1. **Introduction**

This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) sets out the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) consideration of environmental and other factors for Airport Layout Plan (ALP) approval for the projects proposed at Morristown Municipal Airport (MMU) by the Town of Morristown, New Jersey, the airport’s sponsor. The FAA arrived at the determinations and approvals presented in this FONSI by considering public comments and reviewing the environmental analysis in the *Runway 5-23 Rehabilitation Final Environmental Assessment (EA)* dated February 2015. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before being able to take the federal actions necessary to allow the proposals described in the Final EA to take place at MMU. In accordance with Title 40, Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) § 1501.3 of the President’s Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (CEQ), the implementing federal regulations for the NEPA of 1969, the FAA supervised preparation of the aforementioned Final EA. The Final EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA as discussed in FAA Orders 5050.4B, *Airport Environmental Handbook*, 1050.1E, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, and the *Airports Desk Reference*.

2. **Background (Refer to Chapter 1 of the Environmental Assessment (EA))**

The Airport is owned by the Town of Morristown and operated by DM Airports, Ltd. MMU is designated as a general aviation reliever airport in the FAA’s National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). Located fifteen miles northwest of Newark Liberty International Airport and twenty-five miles west of New York City, MMU provides convenient access to the nation’s airspace system for businesses and residents in Morris County and the NY/NJ Metropolitan area. The FAA report “General Aviation Airports: A National Asset” published in May 2012 classified MMU as one of 84 “National” general aviation airports in the U.S. “National” airports serve national and global markets and have “very high levels of activity with many jets and multiengine propeller aircraft averaging about 200 based aircraft including 30 jets”. Several prominent corporations base their aircraft at MMU because of its proximity to their corporate facilities. In addition, MMU is utilized by transient aircraft traveling to the NY/NJ Metropolitan area. It is also used for recreation and medevac operations including the transport of human organs for transplants. According to a 2011 Economic Impact Study, MMU generates $243.6 million in annual economic impact and generates 1,158 jobs.

The two runways on the Airport are Runway 5-23 and Runway 13-31. Runway 5-23 (5,998 ft. long by 150 foot wide) is the primary runway and Runway 13-31 (3,997 ft. long by 150 foot wide) is the crosswind runway. Runway 5-23 accommodates the majority of aircraft operations.
Based upon the total number of operations in 2012 (138,236), the Airport averages approximately 400 operations per day, with over 219 based aircraft, approximately 91 of which are jet aircraft.

3. **Project Description (Refer to Chapter 1 of the EA)**
The proposed project consists of numerous interrelated improvements aimed at addressing existing deficiencies in the airport’s aging airfield infrastructure. Included in the proposed project are the following elements:

- Runway 5-23 Pavement Rehabilitation
- Runway 5-23 Runway Safety Area Grading and Drainage Improvements
- Glide Slope Critical Area Stabilization Grading and Drainage Improvements
- Medium Intensity Approach Lighting System (MALSR) with Runway Alignment Indicator System Replacement
- Runway 5 Departure End Runway Safety Area Improvements
- Runway 23 Departure End Runway Safety Area Improvements
- Taxiway E Relocation
- Drainage System and Outfall Replacement
- Connector Taxiway and Fillet Construction
- Runway and Taxiway Lighting Rehabilitation and Replacement
- Runway 13-31 Runway Safety Area Improvements, including modifications to flight procedures relating to threshold displacement of RW 13 and threshold relocation of RW 31

4. **Necessary Federal Actions**
The FAA’s actions, relative to the Project, include making a determination of compliance with Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508), and other applicable federal statutes, federal environmental regulations and approvals. The FAA findings within which these determinations are made are found in Section 10, “Environmental Finding” of this FONSI. Additionally, the following actions are also required of the FAA:

1. Unconditionally approve the updated ALP that depicts the project pursuant to § 47107(a)(16);
2. Determine, and approve of, the effects of this project upon the safe and efficient utilization of navigable airspace pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b);
3. Approve for relocation, installation, and/or upgrade of various navigational aids;
4. Designate controlled airspace and revised routing, including navigational aids and flight procedures (14 C.F.R. Part 71);
5. Maintain continued close coordination with the DM Airports, Ltd., the Town of Morristown, and appropriate FAA program offices, as required, for safety during construction;

6. Determine under 49 U.S.C. § 47107 relating to the eligibility of the Project for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), and/or approval of an application to use Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) under 49 U.S.C. Section 40117 (this FONSI does not determine eligibility or availability of potential funds);

7. Determine conformance with FAA design criteria, federal regulations, and grant agreements (14 C.F.R. Parts 77, 150, 152); and

8. Determine under 49 U.S.C. § 44502(b) that the Proposed Project is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense;

5. **Purpose And Need (Refer to Chapter 2 of the EA)**
The purpose of the project is to correct existing deficiencies in the aging airfield infrastructure and help the Airport come into compliance with FAA safety and design guidelines. The project would ensure that Runway 5-23 and associated infrastructure are rehabilitated and/or replaced so that they continue to operate safely, efficiently, reliably, and with reduced maintenance cost.

