible land uses currently in the RPZ to the maximum extent practicable.

The County land use designation in the northern portion of the Study Area (i.e., north of existing Airport Way) is Urban Industrial, which is derived from the zoning code of Business Park and Industrial Park. The Proposed Action in the northern portion of the Study Area would be consistent with the County land use and zoning policies and plans. The County land use designation in the southern portion of the Study Area outside of the City boundary (i.e., south of existing Airport Way) is RCF, which is derived from the zoning code of Agriculture-10 Acre. The County zoning code of Agriculture-10 Acre does not allow for airports. The retaining wall, portions of the proposed runway and taxiway, and Airport Way relocation are proposed on County land use designation RCF (see Figure 3-12 in the FEA) and on land zoned as Agriculture-10 Acre by the County (see Figure 3-13 in the FEA). The Airport is designated as an essential public facility (EPF) and as such, the Airport Sponsor intends to apply for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or a Development Agreement (DA) through the County for approval of the airport use in the Agriculture-10 Acre zone. Additionally, the Airport Compatibility Areas (ACA) surrounding the Airport discourages incompatible land uses and changing the land use to allow the Proposed Action would be in line with the purpose of the ACA designation.

The change to the noise contours due to the Proposed Action would not affect noise-sensitive land uses. As described throughout Chapter 3 of the FEA, the Proposed Action would not significantly affect other resources that could indirectly affect land use (e.g., the Proposed Action would not disrupt communities, affect Section 4(f) resources, affect farmlands, etc.). The Proposed Action would be consistent with local plans and policies with a CUP or DA in the

southern portion of the Study Area. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not significantly impact land uses within the study area.

J. Natural Resources and Energy Supplies

The Proposed Action would temporarily increase the use of natural resources at the Airport during construction. However, these resources are not rare or short in supply. The Proposed Action would not increase the use of natural resources at the Airport beyond supporting the expected growth in operations that is forecasted to occur with or without implementation of the Proposed Action. A small increase in the required electrical demand at the Airport is anticipated due to the new airfield lighting. However, the new lighting is proposed to have light-emitting diode lighting, which could result in a minor improvement to the energy efficiency at the Airport. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts to natural resources or energy supply.

K. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use

Construction of the Proposed Action would result in noise from construction vehicles and machinery and would generally be limited to the immediate vicinity of the construction activity. Noise levels would vary depending on the nature of the construction activity and the type and model of equipment in use. While construction noise associated with the Proposed Action may be heard near these residences, the construction noise for the relocated Airport Way would be temporary, lasting only during the anticipated six months of construction. The remaining project components would be constructed after the relocation of Airport Way and take about one year to complete.

The total area within the 2028 Proposed Action 65 dB and greater DNL noise contours is 44.16 acres. The total area inside the 2028 Proposed Action 65 dB and greater DNL noise contours would decrease by over four acres compared to the 2028 No Action Alternative (see Figure 3-18 in the FEA). There are no residences or other noise sensitive uses within the 2028 Proposed Action 65 dB and greater DNL noise contours.

The total area within the 2033 Proposed Action 65 dB and greater DNL noise contours is 44.81 acres. The total area inside the 2033 Proposed Action noise contours would decrease by about four acres compared to the 2033 No Action Alternative (see Figure 3-20 in the FEA). There are no residences or other noise sensitive uses within the 2033 Proposed Action 65 dB and greater DNL noise contours.

The Proposed Action results in a decrease in the noise contours area of four acres for both the 2028 and 2033 scenarios. With the new Runway 15/33 alignment shifted slightly west and south, when aircraft are arriving on Runway 15, they would be higher when flying over residential areas north of the Airport and would be lower when departing and flying over residential areas south of the Airport. When aircraft are arriving on the new Runway 33, they would be slightly lower over residential areas south of the Airport and higher when departing

and flying over residential areas north of the Airport. However, there are no noise-sensitive sites located in the DNL 65 dB and greater noise contours for the Proposed Action. Therefore, there would be no impacts to noise and compatible land use due to the Proposed Action.

L. Socioeconomic Impacts and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks⁴

Construction of the Proposed Action would result in the short-term employment of construction workers. The Proposed Action would not change the number of employees at the Airport or induce an increase in the number of operations at the Airport compared to the No Action Alternative. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Action would not have a significant effect on socioeconomics.

