Friedman Memorial Airport Authority ("FMAA") Meeting

I just reviewed the FMAA agenda and packet for the FMAA meeting scheduled for October 2, 2012. I am attaching the agenda and the meeting brief. There are several items of interest. First, under Unfinished Business (¶ III(A)(6)(b)), the FMAA will be discussing a draft Environmental Assessment. Although the draft EA was not included in the FMAA packet, I am attaching it for your review. The attached Environmental Assessment ("EA") prepared by Mead & Hunt has been received by FMAA. This EA reviewed the request by SkyWest to replace the Brasilia (a 30 passenger turboprop) with a twin engine jet (a 65 passenger aircraft). The regional jet would fly into FMA 3 times/day, while the Brasilia flies into FMA a maximum of 6 times/day. The request by SkyWest triggered the need for the EA. The EA evaluated six alternatives and concluded that only two alternatives (no action and the proposed action to replace the Brasilia with a regional jet) should be evaluated. After evaluating the two alternatives, the EA concludes that there is no significant impact in any of the environmental impact categories for either the proposed action or the no-action alternative. The comment period for the draft EA apparently ends on October 12, 2012. I am not sure whether you wish to make any comments, but if so, there should be a discussion about potential comments.

Second, under Unfinished Business (¶ III(B)), the FMAA will discuss the transfer of property as contemplated by the Amended and Restated Joint Powers Agreement. Third, under New Business (¶ V(A)), there will be a discussion of the amended bylaws.

I did not see anything else on the agenda, the meeting brief or any attachment which I feel should be discussed during the City Council meeting. If you want access to the entire FMAA packet, please go to www.fivfmaa.com and click onto FMAA Meetings & Agendas.
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NOTICE OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF
THE FRIEDMAN MEMORIAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a regular meeting of the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority shall be held Tuesday, October 2, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. at the old Blaine County Courthouse Meeting Room, Hailey, Idaho. The proposed agenda for the meeting is as follows:

AGENDA
October 2, 2012

I. APPROVE AGENDA

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (10 Minutes Allotted)

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
A. Airport Solutions
   1. Blaine County Report
   2. City of Hailey Report
   3. Airport Manager Report
   4. Legal Counsel Report
   5. Communications Director Report
      a. Coffee Talk
      b. Airport Tour (Public)
      c. Sustain Blaine Airport Tour
      d. Idaho Transportation Department Board Presentation
      e. Sun Valley Board of Realtors Presentation
   6. Existing Site
      a. Friedman Memorial Airport Alternatives – Technical Analysis
   b. Retain/Improve/Develop Air Service
      a. FSVA Report
      b. First Time Schedule Commercial Jet Service Environmental Assessment (EA) Update
   c. Joint Powers Agreement Property Transfer Update

IV. APPROVE FRIEDMAN MEMORIAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY MEETING MINUTES OF:
A. September 4, 2012 Regular Meeting - Attachment #1

V. NEW BUSINESS
A. FMAA Bylaws – Attachment #2

VI. AIRPORT STAFF BRIEF
A. Noise Complaints
B. Parking Lot Update
C. Profit & Loss, ATCT Traffic Operations Count and Enplanement Data – Attachments #3 - #8
D. Review Correspondence – Attachment #7
E. Fly Sun Valley Alliance Update – Attachments #8, #9
F. Airport Weather interruptions
G. Operations Brief
H. Administrative Brief
I. FY ’12 Independent Audit
J. Airport Appreciation Day

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION - I.C. §67-2345 (1)(a)

IX. ADJOURNMENT

FRIEDMAN MEMORIAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES. SHOULD YOU DESIRE TO ATTEND A BOARD MEETING AND NEED A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION TO DO SO, PLEASE CONTACT THE AIRPORT MANAGER’S OFFICE AT LEAST ONE WEEK IN ADVANCE BY CALLING 208-4596 OR WRITING TO P.O. BOX 913, HAILEY, IDAHO 83333.
III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Airport Solutions

1. Blaine County Report

This item is on the agenda to permit a County report if appropriate.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discussion

2. City of Hailey Report

This item is on the agenda to permit a City report if appropriate.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discussion

3. Airport Manager Report

This item is on the agenda to permit an Airport Manager’s report if appropriate.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discussion

4. Legal Counsel Report

This item is on the agenda to permit a report from Legal Counsel if appropriate.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discuss/Direct

5. Communications Director Report

a. Coffee Talk

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discussion

b. Airport Tour (Public)

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discussion

c. Sustain Blaine Airport Tour

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discussion

d. Idaho Transportation Department Board Presentation

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discussion

e. Sun Valley Board of Realtors Presentation

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discussion
5. Existing Site

a. Friedman Memorial Airport Alternatives – Technical Analysis

Work continues on the Airport Alternatives Technical Analysis effort. Airport Manager and the T-O team have identified an array of alternatives and are now moving forward with analysis. This includes refinement of the full compliance alternatives presented at the September meeting, plus several alternatives that improve the airport, both within the existing fence and with modest expansion of the airport property. Dave Mitchell of T-O Engineers will attend the meeting to present refined full compliance alternatives along with preliminary versions of the other alternatives.

A meeting at the Seattle ADO to discuss the draft alternatives is planned for mid-October, with a final presentation of alternatives at the November FMAA meeting. Submittal of the final alternatives report is also planned for early November.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discuss/direct

6. Retain/Improve/Develop Air Service

a. FSVA Report

This item is on the agenda to permit a report if appropriate.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discuss/direct

b. First Time Scheduled Commercial Jet Service Environmental Assessment (EA) Update

The FAA completed the review of the Draft Environmental Assessment for Operations Specifications approval of regional jet operations at the airport by SkyWest Airlines. No physical improvements would be necessary to accommodate the proposed change in aircraft type; therefore the proposed action is limited to the modification of the Airline’s Operations Specification. This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the associated federal actions.

The EA document has been made available for public review on September 12th, with the close of the comment period scheduled for October 12th. During the public review period, input and comments are being received. Following the public review period, comments will be reviewed and a Final Environmental Assessment document will be prepared for FAA acceptance.
Dave Mitchell of T-O Engineers and Brad Rolf of Mead & Hunt will be attending this Board meeting to provide a brief presentation on the findings of the Environmental Assessment and answer any questions the Board may have.

Click here to review the Draft Environmental Assessment.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discuss/direct

B. Joint Powers Agreement Property Transfer Update

This item is on the agenda so that Legal Counsel may update the Board on the Joint Powers Agreement Property transfer process.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Discuss/direct

IV. APPROVE FRIEDMAN MEMORIAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY MEETING MINUTES OF:

A. September 4, 2012 Regular Meeting – Attachment #1

BOARD ACTION: 1. Action

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. FMAA Bylaws – Attachment #2

As you know, Board Member McCleary and Board Member Mc Bryan have been working to develop the amended Bylaws with Legal Counsel. The purpose of their effort is to update the Bylaws to ensure that they are in line with the current version of the JPA and practices, to clean up and clarify language and to better define the responsibilities of officers. Attachment #2 is a draft Amended Bylaws included for Board information, review and use.

BOARD ACTION: 1. Action
VI. AIRPORT STAFF BRIEF

A. Noise Complaints:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AIRCRAFT TYPE</th>
<th>INCIDENT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halley</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>9:49 am</td>
<td>B-17</td>
<td>Low Departure over Halley</td>
<td>This aircraft departed North in response to winds in excess of 15 knts out of the north. This would have constituted an unacceptable tailwind for a south departure. Ops Chief advised the caller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantrelle</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>5:15 am</td>
<td>Sgl Eng</td>
<td>Early Departure</td>
<td>Suspected aircraft ID’d. Ops Chief communicated the concern to the aircraft operator. Ops Chief communicated with caller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantrelle</td>
<td>9/22</td>
<td>2:35 am</td>
<td>Twin turbo</td>
<td>Late Operations</td>
<td>This was a Life Flight operation. Caller was notified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Brdfrd</td>
<td>9/22</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same As Above</td>
<td>Same As Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Brdfrd</td>
<td>9/23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Caller believes approach &amp; departure paths have changed and aircraft are now flying over her house routinely</td>
<td>Ops Chief left a msg for the caller. There have been no changes to approach/departure paths at FMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Parking Lot Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$16,950.82</td>
<td>$5,125.43</td>
<td>$19,561.73</td>
<td>$9,799.38</td>
<td>$15,813.00</td>
<td>$6,530.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C. Profit & Loss, ATCT Traffic Operations Count and Enplanement Data - Attachments #3 - #6

Attachment #3 is Friedman Memorial Airport Profit & Loss through July 2012. Attachment #4 is air traffic control tower traffic operations data for August 2012. Attachment #5 is 2001 - 2012 air traffic control operations data comparison by month. Attachment #6 is 2006 - 2012 enplanement data. The following revenue and expense analysis is provided for Board information and review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July 2011/2012</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July, 2012</td>
<td>$360,740.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Federal Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July, 2011</td>
<td>$342,514.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY '12 thru July</td>
<td>$1,712,735.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Federal Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY '11 thru July</td>
<td>$1,657,490.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June, 2012</td>
<td>$126,787.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Federal Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June, 2011</td>
<td>$126,184.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY '12 thru July</td>
<td>$1,564,821.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Federal Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY '11 thru July</td>
<td>$1,499,637.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Net Income to include Federal Programs | FY '12 thru July | $-128,188.61 |
*Net Income to include Federal Programs | FY '11 thru July | $-218,016.51 |

*Difference in net income is related to federal transactions.

D. Review Correspondence - Attachment #7

Attachment #7 is information included for Board review.

E. Fly Sun Valley Alliance Update – Attachments #8, #9

Attachment #8 is the August 20, 2012 Fly Sun Valley Alliance Meeting Minutes. Attachment #9 is the September 10, 2012 Fly Sun Valley Alliance Meeting Agenda.

F. Airport Weather Interruptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SkyWest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wx: Weather       Mech: Mechanical

NOTE: Horizon Airlines has suspended SUN service until the winter season.
G. Operations Brief

The Passenger Terminal Carpet project is complete. Please come by and see the improvement!

The ARFF/Ops Staff appreciated the volunteer assistance we got from various tenants in helping to produce the Airport Community Appreciation Day. All indications suggest that the event was a rousing success.

The ARFF/Ops staff just completed FAA-mandated, annual recurrent training on Wildlife Hazard Management.

