

**U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Western-Pacific Region**

---

**Finding of No Significant Impact**

---

**for the  
Proposed Rancho Santa Fe Parkway Project  
at Kingman Municipal Airport  
in Mohave County, Arizona**



For further information:

Matthew H. Bilsbarrow  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Western-Pacific Region, Office of Airports

Phoenix Airports District Office  
3800 North Central Ave, Suite 1025  
Phoenix, AZ 85012  
602-792-1066

November 9, 2023

## **GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT**

**WHAT'S IN THIS DOCUMENT?** This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed Rancho Santa Fe Parkway that crosses Kingman Municipal Airport located in Kingman, Mohave County, Arizona. This document includes the FAA's determinations and approvals for the proposed federal action described in the Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) dated September 2023. This document discusses all alternatives considered by the FAA in reaching its decision and briefly summarizes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative, which were evaluated in detail in the Final EA.

**WHAT'S HAPPENED TO DATE?** The City of Kingman (City) published a Notice of Availability for the Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) on July 24, 2023. The Draft EA was available for public review from July 24, 2023 to August 24, 2023. The City received seven responses containing a total of 23 comments on the Draft EA. The FAA considered the public's comments and prepared a Final EA in November 2023.

**WHAT SHOULD YOU DO?** Read this FONSI to understand the actions that FAA intends to take in connection with the proposed Rancho Santa Fe Parkway Project that crosses Kingman Municipal Airport.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?** The FAA may approve the City's land-use change request and process the land-obligation release. The City and Arizona Department of Transportation may start implementing the Rancho Santa Fe Parkway Project.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION  
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**PROPOSED RANCHO SANTA FE PARKWAY  
KINGMAN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT  
MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZONA**

## **1. Introduction**

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) provides this document as its issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) associated with the proposed Rancho Santa Fe Parkway (RSFP) Project (Project) that crosses Kingman Municipal Airport (Airport) located in Kingman, Mohave County, Arizona. The FAA based this decision on information and analysis presented in the Final Environmental Assessment (EA), dated November 2023, which the FAA incorporates by reference. The FAA prepared the Final EA per the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR § 1500-1508), and FAA Order 1050.1F. The FAA's applicant is the City of Kingman (City), which owns and operates the Airport. The City requested the FAA release them from a land-use obligation related to the Surplus Property Act. On April 25, 2022, the FAA determined that it had authority to approve or disapprove a release from land obligations on former surplus Department of Defense property and change the land use from aeronautical to non-aeronautical for the City's Proposed Project.<sup>1</sup>

## **2. Purpose and Need**

The FAA's overall purpose and need is to fulfill its statutory mission, which is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. The FAA's purpose and need is "to encourage the development of intermodal connections on airport property between aeronautical and other transportation modes and systems to serve air transportation passengers and cargo efficiently and effectively and promote economic development."<sup>2</sup> The City's objective is to provide safe and efficient vehicular access to and from East Kingman.

## **3. FAA's Proposed Action and City's Proposed Project**

The FAA proposes to release the City from its land obligation on 42.6 acres of Airport property, allowing this land to be reclassified from aeronautical use to nonaeronautical use. FAA's Proposed Action would enable the City's Proposed Project, RSFP, to cross Airport property. RSFP consists of four components:

1. Construction of a new Traffic Interchange (TI) on Interstate 40 (I-40) between milepost (MP) 55.5 and MP 57.2. The new TI would have RSFP depressed under I-40;
2. Construction of a new paved arterial street between Louise Avenue and Industrial Boulevard that crosses Airport property;

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter from the Michael Williams, FAA, to Doug Breckenridge, City of Kingman, April 25, 2022. Final EA Appendix D.6

<sup>2</sup> 49 U.S.C. § 47101(a)(5).