Construction vehicles would travel on local roads to access the Airport. Construction-related traffic would likely occur before or after the peak traffic times and would not substantially affect the level of service (LOS) of the roadways around the Airport. Potential traffic-related effects from construction would be temporary, lasting only as long as the construction period of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would not change the number of employees at the Airport or result in an increase in the number of operations at the Airport compared to the No Action Alternative. Airport traffic is anticipated to continue to use the relocated Airport Way at the same traffic volume as with the No Action Alternative. Since the volume of traffic using the relocated Airport Way would not change under the Proposed Action, there would be no decrease in LOS. The Airport Sponsor would need to coordinate final design plans for the Airport Way relocation with the County.

The construction and implementation of the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport and Harvey properties and County right-of-way and would not require the acquisition or relocation of any schools, childcare centers, or similar facilities. The Proposed Action would not increase environmental health and safety risks or exposure of environmental contaminants to children in the geographic areas. There are no significant health and safety risks that would disproportionately affect children associated with the construction and implementation of the Proposed Action. Therefore, no significant impacts to socioeconomics or children’s environmental health and safety were identified that would occur from the Proposed Action.

⁴ Since the publication of the draft EA, Executive Orders 12898, 13985, 14091, and 14096 were revoked on January 20, 2025. On January 21, 2025, President Trump issued E.O. 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity. In addition, CEQ revoked its regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508) implementing NEPA, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*, as amended, in response to E.O. 14154. Consequently, it is no longer a legal requirement or the policy of the federal government to conduct environmental justice analyses. As a result, the Final EA has removed the prior discussion of, and data/analysis related to, environmental justice.

M. Visual Effects

Construction of the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport and Harvey properties and County right-of-way and is likely to occur during daytime hours. If construction takes place during nighttime, light emissions would be directionally focused, temporary, lasting only during the construction months.

Construction of the Proposed Action would require using large construction equipment and construction vehicles. However, the equipment and vehicles would only be at the Airport during construction and are considered temporary. All project improvements would take place on existing Airport and Harvey properties and County right-of-way.

Therefore, no significant light emissions or visual impacts would be expected due to the Proposed Action.

N. Water Resources

Wetlands

The Proposed Action would result in a permanent loss of 0.12-acre and a temporary loss of 0.17-acre of wetlands due to the relocated Airport Way. Avoidance and minimization of wetlands impacts were incorporated to the extent possible for the Proposed Action. The Airport Sponsor will obtain a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit, as well as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the wetlands impacts. As required for the Section 404 permit, the Airport Sponsor will develop and implement a mitigation plan to compensate for all unavoidable wetland and wetland buffer impacts and obtain all applicable permits prior to construction. The Airport Sponsor would coordinate with the Washington DOE and Snohomish County regarding wetlands permits and mitigation.

Floodplains

The Study Area is within the 100-year floodplain as well as in the density fringe area, as designated by Snohomish County. The Proposed Action would encroach on FEMA-designated density fringe floodplain and cannot be raised above established base flood elevations (BFEs) due to Snohomish County density fringe floodplain requirements. FAA has determined that the encroachment would not constitute a significant floodplain encroachment and that the Proposed Action would not cause notable adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values. The Proposed Action would meet local requirements for development in the density fringe floodplain maximum allowable density and maximum allowable obstruction. From modeling conducted for the Proposed Action, proposed development would not result in an increase in the BFE for the 100-year (one percent-annual-chance) flood event. In addition, the Proposed Action would adhere to the Snohomish County Shoreline Management Program (SMP) by maintaining floodwater discharge locations and preserving natural and beneficial

values of floodplains. Therefore, the Proposed Action would result in no significant impact on floodplains.

Surface Waters

The Proposed Action would result in a net increase of impervious area (i.e., 5.7 acres). Drainage boundaries and stormwater outfalls would remain unchanged as the result of the Proposed Action. Proposed conditions peak flow rates would be less than or equal to existing conditions flow rates to minimize adverse effects to downstream infrastructure and aquatic life. Water quality treatment would be provided for the disturbed areas of the Proposed Action and any demolished water quality facilities in accordance with the Snohomish County Drainage Manual (SCDM). Therefore, the Proposed Action would result in no significant impact on surface waters.

Groundwater

Construction of the Proposed Action may require dewatering to construct improvements to stormwater infrastructure. The construction contractor would provide best practices and procedures for dewatering as outlined in the Construction Stormwater General Permit (CSWGP). Groundwater recharge rate would not be substantially affected due to additional stormwater runoff discharging to the Snohomish River, which is hydraulically connected to groundwater beneath the Study Area. The Study Area is within a CARA with high aquifer sensitivity as well as a groundwater nitrate priority area. As a result, a hydrogeological report would be required to obtain applicable shorelines permits. The hydrogeologic report would include a plan for monitoring groundwater quality and quantity. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant impact on groundwater.