New Projects/Tasks:

FMAA Snow Committee Meeting - October 23
Surplus Property Disposal (Closed Bid Auction) – Late October
Airfield preparation for winter ops - ongoing
Snow removal equipment servicing and preparation - ongoing
Receipt of new Snow removal equip. (Front-end loader and implements) – October

H. Administrative Brief

I. AIP Project Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Expenditures to Date</th>
<th>95% of Eligible Expenses</th>
<th>93.75% of Eligible Expenses</th>
<th>Grant Amount Remaining</th>
<th>Grant/Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Acquire snow removal equipment (SRE) (broom and plow) (Phase 2); Rehabilitate apron (Phase 1), design only; Rehabilitate parallel taxiway (Phase 1), design only; Rehabilitate taxi lanes (Phase 1); design only</td>
<td>$266,000.00</td>
<td>$259,697.83</td>
<td>$256,213.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$9,787.00</td>
<td>CLOSED 02/06/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rehabilitate parallel taxiways A &amp; B and connector taxiways A2-A2B and B1-B5 and taxi lanes (seal coat) (Phase 2), construction; Rehabilitate aprons (seal coat), (Phase 2) (Phase 2)</td>
<td>$218,200.00</td>
<td>$224,573.28</td>
<td>$213,344.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$4,856.00</td>
<td>CLOSED 9/15/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Acquire snow removal equipment (SRE), including truck and rotary plow</td>
<td>$545,500.00</td>
<td>$565,880.30</td>
<td>$537,566.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$7,914</td>
<td>CLOSED 9/15/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Conduct 90-Day Airport Safety Area Standards</td>
<td>$237,230.00</td>
<td>$29,792.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$27,930.00</td>
<td>$207,437.50</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Replacement Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Conduct environmental study for replacement airport for Friedman Memorial Airport, Hailey, Idaho</td>
<td>$2,245,094.00</td>
<td>$2,363,256.76</td>
<td>$2,245,093.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>CLOSED 07/08/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Conduct environmental study for replacement airport for Friedman Memorial Airport, Hailey, Idaho (Phase 2)</td>
<td>$2,500,000.00</td>
<td>$2,437,377.61</td>
<td>$2,315,506.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$184,492.00</td>
<td>CLOSED 08/21/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Conduct environmental study for replacement airport for Friedman Memorial Airport, Hailey, Idaho (Phase 3)</td>
<td>$453,816.00</td>
<td>$429,914.00</td>
<td>$403,416.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$45,400.00</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Conduct environmental study for replacement airport for Friedman Memorial Airport, Hailey, Idaho (Phase 4)</td>
<td>$2,500,000.00</td>
<td>$1,543,246.77</td>
<td>$1,466,094.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,033,916.00</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. FY '12 Independent Audit**

Representatives from the Airport's independent auditor, Simmons & Clubb, CPA began the on-site procedures and records testing for the FY '12 independent audit. In the next few weeks they will be contacting FMAA members to conduct interviews and will return to the Manager's Office during the week of November 5th to complete the on-site testing. The Board can expect to receive the draft financials and audit report presentation during the January regular meeting.

**J. Airport Appreciation Day**

The Friedman Memorial Airport Authority Board and Staff extends its gratitude and appreciation to the Wood River Valley Community for its support of the Airport Appreciation Day festivities held on Saturday, September 15. Yet again, this very special event was a rousing success!

That success could not have been possible without the tireless support and commitment of all the Airport Tenants, in particular, the Blaine County Pilots Association, Atlantic Aviation, Horizon Air, SkyWest Airlines, the TSA, Avis Rent A Car, Hertz Rent A Car, Runway Gift Café, LLC, The Car Park, Glass Cockpit Aviation, the City of Hailey, Power Engineers, Swire Pacific Coca-Cola, Pepsi, Zaney's Coffee and the many volunteers who generously donated their time and equipment. Most importantly, the day was made great because of the support and participation of our tremendous community. Thanks to all!!!

The Car Park was gracious enough to count the number of vehicles associated with the event and the number of occupants. The final count is 387 cars and 887 attendees. These counts do not include the numerous volunteers that arrived early for setup.
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APPENDIX A – LETTER OF INTENT
APPENDIX B – AGENCY COORDINATION LETTERS
1.1 PROPOSED ACTION

SkyWest currently services Friedman Memorial Airport (FMA) as Delta Connection, with an Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia (a 30-passenger turboprop). SkyWest proposes to replace this service with a Bombardier CRJ700ER, (a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats). The Letter of Intent (LOI) from SkyWest stating this proposal is provided in Appendix A. In order to do this, SkyWest has made a request to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to amend the Airline’s Operations Specifications (proposed action) at FMA. SkyWest has indicated that it would reduce the frequency of service from a high-season peak of 6 daily departures with the EMB-120 to 3 daily departures with its 65-seat CRJ700ER.

The CRJ700ER is a Category C aircraft whereas FMA is a Category B airport. Effectively, this means that there is not enough Runway Safety Area (RSA) at FMA for the CRJ700ER to safely operate as per FAA regulations. Therefore, this proposal also involves the additional agreement between FMA and the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) to ensure that the taxiways on either side of the runway at FMA be free of any traffic, effectively providing sufficient RSA for a Category C aircraft.

No physical improvements would be necessary to accommodate this change in aircraft type, so the proposed action is limited to the amendment of the Airline’s Operations Specification. This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the associated federal actions, as well as FAA Order 1050.1E, Change, 1, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, among other federal, state and local laws and regulations.

1.2 HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

FMA is located in South Central Idaho and serves the Wood River region (see Figure 1-1). The valley has five incorporated cities: Bellevue, Hailey (county seat of Blaine County), Ketchum, Carey and Sun Valley. FMA is located in the City of Hailey, the fastest growing city in the Wood River Valley. According to the 2010 census, the City of Hailey had a population of 7,960, the City of Bellevue, 2,287, and Blaine County 21,326. At an elevation of 5,317 feet the airport is nestled within the Idaho Rockies and is at the edge of the Sawtooth and Challis National Forests. The area is well known for the Sun Valley resort.
FIGURE 1-1
LOCATION MAP
The Airport is located within the City of Hailey and encompasses 209 acres of land. North and east of the Airport is a mixture of residential and commercial uses. The area south and southeast of the Airport is agricultural land use. West is a mix of industrial and lower density residentially-designated areas which currently have limited development. Commercial and recreational uses and a cemetery are located immediately north of the Airport. Further to the northwest is the historical center of Hailey which has a mixture of commercial and residential uses. The City of Bellevue lies about 2 miles southeast of the Airport. Land use is depicted in Figure 4-1 in Chapter 4.

FMA is a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 139 B-II Certificated airport. Given the geographical location of FMA, FMA currently does not and cannot comply with FAA airfield design standards on the limited land owned by the Airport. For example, the horizontal distance between the airport parallel taxiway and the runway is at 250 feet rather than the required 400 feet per FAA design standard. In order to meet FAA design standards for the type of commercial and general aviation aircraft that routinely use the Airport, an agreement between the FMA and the ATCA has been put into place which constrains aircraft taxi movements when aircraft such as the Horizon Airlines Dash 8-400 flies into Friedman Memorial. Such an agreement has been extended to include SkyWest CRJ700 ER aircraft. Furthermore, the FAA required Runway Safety Area and Runway Object Free Areas do not meet standards because of the close proximity of the runway to State Highway 75. Because of the Runway Safety Area length deficiency a portion of the north end of the runway is not available for use for aircraft takeoffs and landings as it has been designated as part of the Runway Safety Area. The mountainous terrain on the east, west, and north sides of the Airport precludes instrument approach procedures such as exist at most commercial airports. Based on historic data approximately 25 percent of scheduled airline flights during winter months are either cancelled or diverted to another airport.

In the 1985 FMA Airport Master Plan, options for the alteration of the FMA layout was discussed, including the relocation of State Highway 75. However, the cost and difficulty associated with this type of movement in developing the Airport to correct FAA discrepancies were considered extreme. In 1990, an Airport Feasibility Study was drafted in order to identify and compare the improvements necessary to modify the current airport site's deviations to FAA standards versus construction of a new airport at a different location in the Wood River Region. The final site choice was located in western Blaine County near the Camas County line. The residents of Blaine County and the Blaine County Airport Commissioners were the final authority on deciding the action to take preceding this study. They concluded that staying with the current airport site was the best decision at the time.

The next study was published in 1994. This 1994 Airport Master Plan Update recognized that growth at the existing Airport would eventually require relocating the entire airport away from its present site and the valley. As a result of ARC C-III aircraft replacing the existing Airport's (B-III) design/critical aircraft and the FAA's requirements for appropriate airfield design criteria (i.e. safety area dimensions).

The 2004 Master Plan Update was undertaken to examine alternatives to rectify the Airport's deviations from FAA design standards. Factors under consideration in this study included identifying improvements needed for existing airport facilities, evaluating alternative development options in order to meet required standards, as well as developments necessary to meet long-range (20-year) airport
requirements based on the projected increase in future airport operations. The 2004 Master Plan Update explored both short-term and long-term alternatives. The Airport Authority opted to begin with the required short-term improvements, but due to the combination of high costs, negative community reaction to required land acquisition, and lack of resolution for long-term airport growth requirements, the Authority also approved a study for investigating alternate airport locations and selecting a new airport site.

The 2006 Feasibility Study was conducted as a result of the findings and conclusions reached by the 2004 FMA Master Plan Update. The goal of the study was to identify alternate airport site locations away from the existing airport, select a preferred site from these locations, and conduct a financial feasibility analysis for the new airport. Following this study, the FAA initiated an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to investigate the impacts of the FMA’s replacement airport. It was intended that the EIS would determine all impacts to the environment, such as, but not limited to, noise, air quality, water quality, wetlands, fish, wildlife, plants, farmlands, floodplains, historic/tribal resources, hazardous wastes, socioeconomics, and economic factors.

During the EIS process, issues related to wildlife matters arose and the costs associated with the alternative sites for the replacement airport increased beyond what was expected. This raised feasibility concerns for the project’s advancement. The FAA indefinitely suspended the Draft EIS in August 2011. Currently, the status of the EIS remains suspended.
CHAPTER 2

PURPOSE AND NEED

2.1 PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to replace the current SkyWest Airlines' scheduled passenger service to FMA that currently uses the Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with the Bombardier CRJ700ER. The Brasilia is a twin-engine turboprop aircraft with 30 passenger seats while the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats. This EA is intended to support FAA's review of the Airline's proposed amendment of its Operations Specifications.

2.2 NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

The need for the proposed actions is to meet the Airline's desire to phase out service by the Brasilia while introducing service using the CRJ700ER at FMA.

Operations Specifications Amendment. FAA's "continuing mission is to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in the world." A central means of implementing this mission is through issuance of Operations Specifications to scheduled airlines as defined in Title 14 CFR Section 119.49. SkyWest has requested amendments to its Operating Specifications to permit introduction of scheduled passenger service using the CRJ700ER to replace the Brasilia. The FAA must review amendments to operations specifications and is required to either grant or deny the amendment to the operations specifications based on a number of criteria. Air commerce safety is the primary consideration in determining the issuance of the specifications. As stated in 49 USC Section 44705:

"The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue an air carrier operating certificate to a person desiring to operate as an air carrier when the Administrator finds, after investigation, that the person properly and adequately is equipped and able to operate safely under this part and regulations and standards prescribed under this part. An air carrier operating certificate shall (1) contain terms necessary to ensure safety in air transportation; and (2) specify the places to and from which, and the airways of the United States over which, a person may operate as an air carrier." (Emphasis added)

Therefore, the FAA needs to evaluate the requested change to operations specifications to determine that safety in air commerce will allow the amendment of those specifications, pursuant to 14 CFR Section 119.51 and 14 CFR Section 121, and FAA Order 9800.1 Volume 3, Chapter 18, Section 5, Paragraph 3-871.

The amendment will identify the aircraft to be used, the operations authorized and any limitations, deviations or exemptions. The FAA will review the change to ensure that the proposed operating procedures meet the agency's safety standards. As stated in the Background Chapter, because the Airport already has a Class I Part 139 Airport Certification, no changes to the Part 139 certification would be needed in association with this proposed action.
2.3 REQUESTED FEDERAL ACTION

One action by the FAA is requested:

- Issuance of the Operations Specifications amendment for SkyWest to permit scheduled passenger service at FMA under the requirements of Title 14 CFR 119.

2.4 ACTION TIMEFRAME

The proposed change to the Airline’s Operations Specifications would occur in 2012. The change in operations from the Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with the Bombardier CRJ700ER would occur sometime afterward, depending on scheduling considerations.
CHAPTER 3
ALTERNATIVES

3.1 DEFINING THE ALTERNATIVES

The regulations of the President's Council on Environmental Quality (Section 1502.14) state that the alternatives section is the heart of the environmental document. Federal environmental regulations concerning the environmental review process require that all reasonable alternatives, which might accomplish the objectives of the Proposed Action, be identified and evaluated. The alternatives section, "should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision-maker and the public."