6. **Alternatives (Refer to Chapter 3 of the EA)**
The overall Runway 5-23 Rehabilitation Project is composed of 11 distinct, but interrelated, project elements as listed in the Project Description section above. Each project element and its numerous alternatives, including the No-Build Alternative, were exhaustively evaluated on an individual basis. Details of these analyses are included in their entirety in Chapter 3. It was concluded that only one alternative for each project element is practical and feasible relative to meeting the project purpose and need. The preferred alternatives selected for each of the 11 project elements, in total, are referred to as the Proposed Action. The following summarizes the preferred alternatives for each of the 11 project elements:

**Runway 5-23 Pavement Rehabilitation and Runway 5-23 Safety Area Grading and Drainage Improvements - Pavement Alternative IV:** This option involves milling the top 1 inch of asphalt for the entire length and width of the runway, including the repaired keel section, and providing a five-inch asphalt overlay for the entire runway. As a result, re-grading of the lateral safety areas is required to match the raised profile of the Runway 5-23 pavement, in accordance with FAA design standards for Runway Safety Areas. The re-grading will also address grading and drainage deficiencies under existing conditions resulting from uneven settling since construction of the airport. Flood storage volumes would be impacted by the depth of the pavement overlay with this alternative, as well as the addition of material necessary to raise the earth shoulders and safety area elevations to acceptable grades. The resulting flood storage volume loss would be offset, however, by grading and drainage improvements in the RSA.
**Glide Slope Stabilization Area** - Glide Slope Alternative II: The ground area surrounding the glide slope system would be smoothed and steepened to reduce uneven terrain, improve drainage capability, and ultimately enhance system performance.

**Medium Intensity Approach Lighting System (MALSR)** - MALSR Alternative III (Angled Light Plane): Involves replacement of the existing lighting system with the inclusion of an angled light plane fixture. The profile of the existing MALSR Road would be lowered and the historic fill section that the existing MALSR system is constructed on would be narrowed where practicable to create additional flood storage volume. In addition, the subsurface power supply line extending from Airport Road would be replaced.

**Runway 5 Departure End Runway Safety Area Improvements (RSA)** - Runway 5 Departure End RSA Alternative III (Limited Grading): The safety area would receive grading within the first 240 feet of length from the runway end and measure 500 feet wide. After that, due to wetlands constraints, only a swath of 90 feet wide would be graded to standards for the remaining 760 feet of the 1,000 foot safety area. Although the remaining 760 feet of RSA would not meet grading standards, it would support passage by emergency vehicles as it is relatively flat and largely free of fixed objects (trees, buildings, roadways, poles). These conditions will help to decrease the chances for damage to aircraft in the event of an overrun or undershoot. In addition, the MALSR road would provide some access to this area for emergency vehicles.

**Runway 23 Departure End Runway Safety Area Improvements (RSA)** - Runway 23 Departure End RSA Alternative III (EMAS): Involves the construction of a non-standard EMAS on the Runway 23 Departure End to alleviate the non-standard RSA. The overall installation would be approximately 345 feet in length, of which 310 feet would be composed of actual EMAS blocks and 35 feet would consist of a lead-in ramp between the runway end and the EMAS blocks. The existing localizer antenna would remain in its current non-standard location. The localizer antenna is mounted on a wooden platform to provide appropriate vertical clearance. The platform height would need to be raised so that the localizer signal is not affected by the EMAS blocks. Relocation to a standard location, 600 feet from the end of the useable pavement, is not feasible due to the presence of Columbia Turnpike approximately 650 feet from the runway end, and the extensive wetland and floodplain impacts that would be required to install and maintain a relocated localizer. In addition, relocation of the localizer would require construction of a stream crossing (bridge or large culvert).

**Taxiway E Relocation** - Taxiway E Alternative III (Relocate): The portion of Taxiway E on the east side of Taxiway A would be reduced in width and become an access road for ARFF and ground vehicles, while an additional stub would be constructed to serve as the new Taxiway E for aircraft. This work is being done because the existing Taxiway E does not comply with current taxiway design standards.