IX. Mitigation/Minimization

The Airport Sponsor has committed to the following mitigation measures as part of the Proposed Action:

Measures to avoid or minimize effects on Biological Resources

Included within the Biological Opinion issued by NMFS, the following measures will be employed during construction of the Proposed Action:

- In accordance with the BO issued by NMFS, the following reasonable and prudent measures (RPM) will be employed during construction of the Proposed Action:

RPM #1: The FAA will minimize take to species assessed in the biological opinion from exposure to stormwater pollutants associated with new and reconstructed impervious surfaces by ensuring that stormwater runoff produced by impervious surfaces of Harvey Field Airport that are modified through the proposed actions are treated and discharge(s) managed with stormwater facilities/BMPs that are designed, constructed, operated, and

maintained using the best available information on low impact development (LID) principals and best management practices for stormwater treatment, flow control, and discharge. The following stormwater management terms and conditions would implement RPM #1:

- The project developer will be responsible for ensuring installation, function, and maintenance of the proposed stormwater facilities/BMPs during construction, as described in the proposed action detailed in the BA.
- Following construction, Harvey Field's owners/operators, or any successor in interest to the project developer, will assume responsibility for maintenance of all of the system components per the manufacturers recommendations and/or as described in the BA and in the airport's stormwater management plans for Harvey Field.
- Harvey Field's owners/operators will carry out the stormwater operation and maintenance plans as described in the BA including all provisions pertaining to: identification of responsible parties, inspection and maintenance schedule, and inspection and maintenance procedures. Harvey Field will also keep and preserve a log of all maintenance activities.

RPM #2: The FAA will minimize take by ensuring the completion of a monitoring and reporting program to confirm that the take exemption of the proposed action is not exceeded and that the terms and conditions in this incidental take statement are effective in minimizing incidental take. The following monitoring and reporting terms and conditions implement RPM #2:

- The FAA shall submit the following reports to NMFS:
 - A project completion report within 60-days of completing construction for each of the proposed activities, including:
 - Project named (include the consultation tracking number WCRO-2024-002704)
 - FAA Contact person
 - Harvey Field contact person
 - Construction completion date
 - Three annual reports summarizing each stormwater facility/BMP Operations and Maintenance (O&M) for the three consecutive, full years following construction, including the following information:
 - Stormwater facility/BMP identifying information:

- Identifying name or number
- Location
- Diagram or schematic of facility/BMP depicting its location relative to adjacent infrastructure
- Stormwater facility/BMP monitoring logs with:
 - The name of the employee or contractor responsible for all inspections
 - The date of each regular inspection, as specified in the Airport's O&M plan for stormwater facilities/BMPs
 - The date of any additional inspection made in response to triggering events (such as storm events with greater than or equal to 1 inch of rain during a 24-hour period, spills or foreign materials entering a stormwater facility/BMP with the potential to impair its function or effectiveness)
 - A description of any structural repairs (such as facility cleanout – sediment and oil removal and disposal – vegetation management, erosion control, ponding water, pests, trash or debris removal) to return the facility/BMP to its designed functional condition
 - An estimate of the percent cover of healthy vegetation in those stormwater facilities/BMPs that rely on vegetated elements to achieve treatment or flow control functions. For those stormwater facilities/BMPs that have less than 80% cover of desirable vegetation, include a description of any corrective action taken to attain the 80% cover requirement.
- Each of the above reports must be submitted to:
 - Projectreports.wcr@noaa.gov Attn: WCRO-2023-02840

Measures for impacts and consideration regarding Historical, Architectural, Archeological and Cultural Resources

Construction and implementation of the Proposed Action would have no effect on historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural resources so no mitigation measures are required. However, an Inadvertent Discovery Plan will be prepared that outlines procedures to perform in the event of a discovery of archaeological materials.

Measures in consideration of regulations related to Land Use

Construction and implementation of the Proposed Action would require a conditional use permit (CUP) or Development Agreement (DA) for the south portion of the Study Area, that is currently zoned as Agriculture-10 Acre. The Airport Sponsor will coordinate with Snohomish County and apply for a CUP or DA for the south portion of the Study Area to ensure the Proposed Action is consistent with local plans.