3. Construction of a new drainage channel collocated within the arterial street's right-of-way (ROW). The drainage channel would outlet into Rattlesnake Hill Wash at a point northwest of Industrial Boulevard and southeast of a railroad bridge; and
4. Construction of a 21-inch-diameter sewer line collocated along the south side of Berry Road and adjacent to an existing utility easement across Airport property.

#### **4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered**

The FAA studied two alternatives in the Final EA, which are the City's Proposed Project (Preferred Alternative) and the No Action Alternative. The City screened several TI designs, road corridors, drainage designs, and sewer line routes. The 10 selection criteria for the TI design were:

1. Construction cost,
2. Adequacy of roadway geometry and safety,
3. Improvements to traffic operations,
4. Amount of ROW acquisition,
5. Amount of earthwork,
6. Compliance of drainage functions to City standards,
7. Size and cost of structures,
8. Impacts to I-40,
9. Number of conflicts with existing utilities, and
10. Amount of environmental impacts.

The three selection criteria for the road corridors were:

1. The degree of paralleling section lines,
2. The degree of following existing utilities, and
3. The directness between I-40, State Route 66, and the Airport.

The four selection criteria for the drainage design were:

1. Minimizing the amount of ROW acquisition,
2. Minimizing the number of crossings of Rattlesnake Wash,
3. Minimizing impacts to adjacent properties, and
4. Reconnecting and concentrating sheet flow associated with Rattlesnake Wash prior to those flows entering Rattlesnake Hill Wash and crossing under a railroad bridge.

The two selection criteria for the sewer line alignment were:

1. Paralleling existing utility easements, and
2. Conforming with the City's Wastewater Master Plan Update and Inflow/Infiltration Study.

The City selected the option that met these criteria for the Proposed Project. The FAA considered the City's Proposed Project as the Preferred Alternative. The FAA did not examine other action alternatives, because the Proposed Project does not involve any unresolved resource conflicts.

## 5. Assessment

The FAA considered the Proposed Action's and the No Action Alternative's potential environmental impacts, which were identified and evaluated in the Final EA. The FAA didn't analyze in detail the following environmental impact categories, or portions of categories, listed in the Final EA's Table 4.2-1, because the associated resources were absent, or impacts were negligible. These were:

1. Biological Resources-Threatened and Endangered Species,
2. Biological Resources-Designated Critical Habitat,
3. Coastal Resources,
4. Resources Protected by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Action of 1966,
5. Noise-Aircraft Noise,
6. Water Resources-Wetlands,
7. Water Resources-Surface Waters,
8. Water Resources-Groundwater, and
9. Water Resources-Wild and Scenic Rivers.

The FAA analyzed the following environmental impact categories in detail in the Final EA in Section 4. A summary of the Proposed Action's impacts is also provided below.

**A. Air Quality.** The Final EA in Section 4.3 compared the estimated total annual emissions for criteria pollutants that would result from the construction and operation of the Proposed Action with the *de minimis* thresholds. The analysis concluded that emissions for all applicable pollutants would be less than the general conformity *de minimis* thresholds. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures listed in the Final EA's Section 4.3.5.1 to reduce dust, revegetate disturbed areas, and cover stockpiled materials. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to air quality.

**B. Biological Resources.** The Final EA in Section 4.4 stated that the Proposed Action would impact 131.2 acres of semidesert grassland used by golden eagles, bald eagles, and migratory birds. However, the Proposed Action occurs within a Hualapai Valley, which is primarily undeveloped and contains open land with this biotic community. Golden eagles, bald eagles, and migratory birds are unlikely to nest in the area impacted by the Proposed Action, because vegetation is sparse. The area north of I-40 contains habitat unsuitable for Sonoran desert tortoise and the portion south of I-40 is considered marginal habitat. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures listed in the Final EA's Section 4.4.5.1 to minimize impacts to migratory birds, state-protected native plants, and semidesert grassland habitat in general. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to biological resources.