Based upon this guidance, six alternatives have been identified, including the No Action:

- Proposed Action
- Use of Other Aircraft Types
- Service Provided by Other Airlines
- Use of Other Airports
- Other Modes of Transportation
- No Action

The above alternatives are evaluated in the sections that follow to determine which are practicable and capable of meeting the project purpose and need. Those alternatives meeting this standard are brought forward into the analysis and evaluated in the subsequent chapter relative to the potential environmental impacts. As noted in FAA Order 1050.1E, "An EA must consider the proposed action and a discussion of the consequences of taking the no action, and may limit the range of alternatives to action and no action when there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternatives uses of available resources."

3.2 PROPOSED ACTION

SkyWest is seeking to replace passenger service using Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. This change is a result of SkyWest's strategy of reducing its use of turboprops. This is of particular importance at the FMA, where it is expected that the proposed CRJ700 service would be more reliable than the current EMB120 service.

3.3 USE OF OTHER AIRCRAFT TYPES

While it would be theoretically possible for SkyWest to purchase another aircraft type, it is not practical for an airline to purchase a unique aircraft type for one destination, and neither the FAA nor the Airport have the authority to instruct a carrier to provide service using a different aircraft as long as the proposed aircraft can safely operate at the proposed airport. Therefore, it is concluded that the
alternative of using another aircraft type is not a viable alternative to the Proposed Action. This alternative will not receive further evaluation.

3.4 SERVICE PROVIDED BY OTHER AIRLINES

It would be possible for additional passenger service to be provided by an airline other than SkyWest. However, the requested Federal action is approval of an amendment to SkyWest’s Operations Specifications for this airport. Service by another airline would not meet the purpose and need of this project. If another airline wished to add service to this Airport, it would be evaluated as an independent action. Therefore, this alternative will not be evaluated further in this EA.

3.5 OTHER MODES OF TRANSPORTATION

Alternative modes of transportation may provide other options to meet air travel needs of individuals and businesses using the Airport. This type of alternative typically includes rail, highway travel, and telecommunications technologies. The ability of such alternatives to satisfy the need at is largely dependent upon such factors as: 1) availability of the mode of transportation; and 2) trip characteristics and travel needs of the air passengers. Other available modes of transportation to the area include bus and car service. However, due to the distance from other main airports, and therefore, the corresponding increase in travel time, it is not likely that this would replace the need for commercial service at the Airport. Additionally, as stated above, because the request from SkyWest deals specifically with service at FMA, other modes of transportation does not meet the purpose and need. Therefore, it is not carried forward into the EA.

3.6 NO ACTION

NEPA, and its implementing regulations, require consideration of the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative, when compared with other alternatives, enables the identification of the probable environmental impact of the proposed action. Under the No Action alternative, SkyWest’s existing service using Brasilia’s would be retained. The airline would not provide service to the Airport using regional jets. Although the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need, its environmental effects will be considered in order to meet the requirements of NEPA.

3.7 ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD FOR EVALUATION

As noted in FAA Order 1050.1E, “An EA must consider the proposed action and a discussion of the consequences of taking the no action, and may limit the range of alternatives to action and no action when there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternatives uses of available resources.” Based on that guidance and the fact that the other alternatives do not meet the purpose and need, the following alternatives are carried forward into the environmental analysis portion of the EA:

No Action: SkyWest’s existing service using Brasilia’s would be retained. The airline would not provide service to the Airport using regional jets.
Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative): SkyWest Airlines would replace passenger service using Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. FAA would approve the associated amendment to SkyWest’s Operations Specifications to permit this change and would address the operating characteristics of the CRJ700ER.
CHAPTER 4
AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1 AIRPORT LOCATION AND STUDY AREA

A Study Area was conservatively defined to encompass those areas on and near the Airport that might be affected by the Proposed Action. The Study Area includes FMA and adjacent areas in the approach-departure corridor and is depicted on the resource figures (See Figure 4-1). The rectangular study area is 5,000 feet wide centered on the Airport’s runway and as such encompasses almost all of the developed area of Hailey and is approximately the width of the valley around the Airport. It extends 13,000 feet (nominally 2.5 miles) southeast to encompass the northern half of the City of Bellevue. The Study Area also extends 10,000 feet to the northwest. The common arrival and departure flights tracks are encompassed within the Study Area.

The following sections detail the existing environment and the potential environmental impacts that would occur under the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives.

4.2 AIR QUALITY

Air quality impacts are assessed based upon the Clean Air Act of 1970 and its amendments, and their associated regulations. The principal regulatory guidance is contained in the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Specific guidance for airport projects is provided in the Air Quality Procedures for Civilian Airports & Air Force Bases and its 2004 Addendum1.

There are six air pollutants of concern in the assessment of impacts from airport-related pollutants: carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulates (both PM-10 and PM-2.5), and sulfur dioxide. The Airport is located an area that is in attainment for all six pollutants. Therefore, the General Conformity Rules in the Clean Air Act do not apply to this project.

The Air Quality Procedures for Civilian Airports & Air Force Bases indicates that:

If the level of annual enplanements exceeds 1,300,000 (or 2.6 MAP), the level of general aviation and air taxi activity exceeds 180,000 operations per year or a combination thereof, a NAAQS assessment should be considered.

---

Land Use Designations
- Residential (single and multi-family)
- Commercial / Industrial
- Institutional
- Public Facilities
- Parks / Recreation Area
- Cemetery
- Agricultural
- Open Space / Undeveloped
- School

Source
1. Aerial: NAIP (July 2006)

FIGURE 4-1
EXISTING LAND USES (STUDY AREA)
In 2011, the Airport had 52,639 passenger enplane-ments and 30,913 aircraft operations (i.e., landings and takeoffs)\(^2\). These activity levels are lower than the thresholds described above for preparing a NAAQS assessment. Therefore, it can be concluded that neither the Proposed Alternative nor No Action Alternative would have a significant effect on air quality.

### 4.3 CLIMATE CHANGE/GREEN HOUSE GASES

Research has shown there is a direct correlation between fuel combustion and greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions. In terms of U.S. contributions, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reports that "domestic aviation contributes about 3 percent of total carbon dioxide emissions, according to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) data", compared with other industrial sources, including the remainder of the transportation section (20 percent) and power generation (41 percent)\(^3\). The international Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) estimates the GHG emissions from aircraft account for roughly 3 percent of all anthropogenic GHG emissions globally\(^4\). Climate Change due to GHG emissions is a global phenomenon, so the affected environmental is the global climate\(^5\).

Although there are no federal standard for aviation-related GHG emission, it is well-established that GHG emissions can affect climate\(^6\). The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has indicated that climate should be considered in NEPA analysis. As noted by CEQ, however, "it is not currently useful for the NEPA analysis to attempt to link specific climatological changes, or the environmental impacts thereof, to the particular project or emissions; as such direct linkage is difficult to isolate and to understand".\(^7\)

As noted in the previous section, FMA is located within an area which is in "attainment" area for all criteria pollutants and therefore no quantitative emission inventory analysis was required. According to the Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks from 1990 – 2009, 2% of the U.S 2009 CO2-e emissions were from aviation sources. According to Table 3-12 in this report, of this 2% of total 2009 U.S 2009 CO2-e emissions, 80% was derived from the usage of commercial jet aircraft. Given that the Proposed Action represents a reduction in aircraft usage at the FMA, the FAA has determined that the increase of GHG emissions, if any at all, as a result of the proposed action is an insignificant one.

### 4.4 COASTAL RESOURCES

Effects on coastal resources are assessed based upon requirements defined in the Coastal Resources Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act and Executive Order 13089, Coral Reef Protection. Barrier islands occur along all coastlines of the United States. Coastal zones are those waters and their

---

\(^2\) Agenda package of FMA Authority, February 9, 2012, Attachments 11 and 12.
\(^3\) Aviation and Climate Change. GAO Report to Congressional committees (2009).
\(^5\) As explained by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "greenhouse gases, once emitted, become well mixed in the atmosphere, meaning U.S. emissions can affect not only the U.S. population and environment but other regions of the world as well; likewise, emissions in other countries can affect the United States." Climate Change Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Technical Support Document for Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act 2-3 (2009), available at http://epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment.html.
\(^7\) Draft NEPA Guidance on Consideration of the Effects of Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, CEQ (2010).
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bordering areas in states along the coastlines of the oceans, the Gulf of Mexico and shorelines of the Great Lakes. The Study Area is located in an inland area that does not include any of these coastal resources. Therefore, there would be no impacts relating to coastal resources from either the no action or proposed action alternatives.

4.5 COMPATIBLE LAND USES

The Airport is located within the City of Hailey, which is responsible for the planning and zoning within the city limits. Land uses in the vicinity of the Airport include a full range of uses, as shown in (Figure 4-1). East of the Airport is a mixture of residential and commercial uses. The area south and southeast of the Airport is in agriculture. West is a mix of industrial and lower density residentially-designated areas which currently have limited development. Commercial and recreational uses and a cemetery are located immediately north of the Airport. Further to the northwest is the historical center of Hailey which has a mixture of commercial and residential uses. The City of Bellevue lies about 2 miles southeast of the Airport.

Neither the No Action Alternative nor the Proposed Action Alternative includes acquisition of land and there are no other anticipated impacts or changes to land use as a result of the Proposed Action.

Noise is evaluated in Section 4.15. Noise is commonly evaluated using noise contours developed for an airport’s existing and forecast activity levels. The 65 DNL contour is used as the threshold of compatibility for sensitive land uses, such as residences. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be a slight decrease in overall operations (from the reduction of daily flights from SkyWest due to the use of an aircraft that can accommodate more passengers).

These changes results in a slight decrease in the overall area encompassed by the 65 Day Night Level (DNL) contour in 2012 (See Section 4.15, Noise). No residential or other sensitive land uses lie within the 65 DNL contour. The 65 DNL contour for the Proposed Action is 3.5 acres smaller than the No Project contour.

Noise contours were also produced for 2017 with and without the Proposed Action (see Section 4.15, Noise). Again the contours for the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives are almost identical, with the 65 DNL contour for the Proposed Action being 1.8 acres smaller than for the No Action alternative. As with the 2012 contours, no residential or other sensitive land uses lie within the 2017 65 DNL contour. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in any significant noise impacts.

While noise is typically the central compatibility concern for land uses in the vicinity of an airport, safety and airspace protection should also be considered. Safety concerns are usually limited to ensuring that incompatible uses would not be placed within Runway Protection Zones and that wildlife attractants would not be created in the Airport’s vicinity. Airspace is normally evaluated based upon the imaginary surfaces defined in Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77, Safe, Efficient Use, and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace.

The safety element of land use compatibility is achieved by ensuring that only compatible land uses lay within an airport’s runway protection zones. Runway protection zones are trapezoidal areas located
200 feet beyond the usable ends of a runway. The Airport has used displaced thresholds and declared
distances to bring the arrival and departure runway protection zones in the approach to Runway 13 onto
Airport property. Declared distances also shift the departure runway protection zone beyond Runway
end 31 further onto the Airport. However, portions of both the arrival and departure runway protection
zones for this runway end extend onto the adjacent agricultural lands and over a segment of State
Highway 75.

Airspace is the final compatibility concern. Numerous objects in the vicinity of the Airport penetrate the
airspace surfaces defined in FAR Part 77. These include segments of State Highway 75, various on-
Airport buildings and equipment, and a small number of off-airport trees. These penetrations have been
addressed through use of a displaced threshold for Runway 13, installation of obstruction lights, and
adjustments to the instrument approach minimums. Furthermore, a Letter of Agreement exists
between the ATCT and FMA where the taxiways on either side of the runway at FMA would be cleared
prior to the departure or landing of category C aircraft such as the CRJ700ER. In this way, the RSA stated
necessary for safe operation by the FAA would effectively be provided for these flights.