Measures to compensate for all unavoidable Wetlands and Wetlands Buffers

Avoidance and minimization of impacts to Wetland A, Wetland A buffers, and Wetland D buffers were incorporated to the extent possible during the Proposed Action preliminary design. All applicable permits will also be obtained prior to construction, including a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404 permit for discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States as well as an NPDES permit, which would be required for clearing, grading, and excavating activities that disturb one or more acres and discharge stormwater to surface waters of the state. The NPDES permit would also include a list of best practices that the construction contractor will need to follow during construction. The project will be designed to meet the conditions of a Nationwide Permit, which is a general permit issued by USACE for certain specified activities. The Proposed Action may qualify for Nationwide Permit 14: Linear Transportation Projects permit; however, this would be confirmed during the permitting process.

As required for the USACE Section 404 permit, the Airport Sponsor will develop and implement a mitigation plan to compensate for all unavoidable wetland and wetland buffer impacts. FAA expects the Airport Sponsor to purchase credits from an approved mitigation bank to satisfy the permit-required mitigation obligation needed to proceed with the Proposed Action that would have 0.12 acre of unavoidable wetland impacts. The Airport Sponsor will coordinate with DOE and Snohomish County regarding wetlands permits and mitigation.

The Proposed Action would result in no significant impacts to other resource categories discussed in the FEA.

Required Permits, Licenses, and Other Approvals

As discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EA, there are several permits, licenses, and/or other approvals the Airport Sponsor would obtain or would continue operating under existing permits to comply with County, state, and federal regulations. See **Table 1** below for a summary of required permits, licenses, and/or other approvals for implementation of the Proposed Action.

Table 1

Summary of Permits, Licenses, and Other Approval for the Proposed Action

Permit Name	Agency	Permit Category	Applicant	Contents
Conditional Use Permit	Snohomish County	Land Use	Airport Sponsor	Apply for a Conditional Use Permit for the southern portion of the Study Area
Development Agreement	Snohomish County	Land Use	Airport Sponsor	Apply for a Development Agreement for the southern portion of the Study Area instead of a Conditional Use Permit, to be determined by Snohomish County.
Shoreline Substantial Development Permit	Snohomish County / DOE	All Water Resources Categories	Airport Sponsor	Conformance with goals of SMA and Snohomish County SMP; ⁵ Snohomish County will review and provide opinion; DOE has final approval ⁶
Shoreline Conditional Use Permit	Snohomish County / DOE	All Water Resources Categories	Airport Sponsor	Obtain conditional use of Air Transportation Facilities within Shoreline areas; ^{7 8} Snohomish County will review and provide opinion; DOE has final approval ⁹
Shoreline Variance Permit	Snohomish County / DOE	All Water Resources Categories	Airport Sponsor	Demonstrating that fill placed in the floodplain would meet the intent of County performance standards; ¹⁰ Snohomish County

⁵ Snohomish County. (2019, October 14). Shoreline Management Program: Shoreline Environment Designations, Policies, and Regulations.

⁶ Snohomish County. (n.d.). *Shoreline Areas of Snohomish County*. Retrieved September 2023, from Snohomish County: <https://snohomishcountywa.gov/1377/Statewide-Significance>.

⁷ Snohomish County (2012). Snohomish County Code 30.44.110, Shoreline Substantial Development, Conditional Use, and Variance Permits. Retrieved November 2023, from Snohomish County: <https://snohomish.county.codes/SCC/30.44.110>.

⁸ Snohomish County. (2019). Snohomish County Code 30.67.430, Allowed and Conditional Uses and Modifications. Retrieved November 2023, from Snohomish County: <https://snohomish.county.codes/SCC/30.67.430>.

⁹ Snohomish County. (2012). Snohomish County Code 30.44.240, Shoreline Conditional Use and Variance Permits – Review Required by State. Retrieved November 2023, from Snohomish County: <https://snohomish.county.codes/SCC/30.44.240>.

¹⁰ Snohomish County. (2012). Snohomish County Code 30.44.150, Additional Review Criteria for a Shoreline Variance Permit. Retrieved November 2023, from Snohomish County: <https://snohomish.county.codes/SCC/30.44.150>.