**Drainage System and Outfall Replacement** - Drainage System Alternative III (Redesign to NJDEP Standards): Involves redesigning the drainage system to be larger in size and capacity in order to comply with NJDEP criteria.
Connector Taxiway and Fillet Construction - Connector Taxiway Alternative II (Build): Involves reconstructing the existing connector taxiways and fillets for Runway 5-23 as the runway overlay would create unevenness between the two surfaces. Additionally, recent changes to the FAA geometric layout and engineering design standards for taxiways require that airports amend their taxiway system as necessary. This alternative suggests making these modifications in conjunction with the runway rehabilitation project in order to ensure that the taxiway and fillet profiles are coordinated with the five-inch asphalt runway overlay.

Runway and Taxiway Lighting Rehabilitation and Replacement - Airport Lighting Alternative II (Build): Involves the development necessary to align the runway and taxiway lighting systems with the anticipated changes to the runway and taxiway pavements. The systems would be upgraded and repositioned as required by the runway overlay and FAA standards.

Runway 13-31 Runway Safety Area Improvements - Runway 13-31 RSA Alternative II (Build): Incorporates Declared Distances and a Displaced Threshold of 123 feet to the Runway 13 Departure End, and suggests relocating the end of Runway 31 Departure End by 100 feet. The only physical changes that would occur under this alternative would involve remarking of the runway and modifications to the airfield lighting and signage so that they conform to the new runway configuration. These changes would bring the RSA dimensions into compliance with FAA standards. The RSAs would meet B-II Safety Area Standards with these improvements.

The Proposed Action was developed through a series of aeronautical and engineering studies and analyses, as well as preliminary engineering design (30% design) based upon the requirements of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13, Airport Design; and FAR Part 77, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace. The preliminary engineering design efforts provided approximate footprints (grading limits / vertical profiles) and impact estimates that are discussed in the Final EA.

A summary of the preferred alternatives for each element of the Runway 5-23 Rehabilitation project evaluated in the Final EA are presented in Table 3-1, Summary of Preferred Alternatives. These alternatives collectively make up the Proposed Action. Figure 1-3 of the Final EA illustrates the Proposed Action in its entirety.

7. **Environmental Consequences (Refer to Chapter 5 of the EA)**

This section of the FONSI summarizes the environmental consequences of the Action Alternatives. Where an alternative would result in an environmental impact, FAA determined whether that impact would be significant based upon FAA impact thresholds established in FAA Order 1050.1E Appendix A, FAA Order 5050.4B and guidance contained in the Environmental Desk Reference for Airports Actions.

The following resources are not addressed in this section because they are either not present in the project area or will not be affected by the project: Coastal Resources; Section 4(f), Parks and Recreation Areas; Historic and Archeological Resources; Roadway Traffic and Transportation; Prime Farmland; Environmental Justice and Children’s Health and Safety; Wild and Scenic Rivers. The following impact analysis provides highlights of the more thorough analysis.
presented in the Final EA. It is the FAA’s finding that the proposed action will not have any significant environmental impacts.

**Air Quality (EA Section 5.2)**
As all elements of the project do not have the potential to increase airside or landside capacity, and are categorized as exempted actions or presumed to conform, no further air quality analysis was required. Potential air quality emissions during construction will be controlled using best management practices.

**Biotic Resources (EA Section 5.3)**
The majority of the project area would be located within existing pavement and maintained turf grass that surrounds Runway 5-23. There will be no significant effects on any biotic resources, including fauna, flora, waterways and specifically State- listed threatened or endangered species, critical habitat, or significant ecological communities.

**Compatible Land Use (EA Section 5.4)**
The zoning and land use in the vicinity are compatible, and are anticipated to remain compatible, with the Proposed Action. In addition, no community disruption; impact to business relations; induced negative socioeconomic impacts; no floodplain impact; and no critical habitat impacts are expected.

**Construction Impacts (EA Section 5.5)**
Construction activities are anticipated to have localized effects on the built and natural environment in the immediate areas of construction, as well as short duration impacts to MMU’s operations. Effects resulting from construction activity are anticipated in the following areas: Air Quality; Wetlands; Hazardous Materials; Noise; Water Quality; and Air Traffic/Airport Operations. Such impacts will not be significant. In general, Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be utilized to assure that construction impacts on Air Quality, Wetlands, Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Water Quality are minimized to the extent practicable. The provisions of FAA AC 150/5370-10F, *Standards for Specifying Construction on Airports*, will also be implemented to minimize construction impacts.