As stated above, the substitution of a regional jet for service using a turboprop would slightly reduce the
size of the noise contours. The Proposed Action would not involve any construction, so no new airspace
concerns would be created. Additionally, the Proposed Action would not affect the runway protection
zones, so safety is also not a concern. Therefore, the FAA has determined that neither the no Action nor
the Proposed Action would have a significant impact on land use compatibility.

4.6 CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Construction impacts may include: noise generated by equipment and construction activities; dust and
emissions from equipment and vehicles; traffic by crews and trucks delivering materials; water pollution
from equipment fuels and lubricants, and construction materials; and disposal of construction debris.
Because no construction would occur as a part of the Proposed Alternative or No Action Alternative, no
construction-related impacts would occur.

4.7 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT: SECTION 4(F) RESOURCES

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act prohibits the use of certain specific types of
publicly owned lands unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative. The types of protected lands
include:

- Public park or recreational area
- Wildlife or waterfowl refuge of national, State or local significance
- Land from an historic site of national, State or local significance

In the context of this statute, use includes both acquisition of the property and constructive use.
Constructive use means adverse indirect impacts that affect the functioning or utility of the qualifying
4(f) site.
There are seven parks and public trails within the study area (see Figure 4-2). No wildlife refuges are located within the study area. Historic sites listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places located near the Airport are shown in Figure 4-3.

No property acquisition or ground disturbance would occur as a part of the Proposed Action. So no direct use of the parks, recreation areas and historic sites within the study area would occur. One historic site, Galena Toll Road, State Highway 75, is located within the existing 65 DNL noise contour; however, the historic property is not a noise sensitive resource. Nonetheless, the proposed change in aircraft types would reduce total aircraft noise exposure to the property. The Proposed Action would not introduce new flight tracks, nor would it significantly change existing conditions at the parks, trails or historic sites. As stated in the Noise section, there would be no significant noise increases over parks, cultural, historic, archaeological sites or other potentially 4(f) properties under the Proposed Action. Therefore, the FAA has determined that there would be no significant adverse impacts to 4(f) properties as a result of either the no action or the proposed action alternative.
FIGURE 4-2
PARKS AND RECREATION AREAS
4.8 FARMLANDS

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) regulates Federal actions with the potential to convert farmland to non-agricultural uses. Farmland exists adjacent to the Airport along its southern boundary. Given that neither the Proposed Alternative nor the No Action Alternative would result in acquisition or use of farmland and that the Proposed Action results in a lesser noise impact than the No Action Alternative, there would be no significant adverse impacts to farmland as a result of either the proposed action or the no action alternative.

4.9 FISH, WILDLIFE AND PLANTS

Two federally listed Threatened Species and three Candidate Species may occur within Blaine County:

- Bull Trout (Salvelinus confluentus) – threatened
- Canada Lynx (Lynx Canadensis) – threatened
- Greater Sage-Grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) – candidate
- Yellow-billed Cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus) – candidate
- Wolverine (Gulo gulo) – candidate
- Whitebark Pine (Pinus albicaulis) – candidate

The Federal Endangered Species Act requires the Federal agencies to not take any actions "likely to threaten the existence of any federally listed endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat." Neither the No Action nor the Proposed Action would involve construction, changes in land use or drainage pattern, introduction of new flight paths, increases in noise levels or other changes that could impact any of the listed species. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts related to listed species.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act prohibits the intentional take of migratory birds, their eggs or nests by private parties and, under some circumstances, Federal agencies. As the Proposed Action does not include construction, utilizes the same flight paths with a reduction in the noise impact, no intentional take of migratory birds their eggs or nests would occur.

There a number of Federal statutes and Executive Orders that applies to invasive species, use of native plants in landscaping, and other factors that related to construction activities. Because no construction is proposed, these statutes and Executive Orders do not apply to the Proposed Action.

Between January 2009 and June 2012, there was only one reported bird strike at the Airport. Because the Proposed Action would decrease the number of flights slightly, there would be a slight decrease in potential for wildlife strikes at the Airport. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts related to wildlife strikes.

---

On 30 July 2012, a correspondence was sent to Mr. Brian Kelly, the State Supervisor for the Idaho State Office of the U. S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding the FAA determination under the Threatened and Endangered Species Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. As of the release of this document, no comments have been received from the USFWS on this project. All communication is found in Appendix B.

In summary there would be no affect to any species of concern as a result of either the proposed action or no action alternative.

4.10 FLOODPLAINS

The requirement to evaluate the floodplains and flood risk is contained in Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management. The Federal Emergency Management Agency issues Flood Insurance Rate Maps that identify flood risk. Flood Insurance Rate Maps 16013C0668E and 16013C0856E11 indicate that no parts of the Airport lie within a 100-year flood zone. Therefore, passenger service using the CRJ700ER would not expose passengers or crew to significant flood risk. Additionally, no construction would occur as part of the Proposed Action. As neither the Proposed Action nor the No Action Alternative would involve changes in or near the 100-year floodplain, no flood related impacts would occur.

4.11 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, POLLUTION PREVENTION, AND SOLID WASTE

Guidance for evaluation of hazardous materials, pollution prevention and solid waste comes principally from two federal statutes: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) as amended. RCRA regulates the generation, treatment, storage and disposal of hazardous wastes. CERCLA mandates cleanup of hazardous substances released into the environment. These two acts are supported by two Executive Orders (EOs) that direct Federal agencies to comply with applicable pollution control standards (EO 12088) and which delegate most response authority for Superfund cleanups to the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Coast Guard.

The only hazardous materials associated with the Proposed Action are the fuel (Jet A) and lubricants carried on the aircraft that would begin serving the Airport. The fuel and lubricants in the regional jets are identical with those carried on the turboprops that they would be replacing. The Airport already stores and dispenses these materials according to permits and regulations. The Airport has policies and procedures in place to meet Federal, state and local regulations for storing and handling hazardous wastes. No new facilities or procedures would be required to support regional jet service. Waste generated by operation of the new service would be comparable with the existing service and would not result in any additional hazardous waste or changes to the storage or handling of hazardous waste at the Airport. Based upon this information it is concluded that neither the Proposed Alternative nor No

---

*Flood Insurance Rate Maps* accessed at: https://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/info?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1&content=firmetteHelp_A&title=FIRMetees
Action Alternative would cause a significant impact from hazardous materials, pollution prevention or solid wastes.

4.12 HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL, ARCHEOLOGICAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

There are a large number of Federal statutes and Executive Orders guiding protection of the various types of historic and cultural resources, including the requirement for government to government consultation with regard to Tribal interests. The National Historic Preservation Act defines Federal agencies’ responsibilities for the protection of sites listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. It also establishes the requirement for consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer if there is a potential for adverse effects on listed or eligible sites.

Figure 4-3 identifies sites within the Study Area that are listed or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Most are clustered around the historical center of the City of Hailey. There is also a site (Site 10 – Galena Toll Rd, State Highway 75) located on the southeastern edge of the Airport.

No property acquisition would occur as a part of the Proposed Action. So no direct impacts to any of the historic sites within the study area would occur, and there is no potential for new sites to be disturbed or uncovered. Because there are no direct construction impacts from this project, the official Area of Potential Effect (APE) relates to the defined area impacted by the noise contours in the out year of 2017 (Figure 4-4), which depict the only potential for indirect impacts on historic sites. This area contains only one site listed as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (Site 10 – Galena Toll Rd, State Highway 75). This site is located within both the existing (No Action) and the Proposed Action (2012 and 2017) 65 DNL noise contours. Because the level of noise associated with this property would remain consistent under both the Action and the No Action Alternatives (within the 65 DNL contour), and because it the Toll Road is considered a noise compatible property, the Proposed Action would not result in any significant noise impacts on that property.

The proposed change in aircraft types from the Brasilia to the CRJ700ER would reduce the overall size of the 65 DNL noise contour in 2012 and 2017, would not introduce new flight tracks, nor would it significantly change existing conditions at any historic sites. Therefore, it is concluded that it would not create impacts to any historic, cultural or archaeological sites.

On August 8, 2012, FAA wrote to the Idaho SHPO initiating 106 consultation. The FAA received a response from Susan Pengilly, Deputy SHPO for Idaho on August 17, 2012, stating “No additional investigations are recommended. Project can proceed as planned.” There are four Tribes with an interest in the area in the vicinity of the FMA. These are the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation, Northwest Tribe of the Shoshone Tribe, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation and the Shoshone Tribe of Wind River Reservation. The FAA contacted all Tribes on August 8, 2012 to initiate formal government-to-government consultation and to solicit their views regarding potential effect on tribal interests in the area. As of the release of this document, no response has been received from any of the Tribes. All correspondence with the Tribes and Idaho SHPO is reproduced in Appendix B.
4.13 LIGHT EMISSIONS AND VISUAL IMPACTS

The FAA examines a project’s potential light emissions and visual impacts on the nearby area. For airports, light emissions of concern commonly include both ground-based lighting (e.g., approach lighting systems, rotating beacons, runway end identifier lights, and security lighting) and the approach lights on aircraft. Light emissions are of potential concern if a new light source would intrude into a residence or other sensitive receptor. According to FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, due to relatively low levels of light intensity from airport lights compared to background levels associated with airport development actions, light emissions impacts are unlikely to have an adverse impact on human activity or the use or characteristics of the protected properties.

Visual impacts, according to the FAA, are more subjective because it includes personal aesthetic preferences. These impacts include things such as increasing contrast between an area and its environment and the community’s perception of that change. Visual impacts at airports are usually only of potential significance if a new structure would block an important scenic vista or effect the context of an historical site.

The Proposed Action would substitute regional jet service for existing service using turboprops. No new lighting systems would be installed nor new structures introduced. The new aircraft would fly the same routes at the same altitudes as the current airline aircraft and the number of operations as a result of the Proposed Action would decrease slightly due to the larger capacity of the CRJ700ER aircraft. Therefore, there would be no substantial changes to either the lighting or visual environment as a result of either the Proposed Action or No Action alternative.

4.14 NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY IMPACTS

Limited Federal guidance exists to direct evaluation of this category of impacts. Most are directed towards maximizing energy efficiency in Federal facilities. Energy requirements associated with airport improvements generally fall into two categories: 1) changed demand for stationary facilities (e.g. airfield lighting and terminal building heating) and 2) those that involve the movement of air and ground vehicles, altering fuel consumption.

The Proposed Action would substitute regional jets for turboprop aircraft. Both aircraft utilize Jet A for fuel. The new passenger service would provide fewer flights than currently provided. It would take a detailed assessment that is beyond the scope of this assessment to determine whether the per passenger fuel consumption would be reduced by this change in service. However, the change in fuel consumption, whether positive or negative, would be small in magnitude. It would not require a change in the fuel service or have a measurable effect on the supply of fuel.

The change in the type of aircraft providing service is not anticipated to require changes to the terminal or other airfield facilities. The terminal is already accommodating service by aircraft with larger passenger capacity (i.e., the 76-passenger Bombardier Q-400).
Given the evaluation above, it is concluded that neither the Proposed Action nor the No Action alternative would have a significant impact on natural resources and energy use.

4.15 NOISE

Noise from aircraft operations are typically the impact of greatest concern to residents and businesses in the vicinity of an airport. Noise impacts are commonly measured using noise contours. For Federal projects the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) is used to quantify noise impacts. Federal statutes establish the 65 DNL contour as the threshold of acceptability for sensitive land uses, such as residences. These guidelines indicate that residential development is incompatible within the 65 or greater DNL noise contours. Other noise sensitive land uses, such as schools, hospitals, churches and rest homes are also considered to be incompatible if located within the 65 DNL contour.