Permit Name	Agency	Permit Category	Applicant	Contents
				will review and provide opinion, DOE has final approval ¹¹
Flood Hazard Permit	Snohomish County	Floodplains	Airport Sponsor	Conformance to Snohomish County density fringe floodplain development requirements
Hydrogeologic Report	Snohomish County / DOE	Groundwater	Airport Sponsor	Plan for monitoring groundwater quantity and quality prepared and certified by a licensed qualified professional ¹²

X. Public Involvement

The Airport Sponsor held an in-person public scoping meeting on December 1, 2022, at the Harvey Field Hangar 15 Event Center from 6:00 – 7:30 PM Pacific Standard Time (PST). The meeting functioned as an ‘open house’ workshop where members of the public could view exhibit boards containing project information and direct questions to the Airport Sponsor, the FAA, and the EA consultant team.

The Airport Sponsor advertised the public scoping meeting in the Everett Daily Herald on Friday October 28, 2022. Additionally, the Airport Sponsor advertised the public scoping meeting on the Airport website (<https://harveyfield.mysocialpinpoint.com/en/publicandagencyinvolvement/>) ahead of the meeting. The Airport Sponsor also mailed postcards advertising the public scoping meeting to nearby residents and businesses in November 2022. These advertisements can be found in Appendix J of the FEA.

A total of 41 members of the public signed into the public scoping meeting (see Appendix J). A total of 39 comments were received during the 30-day scoping comment period. Nine of these comments were received through the website, one was received through the stenographer at the public scoping meeting, two written comments were received at the public scoping meeting, three comments were received in the mail, and 24 comments were received through email. A copy of the

¹¹ Snohomish County. (2012). Snohomish County Code 30.44.240, Shoreline Conditional Use and Variance Permits – Review Required by State. Retrieved November 2023, from Snohomish County: <https://snohomish.county.codes/SCC/30.44.240>.

¹² Snohomish County. (2007). Snohomish County Code 30.62C.140, Hydrogeologic Report. Retrieved December 2023, from Snohomish County: <https://snohomish.county.codes/SCC/30.62C.140>.

public comments and a summarized list of topics for comments received can be found in Appendix J of the FEA.

The Draft EA was made available for a 42-day review period (42 days after the notice of availability advertisement) starting April 12, 2024 at the Airport Sponsor's Administration office during normal business hours, on the project website, and at a local library. The Draft EA notice of availability was emailed to agencies who were previously invited to the agency scoping meeting and any agency or organization that provided a scoping comment during the scoping period. Additionally, members of the public who attended the public scoping meeting or provided comments during the scoping period were also provided an email with the Draft EA notice of availability. The Airport Sponsor held a public meeting during the 42-day Draft EA review period, which was held on May 14, 2024, from 6:00 to 7:30 PM PST in the Harvey Field Hangar 15 Event Center. The Airport Sponsor received a total of 59 comment submissions on the Draft EA. A copy of the comments and responses to those comments are provided in Appendix K of the FEA.

In addition to the written responses found in the FEA, the following information was added to the FEA:

- In response to public and agency comments regarding water resources:
 - Section 1.1.3 in the FEA was added to discuss the history of flooding and density fringe at the Airport.
 - Identified the southern portion of Airport property discharges to existing 18" inch culvert with tide gate. This is reflected in floodplains and surface water sections, and Appendix I. This location is shown on Figures 3-26, 3-32, 3-33, 3-35 in the FEA.
 - Included a discussion of sea level rise in Sections 3.17.2.3, 3.17.2.4, and Appendix I of the FEA. The FEA noted that there is not a significance threshold and that the discussion was provided for informational purposes only.
 - A discussion of Harvey Field not being subject to density fringe requirements until 2005 when FEMA revised their FIRMs to include the Airport as part of this designation.
- In response to public and agency comments regarding floodplain modeling:
 - Section 3.17.2.5 (Floodplain Summary) in the FEA was added to summarize floodplain impacts as a result of implementing the Proposed Action.
 - Floodplain hydraulic modeling for the Snohomish River and its hydraulically connected flood storage areas was conducted to determine potential changes in flood elevations as a result of the Proposed Action (floodplain hydraulic modeling report in Appendix I).

- For informational purposes only, non-regulatory flood events that are less than the FEMA-regulatory 100-year (1-percent-chance) flood event were also analyzed for potential changes in flood elevations, 10-year (ten percent-annual chance) and 50-year (two percent-annual chance) flood events (floodplain hydraulic modeling report in Appendix I).

XI. Agency Findings

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

The following determinations are prescribed by the statutory provisions set forth in the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as codified in 49 USC §47106 and 47107.

i. The project is reasonably consistent with existing plans of public agencies responsible for development of the area surrounding the airport (49 USC §47106(a)(1)).