With regards to the project’s construction phase impacts on MMU’s operations, several closures to pavements throughout the construction period are anticipated to lead to variations in airport operations. As portions of runways, as well as entire runways, are reduced in length or closed during the construction period, some aircraft that currently utilize MMU on a regular basis are anticipated to temporarily relocate and utilize other nearby airports. This is anticipated to occur due to runway length requirements for the various aircraft types that utilize MMU, and would have the most impact on jet aircraft operations. Construction activities would be carefully coordinated with MMU tenants, operations, and the contractor(s) in an effort to keep the operational impacts to a minimum. Notices to Airmen (NOTAMs) would be issued by MMU management, as needed. The construction site would be marked and barricaded in accordance with current FAA safety standards.
Federally-Listed Endangered or Threatened Species (EA Section 5.6)
The project will not impact any federally listed threatened or endangered species of birds, plants, or fish. The only Federally-listed mammal species known to occur in the vicinity of MMU is the Indiana Bat that uses the area for its summer roosting and foraging needs. Because the project area is primarily located within existing pavement and maintained turf grass, mature trees (which may provide summer roosting and foraging habitat) are not anticipated to be topped or cut as part of the Proposed Action, no adverse impacts to the Indiana Bat are expected to occur.

Regarding amphibians and reptiles, the USFWS has found that bog turtle habitat is located in the wetlands surrounding the Runway 5 Departure End. Conservation measures have been requested by the USFWS during construction. They have concurred that if MMU implements the conservation measures prescribed, the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect the bog turtle.

Energy Supplies, Natural Resources, and Sustainable Design (EA Section 5.7)
The Proposed Action is not anticipated to alter the current intake and output of energy or services since it would not expand the capacity of MMU or its buildings. The Proposed Action would not induce any further demand on the existing suppliers for energy and services. Also, the materials necessary to complete this project are not scarce or unusual, and are readily available in the region.

Floodplains (EA Section 5.8)
The Proposed Action is an encroachment in the floodplain but would not have an adverse impact on the beneficial values of the floodplain. The Proposed Action would not result in an increase in flood levels upstream of the improvements, thereby; not increasing the risk to human life due to increased flooding or adversely affect property values. Impacts to floodplains would not be significant and would provide an overall benefit by increasing the flood storage capacity due to a net cut of 41,500 CY. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not constitute a significant encroachment to floodplains. Furthermore, given that the majority of MMU property is within the base floodplain, and that the project will not create any adverse impacts on the beneficial values of such, the relocation of the project components so as to avoid the base floodplain would not be practicable.

Hazardous Materials (EA Section 5.9)
Historic fill exists within portions of the project area. The identified contaminants and their concentrations indicate that the soil should be handled as non-hazardous waste. It is believed that the soils within the project area can be effectively managed in accordance with NJDEP regulations through a combination of on-site reuse; off-site soil treatment and recycling; and off-site beneficial soil reuse.

Secondary (Induced) Impacts (EA Section 5.10)
The Proposed Action would occur entirely on MMU property, and no land acquisition or easements would occur. The project would not expand operations, lengthen the runway, change fleet mix or alter the long-term use of MMU. The project is solely intended to replace and/or rehabilitate existing airfield infrastructure that has reached its useful life. The aircraft that would relocate during the construction phases are not anticipated to cause a significant impact to other
airports they may utilize. The relocations would be temporary and short duration. Disruptions
to residents, businesses, transportation, planned developments, employment, and public service
demands are not anticipated to occur.

**Light Emissions and Visual Effects (EA Section 5.11)**
The surrounding residential areas are shielded from airport light emissions, primarily due to the
buffer of undeveloped and compatible land uses around MMU, such as major highways,
industrial development, mature trees, and the distance of residential neighborhoods from MMU.
None of the project elements that make up the Proposed Action would alter the existing
conditions in the area of MMU; therefore no visual effects are anticipated.

**Noise (EA Section 5.12)**
While the 65 dBA DNL contour does extend beyond MMU with the Proposed Action, there are no
non-compatible land uses within the contour. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that
the Proposed Action does not result in a significant noise impact as defined by FAA Order

**Social Impacts (EA Section 5.13)**
The Proposed Action would occur entirely on MMU property and does not expand operations,
change fleet mix or alter the long-term use of MMU. The Proposed Action does not necessitate
the relocation of residences or businesses, and privately owned property would not be acquired;
therefore, no loss of community tax base and employment would occur. In addition, induced
socioeconomic impacts are not anticipated to occur since there would be no shifts in the patterns
of population movement and growth; no public service demands; and no changes in business and
other economic activities.