Noise contours for this EA were produced using the FAA’s Integrated Noise Model (Version 7.0c). Aircraft operations data for current (2012) and forecast (2017) No Action contours were taken from the FAA’s 2012 Terminal Area Forecast for FMA. Assumptions for flight tracks, fleet mix (range of aircraft types), and time of day of operations were reviewed by Airport and Air Traffic Control staff. Forecast assumptions related to introduction of CRJ700ER aircraft were reviewed by SkyWest Airline staff. In particular, SkyWest indicated that it would reduce the frequency of service from a high-season peak of 6 daily departures with the EMB-120 to 3 daily departures with its 65-seat CRJ700ER.

Figure 4-4 presents 65, 70 and 75 DNL noise contours for 2012 with and without the Proposed Action. The two sets of contours are almost identical and are largely contained within the Airport’s property boundary. The Proposed Action contour differs from the No Action contour in that it is slightly smaller at the northwest and southeast ends. The change at the northwestern end occurs largely because the regional jet is not anticipated to arrive from the northwest; all regional jet arrivals would be from the southeast. Currently the turboprop airline aircraft arrive from the northwest about 2% of the time. Under the No Action contours, one historic property (the Galena Toll Road is contained within the 65 DNL noise contour. This historic property is also located within the 65 DNL noise contour under the Proposed Action and because of its nature is considered compatible with that level of noise, so there would be no significant impacts under this alternative. No residential or other sensitive land uses lie within the 65 DNL contour under the Proposed Action. The 65 DNL contour for the Proposed Action is 3.5 acres smaller than the No Action contour. Due to the low volume of operations, INM does not produce a 70 or 75 DNL contour. Therefore, the comparative acreages within these two contours were not calculated. In any case, these two contour lie within the Airport’s boundary in both the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives.

Noise contours were also produced for 2017 with and without the Proposed Action (see Figure 4-5).
FIGURE 4-4
NOISE CONTOUR COMPARISON 2012
FIGURE 4-5
NOISE CONTOUR COMPARISON 2017
Again the two contours are almost identical and largely remain within the Airport's property line. The 65 DNL contour for the Proposed Action is 1.8 acres smaller than for the No Action alternative. As with the 2012 contours, no residential or other sensitive land uses lie within the 2017 65 DNL contour. INM did not produce continuous 70 and 75 DNL contours for the 2017 scenarios. The acreage differential for these two sets of contours was not calculated.

Based upon the data presented above, it is concluded that neither the No Action nor the Proposed Action would generate significant noise impacts.

4.16 SECONDARY (INDUCED) IMPACTS

According to 40 CFR §1508.8, indirect effects are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. This is in contrast to cumulative impacts which are the result of incremental accumulation of separate past, present and future reasonably foreseeable actions. Cumulative impacts are dealt in Section 4.21 of this document. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems. The terms "effect" and "impact" are used synonymously in the CEQ regulations (40 CFR §1508.8). "Secondary Impact" does not appear, nor is it defined in either the CEQ regulations or related CEQ guidance. For purposes of this EA, secondary and indirect impacts mean the same thing.

No Action
There will be no adverse secondary impacts as a result of the no action alternative.

Proposed Action
This project solely involves the substitution of airline service using a regional jet for similar service using a turboprop, no construction is involved. Therefore, secondary impacts could only arise from changes related to passenger volumes. The substitution of larger capacity regional jets could lead to an increase in passengers. Were this to occur, it could lead to secondary impacts.

The current load factor (i.e., the percentage of passenger seats filled) for the EMB-120 is around 58%. That is, an average of 42% of the seats are vacant with the current service. This average load factor is not expected to change with the introduction of the CRJ700ER. Based upon the current flight schedule with the 30-seat Brasilia, the existing load factor means that there are over 24,000 vacant (round trip) seats annually. SkyWest has indicated that it would reduce the frequency of service from a high-season peak of 6 daily departures with the Brasilia to 3 daily departures with its 65-seat CRJ700ER. As a result, the annual (round trip) seating capacity would only increase slightly due to introduction of the CRJ700ER: from 58,350 to 58,570 passengers. The increase in capacity is only 18 passengers per month. This difference in capacity is not judged to be large enough to produce secondary impacts. Therefore, it is concluded that the Proposed Action would not produce significant secondary impacts.
4.17 **SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND CHILDREN’S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY RISKS**

These three classes of impacts would be of potential concern if a project would respectively:

- Acquire property, displace people or divide communities,
- Introduce health or safety risks that disproportionately affect children, or
- Disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations.

The Proposed Action does not include property acquisition, construction, or displacement of people or businesses. Additionally, the project would not result in any significant noise impacts. Therefore, it would not result in socioeconomic impacts to the surrounding communities.

As noted in the relevant sections in this chapter, implementation of the Proposed Action would not introduce new hazardous materials; significantly increase air or water pollution, or change flight paths or approaches that might change the risk exposure. Therefore, the Proposed Action and No Action would produce no significant impacts relating to socioeconomic impacts, environmental justice, or children’s health and safety.

4.18 **WATER QUALITY**

The Clean Water Act (officially titled the Federal Water Pollution Control Act) contains broad legislation enabling development of water quality standards and management practices. This statutory authority is support by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act which regulates water impoundment projects, and the Safe Drinking Water Act which regulates projects that might contaminate aquifers used as principal drinking water sources.

The Proposed Alternative would only involve substitution of regional jet aircraft for turboprop aircraft. No physical construction would occur. This change would also not introduce new sources of potential water contamination or modify existing water pollution control practices at the Airport. Therefore, neither the Proposed Alternative nor the No Action Alternative would have significant impacts to water quality.

4.19 **WETLANDS**

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s *National Wetland Inventory* was accessed on June 27, 2012. The inventory data indicated that there were no wetland features on the airfield itself. There is an isolated wetland of about 0.75 acres southwest of the Airport on an adjacent agricultural parcel. The riverine areas associated with the Big Wood River lie 1,000 to 1,500 feet to the west of the Airport. As neither the Proposed Action nor No Action Alternative would involve construction in these areas or involve other actions that might indirectly affect those wetlands or water quality near the Airport, no impacts to wetlands would occur.

---

13 Website for National Wetlands Inventory is: [http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html](http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html)
4.20 WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

The only river in the Airport’s vicinity is the Big Wood River which located one quarter mile west of the Airport. The Big Wood River is not one of the 22 rivers or river segments in Idaho that have been classified as Wild and Scenic Rivers.\textsuperscript{14} Therefore, neither the Proposed Action nor No Action Alternative would impact a designated Wild and Scenic River.

4.21 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts are those impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the action added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency, federal or non-federal or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from actions which are individually minor, but collectively significant over a period of time. The cumulative impact of implementation of either the Proposed Action or the No Action, when added with other known past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, would be collectively insignificant.

Past projects that occurred at the Airport in the past 3–5 years were considered for cumulative impacts analysis. These projects are listed below.

1. Runway 13/31 Reconstruction (2007) – This project included the reconstruction of Runway 13/31 because the pavement was in poor condition. The project also further improved the lateral RSA grading, corrected an existing Line of Sight deficiency and included the installation of a storm drainage system on the east side of the runway.

2. Snow Removal Equipment Building Improvements (2008) – Construction of a roof structure to provide additional covered parking for Snow Removal Equipment. The doors of the existing Snow Removal Equipment building were also upgraded during this project.

There are no current projects at the Airport or in the vicinity of the airport. In checking with the approved project list with the Seattle Airports District Office (ADO) of the FAA and with the FMA Airport Manager there are no future projects planned for the 3–5 year time frame either on or off Airport. As stated above, the FAA indefinitely suspended the EIS for a replacement airport in 2011 due to escalating costs and wildlife issues. There has been no change in this status and thus the project cannot be considered reasonably foreseeable. Currently the FAA is undergoing a planning study to evaluate actual cost and of the changes needed to correct non-standard conditions at the existing airport that currently serves C-II and C-III aircraft, including the Horizon’s Q400 and SkyWest’s CRJ700ER. This study will evaluate all options, ranging from the physical movement of existing structures which prevent the FMA from meeting design standards to the justification of modification of standards, where appropriate. This study is intended to be completed in December 2012.

In general, the impacts from these federal actions may be thought as occurring from two sources (1) construction of the structures/improvements, and (2) existence of structure/improvements.

With respect to (1) impacts associated with the construction of each of the structures/improvements in the previous page are all temporary in nature, with no long lasting impact. Therefore these impacts

\textsuperscript{14} Website for National Wild and Scenic Rivers System listing of designated rivers in Idaho is: http://www.rivers.gov/rivers/idaho.php
would not directly or indirectly relate to any of the impacts associated with the initiation and operation of scheduled commercial air service using turbojet aircraft at the FMA.

With respect to (2), the impacts discussed in the EA have been based upon impacts resulting from the associated air quality, noise or capacity issues which may arise due to the change in the numbers of landings and take-offs (operations) or enplanements at the FMA. The best way to consider any cumulative impacts would be to ascertain if any of these past, current or reasonable foreseeable actions would result in a change in the operational level or the type of equipment operating at the FMA and to see how the changes as a result of those projects combine with that of the proposed action. Given that the proposed action reduces the number of operations at the FMA, without an anticipated change in the number of enplanements, there are no impacts from the Proposed Action that could combine with other projects to create cumulative impacts.

4.22 CONCLUSION

From the above analysis, there are no significant impacts in any of the environmental impact categories analyzed for either the proposed action or the no-action alternative.
CHAPTER 5

LEAD AGENCY AND PRINCIPAL PREPARERS

LEAD AGENCY

The Federal Aviation Administration is the lead agency for the preparation of this EA.

Federal Aviation Administration
ANM-200
Flight Standards Division
1601 Lind Avenue SW
Renton, Washington 98057

PRINCIPAL PREPARERS

Responsibility for preparation of this EA rests with the FMA Authority. Substantial assistance and data analysis was provided by the consultant hired by the Authority. The prime consultant for preparation of this document was Mead & Hunt. Below are the Mead & Hunt staff members who were responsible for the EA preparation.

Brad Rolf, PE, Project Manager and Environmental Planner, B.S. Civil and Environmental Engineering, 16 years airport environmental planning and project management experience.

David P. Dietz, AICP, Senior Airport Planner, 36 years planning experience with 28 of those years in airport planning, B.A. Environmental Politics, Masters in City and Regional Planning.

Kate Andrus, Environmental Planner, 6 years aviation and environmental planning experience, B.A. Biology and M.A. Journalism and Science and Environmental Policy.

Corbett Smith, Airport Planner, 6 years airport planning experience, BA Urban and Regional Planning.

Todd Eroh, Senior Airport Technician, 21 years airport graphic and design experience.