Construction of the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport and Harvey properties, and County right-of-way and would be compatible with the City land use and zoning policies and plans. As described in Section 3.12.3 of the FEA, the portion of the Study Area that falls within the City boundary has a current City land use designation of Airport/Industry and City zoning of Airport Industrial.

The County land use designation in the northern portion of the Study Area (i.e., north of existing Airport Way) is Urban Industrial, which is derived from the zoning code of Business Park and Industrial Park. The Proposed Action in the northern portion of the Study Area would be consistent with the County land use and zoning policies and plans. The County land use designation in the southern portion of the Study Area outside of the City boundary (i.e., south of existing Airport Way) is RCF, which is derived from the zoning code of Agricultural-10 Acre. The County zoning code of Agriculture-10 Acre does not allow for airports. The retaining wall, portions of the proposed runway and taxiway, and Airport Way relocation are proposed on County land use designation RCF (see Figure 3-12 in the FEA) and on land zoned as Agriculture-10 Acre by the County (see Figure 3-13 in the FEA). The Airport is designated as an essential public facility (EPF) and as such, the Airport Sponsor intends to apply for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or a Development Agreement (DA) through the County for approval of the airport use in the Agriculture-10 Acre zone. Additionally, the ACA surrounding the Airport discourages incompatible land uses and changing the land use to allow the Proposed Action would be in line with the purpose of the ACA designation.

ii. The interests of the community in or near which the project may be located have been given fair consideration (49 USC §47106(b)(2)).

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of airport development project grant funding applications.

The Airport Sponsor advertised for and held an in-person public scoping meeting on December 1, 2022, at the Harvey Field Hangar 15 Event Center. A total of 41 members of the public signed into the public scoping meeting. A total of 39 comments were received during the 30-day scoping comment period. A copy of the public comments and a summarized list of topics for comments received can be found in Appendix J of the FEA.

The Draft EA notice of availability was emailed to agencies who were previously invited to the agency scoping meeting and any agency or organization that provided a scoping comment during the scoping period. Additionally, members of the public who attended the public scoping meeting or provided comments during the scoping period were also provided an email with the Draft EA notice of availability. The Airport Sponsor held a public meeting during the 42-day Draft EA review period, which was held on May 14, 2024. Evidence of public and agency coordination can be found in Appendix J of the FEA. The Final EA will be made available at the Airport Sponsor's Administration office (9900 Airport Way, Snohomish, WA 98296) and on the project website (<https://harveyfield.mysocialpinpoint.com/en/home/>).

iii. The airport sponsor has taken, or will take, actions to restrict land use in the airport vicinity, including adoption of zoning laws, to ensure the uses are compatible with airport operations (49 USC §47107(a)(10)).

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of airport development project grant funding applications.

As a recipient of AIP funding, the Airport Sponsor has signed grant assurances that require them to take appropriate action, to the extent reasonable, including the adoption of zoning laws, to restrict the use of land adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of, the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations, including landing and takeoff of aircraft.

The most current land uses and zoning designations within the City and County were obtained for analysis. The land use analysis considered existing and future land use plans within and surrounding the Study Area and evaluated the Proposed Action to determine whether it would be compatible with land use guidelines as well as local noise ordinances within the County.

There is no need for the Airport Sponsor to change its existing property boundaries to include incompatible land uses and the Proposed Action does not require the acquisition of land. The new runway would remove incompatible land uses currently in the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) to the maximum extent practicable.

XII. Decision and Order

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

This decision does not constitute a commitment of funds under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP); however, it does fulfill the environmental prerequisites to approve applications for grants of AIP funds for the proposed project in the future. (49 USC § 47101)

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the FAA, I approve and direct that agency action be taken to carry out implementation of the Proposed Action.


WILLIAM C GARRISON
2025.08.06 06:09:39
-07'00'

August 6, 2025

William C. Garrison

Date

Director

Airports Division, ANM-600

Right of Appeal

This FONSI/ROD constitutes a final order of the FAA Administrator and is subject to the exclusive judicial review under 49 USC § 46110 by the US Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the US Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person contesting the decision resides or has its principal place of business. Any party having substantial interest in this order may apply for review of the decision by filing a petition for review in the appropriate US Court of Appeals no later than 60 days after the order is issued in accordance with the provisions of 49 USC § 46110. Any party seeking to stay implementation of the ROD must file an application with the FAA prior to seeking judicial relief as provided in Rule 18(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.