**Solid Waste (EA Section 5.14)**
The Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority (MCMUA) provides for the disposal location.
The MCMUA has adequate capacity to continue to serve the MMU and the region. No change in
MMU’s long-term solid waste stream is anticipated based upon implementation of the Proposed
Action.

**Water Quality (EA Section 5.15)**
No significant water quality impacts are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action. The
Proposed Action was analyzed in accordance with the NJDEP Stormwater Management Rules
practicable, these standards shall be met by incorporating nonstructural stormwater management
strategies into the design.

**Wetlands (EA Section 5.16)**
Wetland locations, functions, and values were well known and fully considered throughout the
project formulation process that led to the Preliminary Engineering Report and Environmental
Assessment. Minimization of wetland impacts was a key consideration in development of the
build alternatives and selection of the preferred alternatives. There are five project components
that will create wetlands impacts leading to a total of 1.3 acres of permanent impacts and 0.70
acres of temporary impacts. As discussed in greater detail below, no practicable alternatives
were identified that would further reduce wetland impacts while meeting project objectives, therefore it is concluded that the Proposed Action avoids and minimizes impacts to wetlands to the extent practicable.

Furthermore, even prior to mitigation, the wetland impacts created by the proposed action are not considered significant based upon NJDEP and FAA thresholds. The sponsor will obtain the necessary NJDEP Individual Wetlands Permit prior to construction. Compensatory wetland mitigation would be a condition of the permit. Compliance with the wetland mitigation permit condition would mitigate the wetland impacts associated with this project and no long term adverse impacts are anticipated.

**Glide Slope Critical Area Stabilization Grading and Drainage Improvements**
This project component will result in permanent impacts to 23,900 sf of wetlands and 6700 sf of temporary impacts to wetlands. In the Final EA, only one build alternative was identified for these improvements because the location of the project is fixed by the location of the glideslope antenna, and therefore cannot be further reduced or avoided. The impacted wetlands are mowed grass, having been formed in depressions on a manmade fill section.

**MALSR**
Regarding the MALSR, the preferred alternative would permanently impact approximately 8,200 sf of wetlands and temporarily impact 5,400 sf of wetlands. Alternative IV does not impact any wetlands; however, it provides access to the system by provision of a catwalk. The catwalk results in substantially higher construction costs and greatly increases the cost and complexity of maintaining the system. Therefore, when considering the small amount of wetlands impacted by the preferred alternative for this project component, Alternative IV is not practicable to construct.

**Runway 5 Departure Extended RSA**
The preferred alternative for the Runway 5 Departure Extended RSA (ERSA) would permanently impact 2,300 sf of wetlands and temporarily impact 5,300 sf of wetlands. Given that the standard ERSA alternative was dismissed because of the extensive wetland impacts that would result, the preferred alternative contemplates a non-standard ERSA. An Engineered Materials Arresting System (EMAS) was not considered for this runway end because the cost would exceed the FAA’s cost feasibility criteria for safety area improvements and this ERSA is relatively free of obstacles that would damage any under- or overshooting aircraft, negating much of the benefits of an EMAS. Additionally, the EMAS would entail significant wetland impacts. The preferred alternative meets many of the ERSA design criteria and would address minor grading issues in upland areas of the ERSA and replace the MALSR with a frangible system in accordance with RSA criteria. Therefore, it is the only practicable alternative for this project component.

**Runway 23 Departure ERSA**
The preferred alternative for the Runway 23 Departure ERSA would provide an EMAS, and permanently impacts approximately 7,500 sf of wetlands while temporarily impacting 700 sf of wetlands. Substantial RSA improvements are warranted in this area due to the proximity of the heavily traveled Columbia Turnpike in the RSA. A standard RSA would require extensive
wetland impacts associated with the RSA improvement as well as relocation of Columbia Turnpike. In addition, some reconfiguration of the NJ 24/Columbia Turnpike Interchange would likely be required to accommodate this alternative. The standard RSA alternative was not selected due to the extreme environmental impact and development cost. The preferred alternative substantively improves the RSA while avoiding most wetland impacts, and meets the FAA’s cost feasibility requirements. For these reasons, it is the only practicable alternative for this project component.