Barbara Emerson, Senior Airport Technician, 21 years airport graphic and design experience, BA Design.
6.1 OVERVIEW

This section will be completed subsequent to the review period of the Draft EA. It will include any comments from agencies or the public submitted on the EA, responses to the substantive comments, as well as a detailed description of the review process for the EA.
ALP – Airport Layout Plan
APE – Area of Potential Effect
BMP – Best Management Practices
CEQ – Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR – Code of Federal Regulations
CO – Carbon Monoxide
DNL – Day-Night Average Sound Level
EA – Environmental Assessment
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FAA – Federal Aviation Administration
FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency
FONSI – Finding of No Significant Impact
FPPA – Farmland Protection Policy Act
MBTA – Migratory Bird Treaty Act
NAAQS – National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA – National Historic Preservation Act
NO2 – Nitrogen Dioxide
NPDES – National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NPS – National Park Service
NRHP – National Register of Historic Places
NRI – National Rivers Inventory
O3 – Ozone

PAPI – Precision Approach Path Indicator

PB – Lead

PM-10/2.5 – Suspended Particulate Matter

RCRA – Resource and Conservation and Recovery Act

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Officer

SO2 – Sulfur Dioxide

SUN – FMA

TAF – Terminal Area Forecast

THPO – Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
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March 5, 2012

Andrew Ayers
Principal Operations Inspector
SkyWest Certificate Management Office
1020 N. Flyer Way (2130 West)
Salt Lake City, UT 84116-2959

In accordance with FAR 121 Subpart E, this letter is to inform you of SkyWest Airlines' intent to begin new service to the following cities on the dates indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Pair</th>
<th>SLC SUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>15JUN 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>SkyWest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>CRJ 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Change</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Aircraft</td>
<td>DH8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Carrier</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2RT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have been informed by Caroline Poyurs, FAA Environmental Specialist, EA would not be necessary due to turbo-jet history in the 1990's. (Please see the e-mail attached). Ms. Poyurs' e-mail is Caroline.CTR.Poyurs@faa.gov, in the event you need to contact her for further clarification.

In addition, enclosed find the Briefing Guide for SUN.
March 5, 2012
Page two

These routes have been examined and comply with FAR’s 121.93(a) (b),
121.95(a)(b), 121.97(a)(b)(c), 121.99(a)(b), 121.101(a)(b)(c)(d), 121.103(a)(b),
121.105 and 121.107.

Awaiting your approval,

Chris Brown
Director Aircraft Operations
APPENDIX B

COORDINATION LETTERS
DATE: August 17, 2012
TO: Norman Le Fevre, FAA
FEDERAL AGENCY: FAA
PROJECT NAME: SkyWest Airlines' Operation Specifications for Freidman Memorial Airport, Hailey, Idaho

Section 106 Evaluation

The field work and documentation presented in this report meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

X No additional investigations are recommended. Project can proceed as planned.

Additional information is required to complete the project review. (See comments below.)

Additional investigations are recommended. (See comments below.)

Identification of Historic Properties (36 CFR 900.4):

X No historic properties were identified within the project area.

Property is not eligible. Reason:

Property is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places:

Criterion: _A_ _B_ _C_ _D_. Context for Evaluation:

X No historic properties will be affected within the project area.

Assessment of Adverse Effects (36 CFR 800.5):

Project will have no adverse effect on historic properties.

Property will have an adverse effect on historic properties. Additional consultation is required.

Comments:

Susan Pengilly, Deputy SHPO
State Historic Preservation Office

August 17, 2012
Date
August 6, 2012

Mr. Bruce Perry
Northwest Tribe of the Shoshone Tribe
707 N. Main Street
Brigham City, UT 84302

Dear Mr. Perry:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority (Authority) are preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate potential impacts of introduction of turbojet passenger service to Friedman Memorial Airport (Airport). This Proposed Operational Specification amendment involves the replacement of the existing Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats, resulting in a shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day with the smaller aircraft to per day to 2 to 3 flights per day with the CRJ700. This would result in a net decrease in operations and no construction or property acquisition would occur as a part of this project. A study area has been defined for the purposes of assessing environmental impacts. A graphic showing the study area is attached as Enclosure 1. The FAA is the lead Federal agency for the proposed project. The Authority is the Airport sponsor. The purpose of this letter is to initiate formal government-to-government consultation regarding this project and to solicit your views regarding potential effect on tribal interests in the area.

Project Information
The Airport is owned by the City of Hailey and Blaine County and is operated by the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority. The Authority proposes to permit introduction of turbojet service to replace existing scheduled passenger service using turboprops. More specifically, existing scheduled service using Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia would be replaced with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. The Brasilia is a twin-engine turboprop aircraft with 30 passenger seats while the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats (as configured for SkyWest operating as Delta Connection).

SkyWest would shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day to 2 to 3 flights per day. The greater seating capacity of the CRJ700ER (65 seats as configured for Delta Connection) compared to the Brasilia (30 seats) makes it possible to meet existing and forecast demand with fewer aircraft. The shift in aircraft types would occur within the next 6 months.
The specific Federal action proposed is issuance of amended Operations Specifications to SkyWest to permit introduction of scheduled passenger service using the CRJ700ER. The amendment will identify the aircraft to be used, the operations authorized and any limitations, deviations or exemptions. The FAA will review the change to ensure that the proposed operating procedures meet the agency’s safety standards.

The proposed action would not require any construction or property acquisition. The existing arrival and departure flight tracks southeast of the Airport would continue to be used. Due to operating limitations of the CRJ700ER no arrivals or departures northwest of the Airport would be conducted. Existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the aircraft and associated passengers. Noise contours prepared for the Environmental Assessment indicate that the project would cause both existing and forecast annual noise contours to shrink slightly. Because there would be no construction or property acquisition associated with this project, no cultural resources field investigations were undertaken.

Confidentiality
We appreciate that you may have concerns about the confidentiality of information on areas or resources of religious, traditional, and cultural importance to the Tribe. We would be happy to discuss these concerns and develop procedures to ensure confidentiality of such information is maintained.

Consultation
If you wish to provide comments related to this proposed project, please contact Norman LeFevre, by mail at ANM-220, FAA Northwest Mountain Regional Office, 1601 Lind Ave, Renton WA 98057, email (norman.b.lefevre@faa.gov) or phone at 425-917-6780.

Your timely response will greatly assist us in incorporating your concerns into the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Norman LeFevre
ANM-220 Branch Manager, FAA Northwest Mountain Region

Enclosure: Study Area graphic
Legend

- Runway
- Area of Potential Effect

N 0 FEET 8,000'

Prepared By: Mead&Hunt  www.meadhunt.com

Area of Potential Effect
Freidman Memorial Airport
August 6, 2012

Mr. Mike Lajeunesse
Shoshone Tribe of Wind River Reservation
P.O. Box 217
Fort Washakie, WY 82514

Dear Mr. Lajeunesse:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority (Authority) are preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate potential impacts of introduction of turbojet passenger service to Friedman Memorial Airport (Airport). This Proposed Operational Specification amendment involves the replacement of the existing Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats, resulting in a shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day with the smaller aircraft to per day to 2 to 3 flights per day with the CRJ700. This would result in a net decrease in operations and no construction or property acquisition would occur as a part of this project. A study area has been defined for the purposes of assessing environmental impacts. A graphic showing the study area is attached as Enclosure 1. The FAA is the lead Federal agency for the proposed project. The Authority is the Airport sponsor. The purpose of this letter is to initiate formal government-to-government consultation regarding this project and to solicit your views regarding potential effect on tribal interests in the area.

Project Information
The Airport is owned by the City of Hailey and Blaine County and is operated by the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority. The Authority proposes to permit introduction of turbojet service to replace existing scheduled passenger service using turboprops. More specifically, existing scheduled service using Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia would be replaced with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. The Brasilia is a twin-engine turboprop aircraft with 30 passenger seats while the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats (as configured for SkyWest operating as Delta Connection).

SkyWest would shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day to 2 to 3 flights per day. The greater seating capacity of the CRJ700ER (65 seats as configured for Delta Connection) compared to the Brasilia (30 seats) makes it possible to meet existing and forecast demand with fewer aircraft. The shift in aircraft types would occur within the next 6 months. The specific Federal action proposed is issuance of amended Operations Specifications to SkyWest to permit introduction of scheduled passenger service using the CRJ700ER.
The amendment will identify the aircraft to be used, the operations authorized and any limitations, deviations or exemptions. The FAA will review the change to ensure that the proposed operating procedures meet the agency's safety standards.

The proposed action would not require any construction or property acquisition. The existing arrival and departure flight tracks southeast of the Airport would continue to be used. Due to operating limitations of the CRJ700ER no arrivals or departures northwest of the Airport would be conducted. Existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the aircraft and associated passengers. Noise contours prepared for the Environmental Assessment indicate that the project would cause both existing and forecast annual noise contours to shrink slightly. Because there would be no construction or property acquisition associated with this project, no cultural resources field investigations were undertaken.

Confidentiality
We appreciate that you may have concerns about the confidentiality of information on areas or resources of religious, traditional, and cultural importance to the Tribe. We would be happy to discuss these concerns and develop procedures to ensure confidentiality of such information is maintained.

Consultation
If you wish to provide comments related to this proposed project, please contact Norman LeFevre, by mail at ANM-220, FAA Northwest Mountain Regional Office, 1601 Lind Ave, Renton WA 98057, email (norman.b.lefevre@faa.gov) or phone at 425-917-6780.

Your timely response will greatly assist us in incorporating your concerns into the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Norman LeFevre
ANM-220 Branch Manager, Northwest Mountain Region

Enclosure: Study Area graphic
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August 2, 2012

Mr. Nathan Smith
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation
P.O. Box 306
Fort Hall, ID 83203-0306

Dear Mr. Smith:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority (Authority) are preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate potential impacts of introduction of turbojet passenger service to Friedman Memorial Airport (Airport). This Proposed Operational Specification amendment involves the replacement of the existing Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats, resulting in a shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day with the smaller aircraft to per day to 2 to 3 flights per day with the CRJ700. This would result in a net decrease in operations and no construction or property acquisition would occur as a part of this project. A study area has been defined for the purposes of assessing environmental impacts. A graphic showing the study area is attached as Enclosure 1. The FAA is the lead Federal agency for the proposed project. The Authority is the Airport sponsor. The purpose of this letter is to initiate formal government-to-government consultation regarding this project and to solicit your views regarding potential effect on tribal interests in the area.

Project Information
The Airport is owned by the City of Hailey and Blaine County and is operated by the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority. The Authority proposes to permit introduction of turbojet service to replace existing scheduled passenger service using turboprops. More specifically, existing scheduled service using Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia would be replaced with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. The Brasilia is a twin-engine turboprop aircraft with 30 passenger seats while the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats (as configured for SkyWest operating as Delta Connection).

SkyWest would shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day to 2 to 3 flights per day. The greater seating capacity of the CRJ700ER (65 seats as configured for Delta Connection) compared to the Brasilia (30 seats) makes it possible to meet existing and forecast demand with fewer aircraft. The shift in aircraft types would occur within the next 6 months. The specific Federal action proposed is issuance of amended Operations Specifications to SkyWest to permit introduction of scheduled passenger service using the CRJ700ER. The
amendment will identify the aircraft to be used, the operations authorized and any limitations, deviations or exemptions. The FAA will review the change to ensure that the proposed operating procedures meet the agency's safety standards.

The proposed action would not require any construction or property acquisition. The existing arrival and departure flight tracks southeast of the Airport would continue to be used. Due to operating limitations of the CRJ700ER no arrivals or departures northwest of the Airport would be conducted. Existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the aircraft and associated passengers. Noise contours prepared for the EA indicate that the project would cause both existing and forecast annual noise contours to shrink slightly. Because there would be no construction or property acquisition associated with this project, no cultural resources field investigations were undertaken.

Confidentiality
We appreciate that you make have concerns about the confidentiality of information on areas or resources of religious, traditional, and cultural importance to the Tribe. We would be happy to discuss these concerns and develop procedures to ensure confidentiality of such information is maintained.

Consultation
If you wish to provide comments related to this proposed project, please contact Norman LeFevre, by mail at ANM-220, FAA Northwest Mountain Regional Office, 1601 Lind Ave, Renton WA 98057, email (norman.b.lefevre@faa.gov) or phone at 425-917-6780.