**C. Climate.** The Final EA in Section 4.5 calculated that the Proposed Action's construction would result in approximately 2,375 metric tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in 2023 and 4,198 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub> in 2024. The social cost of this CO<sub>2</sub> is \$368,088.00. The Proposed Action's construction would also result in 0.08 metric tons of nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) and 0.002 metric tons of methane (CH<sub>4</sub>). Overall, the Proposed Action's social cost of all greenhouse gases (GHG) is \$369,772.47. The FAA conducted this analysis for disclosure purposes only, since the FAA hasn't established significant thresholds or factors to consider for GHG emissions.

**D. Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention.** The Final EA in Section 4.6 stated that hazardous materials, such as gasoline and diesel fuel, would be used by machinery during the Proposed Action's construction. Lead-based paint in I-40's yellow stripping would be removed by Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) prior to the Proposed Action as part of an independent maintenance project. Solid waste generated by the Proposed Action would be disposed of at the Cerbat Landfill, which has space for it in the current cell. The Proposed Action's construction activities would follow existing regulatory procedures to prevent pollution. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures proposed by ADOT in Appendix A.3.a, such as reporting a discovery of hazardous materials. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts related to hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention.

**E. Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources.** The Final EA in Section 4.7 described 26 resources identified in the Proposed Action's area of potential effects, of which 10 were evaluated as historic properties (see Final EA Table 4.7.1). The FAA found that the Proposed Action would have "no adverse effect" on historic properties, and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer concurred. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures listed in Section 4.7.5.1 that establish procedures for responding to a discovery of previously unconsidered or unknown cultural resources. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural resources.

**F. Land Use.** The Final EA in Section 4.8 compared the Proposed Action to existing land use plans and requirements. The Proposed Action's redesignation of approximately 42.6 acres of Airport property from "aeronautical" use to "non-aeronautical" use is compatible with existing and future land use identified on Airport Master Plan as well as in the City and Mohave County general plans. The Proposed Action's construction of a road improvements, drainage structures and sewer lines on 131.2 acres is recommended in the City and Mohave County general plans. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures proposed by ADOT in Appendix A.3.a. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to land use.

**G. Natural Resources and Energy Supply.** The Final EA in Section 4.9 considered the Proposed Action's electricity, fossil fuel, and water needs, which are not in short supply in the City or Mohave County. The Proposed Action would provide a more direct route between the Airport's existing industrial park and I-40, which would potentially reduce fuel consumption. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures proposed by ADOT in Appendix A.3.a. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to natural resources or energy supplies.

**H. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use.** The Final EA in Section 4.10 described the Proposed Action's noise generated during its construction and operation. The closest sensitive receivers (i.e., residences at 0.25 miles away) would experience up to a 20-dBA increase in noise during the Proposed Action's two-year-long construction, but afterwards noise levels would drop from a high of 65 dBA to 45 dBA or less during operations. Noise impacts to sensitive receivers associated with the Proposed Action's operations would be the same as those associated with the No Action Alternative, which is 45 dBA or less. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures listed in Section 4.10.5.1, such as construction workers adhering to Mohave County's

noise ordinance. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts related to noise and noise-compatible land use.

**I. Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks.** The Final EA in Section 4.11 stated that the Proposed Action would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of established community or displace housing or businesses since it would be constructed on vacant lands. The Proposed Action would not impact airport operations. The RSFP has been included in local planning documents for decades and is a vital component of the local transportation network for the City and Mohave County. The Proposed Action would provide jobs in the construction sector; however, construction employment is temporary (i.e., 1-2 years) and would not represent a permanent change in the community tax base. Disproportionately high and adverse impacts would not occur to an environmental justice population as a result of constructing and operating the Proposed Action. Desert Willow Elementary School and White Cliffs Middle School are located approximately 0.7 miles west of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action’s construction or operation would not disrupt the schools’ vehicular access, which is via Airway Avenue to the west. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures proposed by ADOT in Appendix A.3.a. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to socioeconomic factors, Environmental Justice communities, or children’s environmental health and safety.