RW 5-23 Lateral Safety Area Grading (pavement rehabilitation)
The lateral RSA grading is integral to the pavement rehabilitation. As shown in Figure 5-13 of the Final EA, this grading would permanently impact approximately 16,200 sf of “mowed grass” wetlands that have formed in depressions in fill section as well as temporarily impacting 5,000 sf of wetlands. The grading is required to meet RSA grading standards as a result of raising the Runway 5-23 pavement profile. The grading will also address existing drainage deficiencies in the lateral RSA so that the entire RSA can support the design aircraft under dry conditions. As proposed, the lateral RSA’s would meet all FAA design criteria for RSA’s. There are no practicable alternatives that would eliminate or minimize wetland impacts for this project component given the location of Runway 5-23.

Cumulative Impacts (EA Section 5.18)
The environmental analysis considered projects completed in the past three years and planned projects for the next five years. The cumulative impacts of past and future airport projects will not result in significant environmental impacts.

8. Mitigation Measures (Refer to Chapter 6 of the EA)
In addition to the mitigation measures discussed below, Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be utilized to the extent practicable, particularly for controlling the anticipated localized effects on Air Quality, Wetlands, Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Water Quality.

Mitigation for wetland impacts will be in accordance with permit conditions. Impacted wetlands would be mitigated through use of a third party provider and located off of Airport property. All wetland mitigation would be completed in accordance with NJDEP permit conditions and would be subject to NJDEP review and approval to assure that the mitigation is appropriate for the characteristics, functions, and values of the impacted wetlands.

Tree clearing activities are highly unlikely, however, if necessary, would only be permitted October 1 through March 31 to avoid affecting the summer roosting and foraging habitat of the Indiana Bat, a Federally listed endangered species. Conservation measures, as required by the USFWS in their August 14, 2014 correspondence, and as specified in Section 6.2 of the Final EA, would be implemented to protect bog turtle habitat identified on the Runway 5 departure end.

All applicable Morris County and NJDEP stormwater standards and permit requirements will be met, and BMPs will be put in place. The provisions of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-
10F, Standards for Specifying Construction on Airports, will be implemented to minimize potential construction impacts. The following permits or approvals are anticipated:

- NJDEP Individual Wetlands Permit
- NJDEP Individual Flood Hazard Area Permit and Hardship Waiver
- NJDEP Stormwater Management Compliance including Request for Authorization as per NJPDES General Permit No. NJG0088323 Construction Activity Stormwater (SG3).
- NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Letter of Interpretation
- Morris County Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Certification

Additional permits, such as dewatering or Beneficial Soil Reuse, may be required based upon the final design of the project and the contractor’s methods of construction.

With regards to airport operations, construction activities would be carefully coordinated with MMU tenants, operations, and the contractor(s). Notices to Airmen (NOTAMs) will be issued by MMU management as needed. The construction sites will be marked and barricaded in accordance with current FAA safety standards.

9. **Public Involvement (Refer to Chapter 7 of the EA)**
Consistent with the guidance in paragraphs 404a and 404b of FAA Order 5050.4B, two Public Meetings/Workshops were conducted as documented in the Final EA.

10. **Environmental Finding:**
I have carefully and thoroughly considered the facts contained in the attached Final EA. Based on that information, I find the proposed Federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives of Section 101 (a) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and other applicable environmental requirements. I also find the proposed Federal action will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any conditions requiring consultation pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an EIS for this action.

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the FAA, I find that the actions summarized in this FONSI are reasonably supported and approved. I hereby direct that action be taken together with the necessary related and collateral actions, to carry out the agency actions noted above. Specifically:

1. Unconditional approval of the ALP pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 47107(a)(16)

2. Determination of the proposed action’s effects upon the safe and efficient utilization of navigable airspace pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b), 9 U.S.C. §44718 and 14 CFR Parts 77 and 157;

3. Approve for relocation, installation, and/or upgrade of various navigational aids;
4. Designate controlled airspace and revised routing, including navigational aids and flight procedures (14 C.F.R. Part 71);

5. Maintain continued close coordination with the DM Airports, Ltd., the Town of Morristown, and appropriate FAA program offices, as required, for safety during construction;

6. Determine under 49 U.S.C. § 47107 relating to the eligibility of the Project for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), and/or approval of an application to use Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) under 49 U.S.C. Section 40117 (this FONSI does not determine eligibility or availability of potential funds);

7. Determine conformance with FAA design criteria, federal regulations, and grant agreements (14 C.F.R. Parts 77, 150, 152); and

8. Determine under 49 U.S.C. § 44502(b) that the Proposed Project is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense;
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