Your timely response will greatly assist us in incorporating your concerns into the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Norman LeFevre
ANM-220 Branch Manager,
Northwest Mountain Region

Enclosure: 1 Study Area graphic
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August 8, 2012

Mr. Ted Howard
Shoshone-Paiute Tribes
of the Duck Valley Reservation
P.O. Box 219
Owyhee, NV 89832

Dear Mr. Howard:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority (Authority) are preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate potential impacts of introduction of turbojet passenger service to Friedman Memorial Airport (Airport). This Proposed Operational Specification amendment involves the replacement of the existing Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with the Bombardier CRJ700ER. This would result in a net decrease in operations and no construction or property acquisition would occur as a part of this project. A study area has been defined for the purposes of assessing environmental impacts. A graphic showing the study area is attached as Enclosure 1. The FAA is the lead Federal agency for the proposed project. The Authority is the Airport sponsor. The purpose of this letter is to initiate formal government-to-government consultation regarding this project and to solicit your views regarding potential effect on tribal interests in the area.

Project Information
The Airport is owned by the City of Hailey and Blaine County and is operated by the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority. The Authority proposes to permit introduction of turbojet service to replace existing scheduled passenger service using turboprops. More specifically, existing scheduled service using Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia would be replaced with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. The Brasilia is a twin-engine turboprop aircraft with 30 passenger seats while the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats (as configured for SkyWest operating as Delta Connection).

SkyWest would shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day to 2 to 3 flights per day. The greater seating capacity of the CRJ700ER (65 seats as configured for Delta Connection) compared to the Brasilia (30 seats) makes it possible to meet existing and forecast demand with fewer aircraft. The shift in aircraft types would occur within the next 6 months. The specific Federal action proposed is issuance of amended Operations Specifications to SkyWest to permit introduction of scheduled passenger service using the CRJ700ER.
The amendment will identify the aircraft to be used, the operations authorized and any limitations, deviations or exemptions. The FAA will review the change to ensure that the proposed operating procedures meet the agency's safety standards.

The proposed action would not require any construction or property acquisition. The existing arrival and departure flight tracks southeast of the Airport would continue to be used. Due to operating limitations of the CRJ700ER no arrivals or departures northwest of the Airport would be conducted. Existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the aircraft and associated passengers. Noise contours prepared for the Environmental Assessment indicate that the project would cause both existing and forecast annual noise contours to shrink slightly. Because there would be no construction or property acquisition associated with this project, no cultural resources field investigations were undertaken.

Confidentiality
We appreciate that you may have concerns about the confidentiality of information on areas or resources of religious, traditional, and cultural importance to the Tribe. We would be happy to discuss these concerns and develop procedures to ensure confidentiality of such information is maintained.

Consultation
If you wish to provide comments related to this proposed project, please contact Norman LeFevre, by mail at ANM-220, FAA Northwest Mountain Regional Office, 1601 Lind Ave, Renton WA 98057, email (norman.b.lefevre@faa.gov) or phone at 425-917-6780.

Your timely response will greatly assist us in incorporating your concerns into the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Norman LeFevre
ANM-220 Branch Manager, Northwest Mountain Region

Enclosure: Study Area graphic
August 2, 2012

Mr. Brian Kelly
State Supervisor, Idaho State Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1387 S. Vinnell Way, Suite 368
Boise, ID 83709


Dear Mr. Kelly:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is currently involved in the preparation of an Environmental Assessment in order to evaluate the impact for the proposed introduction of turbojet service to Friedman Memorial Airport and proposed Operational Specification amendment for SkyWest. The Airport is owned by the City of Hailey and Blaine County and is operated by the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority.

Project Information
The Authority proposes to permit introduction of turbojet service to replace existing scheduled passenger service using turboprops. More specifically, existing scheduled service using Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia would be replaced with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. The Brasilia is a twin-engine turboprop aircraft with 30 passenger seats while the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats (as configured for Delta Connection).

SkyWest would shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day to 2 to 3 flights per day. The greater seating capacity of the CRJ700ER (65 seats as configured for Delta Connection) compared to the Brasilia (30 seats) makes it possible to meet existing and forecast demand with fewer aircraft. The shift in aircraft types would occur within the next 6 months. No construction would occur as a result of this project.

The specific Federal action proposed is issuance of amended Operations Specifications to SkyWest to permit introduction of scheduled passenger service using the CRJ700ER. The amendment will identify the aircraft to be used, the operations authorized and any limitations, deviations or exemptions. The FAA will review the change to ensure that the proposed operating procedures meet the agency’s safety standards.
Findings
On July, 2012, an official United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) list of Federal Endangered and Threatened Species (including Candidate and Proposed Species) was obtained at: http://www.fws.gov/idaho/species/IdahoSpeciesList.pdf. This list is attached as an enclosure (1). It identifies these species and their likelihood to appear in the proposed project area.

The proposed action would not require any construction or property acquisition. Existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the aircraft and associated passengers. Existing arrival and departure flight tracks southeast of the Airport would continue to be used. Due to operating limitations of the CRJ700ER no arrivals or departures northwest of the Airport would be conducted. Noise contours prepared for the Environmental Assessment indicate that the project would cause both existing and forecast annual noise contours to shrink slightly. Due to the lack of construction associated with this project, no biological field investigations were undertaken. It was concluded that the lack of construction and retention of existing flight tracks would avoid any impacts to habitat or protected species.

Determination
Based on these findings, the FAA has determined that the proposed introduction of turbojet aircraft to provide passenger service to the Airport would have “No Affect” on any listed endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitat. Furthermore, given that existing flight paths would only be utilized and that there would be a reduction in the number of flights to and from Friedman Memorial Airport, the FAA has determined that there would be no affect under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The FAA kindly requests concurrence of this from the USFWS. Your attention to this matter is appreciated. If you have any questions or need additional information on this submittal, please contact Norman LeFevre, at 425-917-6780 or email at Norman.b.lefevre@faa.gov.

Sincerely,

Norman LeFevre
Manager NextGen Branch,
Northwest Mountain Region

Enclosure: (1) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Idaho State Office, Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that Occur in or may be Affected by Projects in Blaine County.
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Area of Potential Effect
Freidman Memorial Airport
Federal Agency Assistance and Consultation
Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act directs the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to consult with federal agencies on any proposed actions (direct or indirect) on federal lands that may potentially affect listed, proposed or candidate species or their habitat.

It is the responsibility of federal "action agencies" (or their designated representatives) to obtain an official table ("Species List") of listed, proposed and candidate species that may be present where the proposed activity is to occur. If the project potentially affects the species or its habitat, the federal agency is required to consult with the Service.

To assist agencies with this task, the Service prepares and regularly updates Species Lists by county. The lists are valid for up to 180 days. Species List areas may be larger than the footprint of the proposed activity. Status changes, such as listings, delistings or critical habitat designations, will be updated immediately by the Service so the action agency will always have access to the most current information for project planning.

For comprehensive information specific to federal agency assistance and consultation, go to: http://www.fws.gov/idaho/agencies.htm

Obtaining Species Lists for Proposed Federal Actions
The Fish and Wildlife Service is developing a web-based system that will allow Action Agencies to generate project-specific Species Lists. We will provide instructions when the new web-based species list system is launched.

Until then, please obtain an official "T&E Species List" directly from the Service’s Idaho FWS website, which is organized by county for your proposed activity consultation.

This list will ensure that your project records contain the most current species information. Please print and retain a copy of this list with your project records. Should your project plans expand or change to include additional counties, you will need to check the website for an updated list, and reprint a new species list for your files.

To obtain the most current County Species List (PDF file for download), click on the link under "Obtaining an Official T&E Species List for Proposed Federal Actions" - www.fws.gov/idaho/species/IdahoSpeciesList.pdf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Amphibian</th>
<th>Bird</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia spotted frog - Great Basin population</td>
<td>Rana luteiventris</td>
<td>[C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sage-Grouse</td>
<td>Centrocercus urophasianus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-billed cuckoo</td>
<td>Coccyzus americanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannock</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemhi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minidoka</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Canada lynx</td>
<td>Grizzly bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Lynx canadensis</td>
<td>Ursus arctos horribilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>[T]</td>
<td>[CH]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benewah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemhi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minidoka</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Southern Idaho ground squirrel</th>
<th>Wolverine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Spermophilus brunneus enemicus</td>
<td>Gulo gulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benewah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minidoka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[C] Candidate  [T] Threatened  [CH] Designated Critical Habitat
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Bull trout</th>
<th>Kootenai River white sturgeon</th>
<th>Banbury Springs lanx</th>
<th>Bliss Rapids snail</th>
<th>Bruneau hot springsnail</th>
<th>Snake River physa snail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[S. confluens]</td>
<td>[A. transmontanus]</td>
<td>[Lanx sp.]</td>
<td>[T. serpentica]</td>
<td>[P. bruneaensis]</td>
<td>[H. (Physa) natricina]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benewah</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemhi</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minidoka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin-Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[C] Candidate  [T] Threatened  [CH] Designated Critical Habitat

-173-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Christ's paintbrush</th>
<th>Goose Creek milkvetch</th>
<th>Macfarlane's four-o'clock</th>
<th>Packard's Milkvetch</th>
<th>Slickspot peppergrass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Castilleja christii</td>
<td>Astragalus anserinus</td>
<td>Mirabilis macfarlanei</td>
<td>Astragalus cusickii var. parkardiae</td>
<td>Lepidium papilliferum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td>[T]</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td>[T]</td>
<td>[PCH]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[C] Candidate  
[P] Proposed  
[T] Threatened  
[E] Endangered  
[CH] Designated Critical Habitat  
[PCH] Proposed Critical Habitat
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Spalding's catchfly</th>
<th>Ute ladies'-tresses</th>
<th>Water Howellia</th>
<th>Whitebark Pine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silene spaldingii</td>
<td>Spiranthese diluvialis</td>
<td>Howellia aquaticis</td>
<td>Pinus albicaulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>[T]</td>
<td>[T]</td>
<td>[T]</td>
<td>[C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benewah</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemhi</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minidoka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 6, 2012

Ms. Suzi Pengilly
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Idaho State Historic Preservation Office
210 Main St.
Boise ID 83702

Dear Ms. Pengilly:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead federal agency responsible for an environmental determination in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the approval of the proposed modification of SkyWest Airlines’ (Airline) Operations Specifications for Freidman Memorial Airport in Hailey, Idaho. The modification would permit the Airline to introduce regional jet service. Approval of the modification to the Operations Specifications constitutes a Federal undertaking, requiring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulations if 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800. This letter is submitted to initiate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.2(c) (1) (i) and 36 CFR Part 800.3(c) and request your concurrence with the Area of Potential Effect (APE) as depicted in Enclosure 1.

Description of Proposed Undertaking
SkyWest is proposing to replace its existing service using the Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. The Brasilia is a twin-engine turboprop aircraft with 30 passenger seats while the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats (as configured for Delta Connection). The substitution of an aircraft with more seating capacity would result in a reduction form the current schedule of 3 to 6 flights per day to 2 to 3 flights per day. Seasonal variation in passenger demand accounts for the range in the number of daily flights. The shift in aircraft types would occur within the next 6 months.

The proposed action would not require any construction or property acquisition. Existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the aircraft and associated passengers. Existing arrival and departure flight tracks southeast of the Airport would continue to be used. Due to operating limitations of the CRJ700ER no arrivals or departures northwest of the Airport would be conducted. Noise contours prepared for the Environmental Assessment indicate that the project would cause both existing and forecast annual noise contours to shrink slightly. Due to the lack of construction associated with this project, no cultural field
investigations were undertaken. It was concluded that the lack of construction and retention of existing flight tracks would avoid any impacts to historic or cultural sites. An APE was defined to encompass those areas on and near the Airport that might be affected by the Proposed Project (see Enclosure). The Study Area includes the Friedman Memorial Airport and adjacent areas in the approach-departure corridor. The rectangular study area is 5,000 feet wide centered on the Airport’s runway. It extends 13,000 feet (nominally 2.5 miles) southeast of the runway end to encompass the northern half of the City of Bellevue. The Study area also extends 10,000 feet to the northwest of the runway end. The common arrival and departure flights tracks are encompassed within the Study Area.