**J. Visual Effects.** The Final EA in Section 4.12 described the Proposed Action’s light emissions and visual character changes. The Proposed Action would install lights for safety at the new I-40 TI and two traffic signals on the TI ramps. The Proposed Action’s construction would not occur at night, so temporary artificial lighting would not be needed. The Proposed Action would be constructed in an undeveloped area and its design considers the anticipated future development described in the City’s and Mohave County’s general plan. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures proposed by ADOT in Appendix A.3.a. Therefore, the Proposed Action wouldn’t result in significant impacts to visual resources or visual character.

**K. Water Resources.** The Final EA in Section 4.13 described that the Proposed Action would construct a two-lane, at-grade, paved crossing of Rattlesnake Hill Wash to replace an unpaved one. The Proposed Action would impact 1.1 acres of the 100-year floodplain associated with Rattlesnake Hill Wash (see EA Figure 4.13-2), which is 0.27% of this floodplain located within one mile of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would not pose a risk to a nearby railroad or the Airport, because surface flow patterns would be maintained, surface elevation of the floodplain would not be altered, and the floodplain at the railroad crossing would not change. The Proposed Action includes adding scour protection for the road crossing. The Proposed Action includes avoidance and minimization measures listed in Section 4.13.5.1, such as the City providing Mohave County with an updated floodplain model after the Proposed Action’s construction. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a significant impact to floodplains.

**L. Cumulative Impacts.** The Final EA in Section 4.14 discussed past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects located at the Airport or within the greater Kingman area that could have incremental impacts to resources also impacted by the Proposed Action. When these are added to

the Proposed Action's impacts, they wouldn't exceed significance thresholds or factors to be considered. Therefore, the Proposed Action wouldn't result in significant cumulative impacts.

## **6. Public Participation.**

The City made the Draft EA available to the public for a 30-day-long review period from July 23, 2023 to August 24, 2023 and published a Notice of Availability in the *Kingman Daily Miner* on July 23, 2023. The City placed a review copy of the Draft EA at the Airport, Mohave County Library, and the City Complex. A link to download the Draft Environmental Assessment was also provided <https://www.kingmanairport.com/airport-information/kingmanairport-rsfp-ea>. The City received seven responses containing a total of 23 comments. The Final EA in Section 5.3 describes the comments and the FAA's response.

## **7. Inter-Agency Coordination.**

The FAA found that further coordination with the U.S. Department of the Interior or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency isn't necessary per 49 U.S.C. § 47101(h). The Proposed Action doesn't involve construction of a new airport, new runway, or major runway extension that has a significant impact on:

- natural resources including fish and wildlife;
- natural, scenic, and recreational assets;
- water and air quality; or
- another factor affecting the environment.

## **8. Reasons for the Determination that the Proposed Action will have No Significant Impacts**

In the Final EA, the FAA examined the environmental impact categories that could be present at the Proposed Action's location or impacted by the Proposed Action. The Final EA showed that Proposed Action wouldn't involve any environmental impacts that exceed the threshold of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B. Based on the information contained in this FONSI and supported by the detailed discussion in the Final EA, the FAA selected the Preferred Alternative as described in Sections 3 and 4 of this FONSI.




**9. Finding of No Significant Impact**

I carefully and thoroughly considered the facts contained in the Final EA. Based on that information, I find the proposed federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives of NEPA’s Section 101(a). I also find the proposed federal action wouldn’t significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any condition requiring any consultation per NEPA’s Section 102(2)(C). As a result, the FAA will not prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for this action.

**APPROVED:**

**MICHAEL N  
WILLIAMS**

 Digitally signed by MICHAEL N  
WILLIAMS  
Date: 2023.11.16 06:15:11  
-07'00'

11/16/2023

---

Mike N. Williams, A.A.E.  
Manager  
Phoenix Airports District Office

---

Date

**DISAPPROVED:**

---

Mike N. Williams, A.A.E.  
Manager  
Phoenix Airports District Office

---

Date