The latitude and longitude of the four corners of the APE are as follows:
- Northwestern corner: N43° 31' 50.48", W114° 19' 59.56"
- Northeastern corner: N43° 32' 18.98", W114° 19' 04.12"
- Southwestern corner: N43° 27' 44.02", W114° 16' 00.54"
- Southeastern corner: N43° 28' 12.48", W114° 15' 05.13"

Native American Consultation
Concurrent with this letter, the FAA has sent letters to the four tribes on the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) list requesting they provide information concerning the proposed project area if any was available.

Summary of Findings and Determination of Effect
Based upon available data the FAA has determined that there are 15 properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the APE. Given the usage of existing flight paths and the reduction in noise levels, the FAA has also determined that the proposed undertaking will not affect any properties listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP. No construction activities will be undertaken so there is no potential for accidental discovery of buried archaeologica resources.

The FAA seeks concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer on its no historic properties affected [Section 800.11(d)] determination for the Proposed Action.

If you have any questions or need additional information on this submittal, please contact Norman LeFevre at Norman.b.lefevre@faa.gov or at 425-917-6780.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Norman LeFevre
NextGen Branch Manager, FAA Northwest Mountain Regional Office

Enclosure: Area of Potential Effect graphic
Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of Potential Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared By: Mead & Hunt  www.meadhunt.com

Enclosure 1

Area of Potential Effect
Friedman Memorial Airport
August 9, 2012

Ms. Lori Armstrong
BLM, Twin Falls District
400 W. F Street
Shoshone, ID 83301

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority (Authority) are preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate potential impacts of introduction of turbojet passenger service to Friedman Memorial Airport (Airport). This Proposed Operational Specification amendment involves a one-for-one replacement of the existing Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia with the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats, resulting in a shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day with the smaller aircraft to per day to 2 to 3 flights per day with the CRJ700. This would result in a net decrease in operations and no construction or property acquisition would occur as a part of this project. A study area has been defined for the purposes of assessing environmental impacts. A graphic showing the study area is attached as Enclosure 1. The FAA is the lead Federal agency for the proposed project. The Authority is the Airport sponsor.

We are contacting you as part of our environmental review process. With this letter the FAA is seeking input on concerns from BLM related to the proposed introduction of turbojet service. We would be pleased to discuss details of the Airport’s proposed project with you.

Project Information
The Airport is owned by the City of Hailey and Blaine County and is operated by the Friedman Memorial Airport Authority. The Authority proposes to permit introduction of turbojet service to replace existing scheduled passenger service using turboprops. More specifically, existing scheduled service using Embraer EMB 120ER Brasilia would be replaced with service by the Bombardier CRJ700ER. The Brasilia is a twin-engine turboprop aircraft with 30 passenger seats while the Bombardier CRJ700ER is a twin-engine jet aircraft with 65 passenger seats (as configured for SkyWest operating as Delta Connection).

SkyWest would shift from providing 3 to 6 flights per day to 2 to 3 flights per day. The greater seating capacity of the CRJ700ER (65 seats as configured for Delta Connection)
compared to the Brasilia (30 seats) makes it possible to meet existing and forecast demand with fewer aircraft. The shift in aircraft types would occur within the next 6 months. The specific Federal action proposed is issuance of amended Operations Specifications to SkyWest to permit introduction of scheduled passenger service using the CRJ700ER. The amendment will identify the aircraft to be used, the operations authorized and any limitations, deviations or exemptions. The FAA will review the change to ensure that the proposed operating procedures meet the agency’s safety standards.

The proposed action would not require any construction or property acquisition. Existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the aircraft and associated passengers. Existing arrival and departure flight tracks southeast of the Airport would continue to be used. Due to operating limitations of the CRJ700ER no arrivals or departures northwest of the Airport would be conducted. Noise contours prepared for the Environmental Assessment indicate that the project would cause both existing and forecast annual noise contours to shrink slightly. Due to the lack of construction or property acquisition associated with this project, no cultural resources field investigations were undertaken.

If you wish to provide comments related to this proposed project, please contact Norman LeFevre at Norman.b.lefevre@faa.gov or at 425-917-6780.

Your timely response will greatly assist us in incorporating your concerns into the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Norman LeFevre
NextGen Branch Manager, Northwest Mountain Region

Enclosure: Study Area graphic
Legend
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AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 09/17/2012   DEPARTMENT: Admin    DEPT. HEAD SIGNATURE: Heather Dawson

SUBJECT:
Development Impact Fee Ordinance

AUTHORITY: □ ID Code __________ □ IAR __________ □ City Ordinance/Code 2.32, 3.08
(IF APPLICABLE)

BACKGROUND/SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:
The 2012 Update of Hailey's Capital Improvement Plan for Development Impact Fees was added to the Hailey Comprehensive Plan in an August meeting. The City is now ready to adopt the Development Impact Fee Ordinance itself. The exhibit to the Ordinance will be the schedule of fees from the 2012 Update.

Day Care Businesses have been listed in the ordinance as an exception, based on the recommendation of the DIF Advisory Committee and the Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission.

FISCAL IMPACT / PROJECT FINANCIAL ANALYSIS:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT BY OTHER AFFECTED CITY DEPARTMENTS: (IF APPLICABLE)

City Attorney       Clerk / Finance Director       Engineer       Building
Library            Planning                         Fire Dept.
Safety Committee    P & Z Commission             Police
Streets            Public Works, Parks            Mayor

RECOMMENDATION FROM APPLICABLE DEPARTMENT HEAD:

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMENTS/APPROVAL:
Adopt Ordinance as drafted or with amendments. Statute does not allow waiver of three readings for DIF Ordinances, and also requires a 30 day waiting period before the ordinance becomes effective.

ACTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL:

Other items require motion of the city council to approve, deny, approve with changes.
Date
City Clerk

FOLLOW-UP:

*Ord./Res./Agmt./Order Originals: *Additional/Exceptional Originals to: ________
Copies (all info.): Copies

-182-
HAILEY ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF HAILEY, IDAHO, AMENDING CHAPTER 15.16 OF THE HAILEY MUNICIPAL CODE, AMENDING SECTION 15.16.020 TO REVISE THE DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE ADMINISTRATOR AND TO ADD A DEFINITION FOR CHILD CARE FACILITY; AMENDING SECTION 15.16.030.03 TO ADD CHILD CARE FACILITY AS AN EXEMPTION; AMENDING 15.16.060.02 TO EXTEND THE TIME TO COMMENCE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS; REPLACING EXHIBIT "A" TO UPDATE THE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE; PROVIDING FOR A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR A REPEALER CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING FOR THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDINANCE.

WHEREAS, Idaho Code § 67-8201 et seq. allows Idaho municipal corporations to enact ordinances allowing cities to collect development impact fees;

WHEREAS, in 2007, Hailey adopted a development impact fee ordinance which is codified as Chapter 15.16 of the Hailey Municipal Code;

WHEREAS, as a basis for Hailey’s development impact fee ordinance, the City engaged a consultant to develop a Development Impact Fee Study;

WHEREAS, Hailey retained Richard Caplan & Associates to prepare a five year update to the capital improvements plan, which is contained in an update to the Development Impact Fee Study (“Updated Study”);

WHEREAS, the Hailey Advisory Impact Fee Advisory Committee has reviewed the Updated Study and submitted written comments to the Hailey City Council;

WHEREAS, Hailey now desires to amend the Hailey development impact fee ordinance to revise definitions, to add an exemption, to extend the time to commence system improvements and to update the development impact fee schedule; and

WHEREAS, Hailey has adopted this amendment to the development impact fee ordinance in accordance with the procedural requirements of Idaho Code § 67-8206.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HAILEY, IDAHO, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Section 15.16.020 of the Hailey Municipal Code is amended to add the definition of “Day Care Business”, and is amended to revise the definition of “Development Impact Fee Administrator” by the addition of the underlined language and by the deletion of the stricken language, as follows:

“Child Care Facility” shall mean any business, home or establishment which provides child care.
"Development Impact Fee Administrator" shall mean the City Clerk/Treasurer Community Development Director of the City of Hailey, Idaho, or his or her designee.

Section 2. Section 15.16.030.03 of the Hailey Municipal Code is amended by the addition of the underlined language, as follows:

15.16.030.03 Exemptions. The provisions of this Chapter 15.12 shall not apply to the following:

A. Rebuilding the same amount of floor space of a structure which is destroyed by fire or other catastrophe, provided the structure is rebuilt and ready for occupancy within two (2) years of its destruction;

B. Remodeling or repairing a structure which does not increase the number of Service Units;

C. Replacing a residential unit, including a Manufactured/Mobile Home, with another residential unit on the same lot; provided that, the number of Service Units does not increase;

D. Placing a temporary construction trailer or office on a lot;

E. Constructing an addition on a residential structure which does not increase the number of Service Units;

F. Adding uses that are typically accessory to residential uses, such as tennis court or a clubhouse, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the use creates a significant impact on the capacity of System Improvements; or

G. The installation of a Modular Building, Manufactured/Mobile Home or Recreational Vehicle if the Fee Payer can demonstrate by documentation such as utility bills and tax records that either (a) a Modular Building, Manufactured/Mobile Home or Recreational Vehicle was legally in place on the lot or space prior to the effective date of this Ordinance or (b) a Development Impact Fee has been paid previously for the Modular Building, Manufactured/Mobile Home or Recreational Vehicle on that same lot or space.

H. Child Care Facility.

Section 3. Section 15.16.060.02 of the Hailey Municipal Code is amended by the addition of the underlined language and by the deletion of the stricken language, as follows:

15.16.060.02 Failure to Commence Construction or Encumber Trust Funds. Any Development Impact Fees paid shall be refunded if the City has failed to commence
construction of System Improvements in accordance with this Ordinance, or to appropriate funds for such construction, within five (5) eight (8) years after the date on which such fee was paid. Any refund due shall be paid to the owner of record of the parcel for which the Development Impact Fees were paid. The City may hold Development Impact Fees for longer than five (5) eight (8) years if it identifies in writing: (a) a reasonable cause why the fees should be held longer than five (5) eight (8) years; and (b) an anticipated date by which the fees will be expended, but in no event greater than eight (8) eleven (11) years from the date they were collected. If the City complies with the previous sentence, then any Development Impact Fees identified in such writing shall be refunded to the Fee Payer if the City has failed to commence construction of System Improvements in accordance with this Ordinance, or to appropriate funds for such construction on or before the date identified in such writing.

Section 4. As authorized by Section 15.16.040.02 of the Hailey Municipal Code, Exhibit “A” to Chapter 15.16 of the Hailey Municipal Code is substituted and replaced by a new Exhibit “A” entitled Development Impact Fee Schedule, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 5. SEVERABILITY CLAUSE. If any section, paragraph, sentence or provision hereof or the application thereof to any particular circumstances shall ever be held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remainder hereof, which shall continue in full force and effect and applicable to all circumstances to which it may validly apply.

Section 6. REPEALER CLAUSE. All Ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed and rescinded.

Section 7. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect after its passage, approval and publication according to law.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE HAILEY CITY COUNCIL and approved by the Mayor this _____ day of ______________, 2012.

ATTEST:

Fritz X. Haemmerle, Mayor

Mary Cone, City Clerk

Publish: Idaho Mountain Express _________, 2012
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