

# **Public Notice**

Applicant: City of McKinney

Project No.: SWF-2020-00359

Date: April 6, 2021

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of this public notice is to inform you of a proposal for work in which you might be interested. It is also to solicit your comments and information to better enable us to make a reasonable decision on factors affecting the public interest. We hope you will participate in this process.

#### **Regulatory Program**

Since its early history, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has played an important role in the development of the nation's water resources. Originally, this involved construction of harbor fortifications and coastal defenses. Later duties included the improvement of waterways to provide avenues of commerce. An important part of our mission today is the protection of the nation's waterways through the administration of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program.

#### **Section 10**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is directed by Congress under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 403) to regulate all work or structures in or affecting the course, condition or capacity of navigable waters of the United States. The intent of this law is to protect the navigable capacity of waters important to interstate commerce.

#### **Section 404**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is directed by Congress under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1344) to regulate the discharge of dredged and fill material into all waters of the United States, including wetlands. The intent of the law is to protect the nation's waters from the indiscriminate discharge of material capable of causing pollution and to restore and maintain their chemical, physical and biological integrity.

#### Contact

Name: Mr. Eric Dephouse, Project Manager

Phone Number: (817) 886-1820

Email: eric.j.dephouse@usace.army.mil

### **PUBLIC NOTICE**

## U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, FORT WORTH DISTRICT

SUBJECT: Application for a Department of the Army Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) to discharge dredged or fill material into waters of the United States associated with the extension of runway 18 - 36 at McKinney National Airport in the city of McKinney, Collin County, Texas.

APPLICANT: City of McKinney

C/O Paul Grimes

222 N. Tennessee Street McKinney, Texas 75069

APPLICATION NUMBER: SWF-2020-00359

DATE ISSUED: April 6, 2021

LOCATION: The proposed runway extension would be located on a 247-acre parcel of land containing 3,736 LF (LF) of stream and 16.47 acres of wetlands in Collin County, Texas. The proposed project would be located approximately at UTM coordinates -96.588276 East and 33.189831 North on the McKinney East 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle map in the USGS Hydrologic Unit 120301060205.

OTHER AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS: State Water Quality Certification

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant proposes to discharge approximately 58 cubic yards of concrete and 4,433 cubic yards of earthen fill into approximately 5.31 acres of waters of the United States consisting of approximately 4.95 acres of non-forested wetlands, 0.11 acre of forested wetlands, and 3,324 LF of intermittent stream (0.25 acre) associated with the extension of the runway at McKinney National Airport.

INTRODUCTION: The McKinney National Airport is a general aviation facility owned and operated by the City of McKinney (the City). The Airport's Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) identifier is TKI. TKI is located in Collin County, Texas, in the east portion of the City of McKinney (**Figure 1**). Runway 18-36 is the only runway at TKI, measuring 7,002 feet long and 150 feet wide. The purpose of the proposed project is to increase take-off and landing distances to accommodate larger aircraft and aircraft with heavier payloads by extending Runaway 18-36 to achieve an effective length of 8,502 feet.

PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT: The need for the project is due to the existing limitations on aircraft that can use TKI, due to its existing length of 7,002 feet. The existing length does not provide for all jet activity that could be provided by the airport, especially during hot weather conditions and when jet aircraft are carrying full loads due to long trip lengths. The

Final Airport Master Plan documented that the demand projection for such aircraft and loads currently exists and is expected to increase.

EXISTING CONDITIONS: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Web Mapping Service (WMS) Web Server Data 2019 depicts the northern portion of the northern tract to be located within "Zone AE", areas determined to be within the floodway. The west and central portions of the northern tract are located within "Zone A", areas determined to be in the 100-year floodplain; and "Zone X (shaded)", areas determined to be within the 500-year floodplain with a 0.2 percent annual chance to flood. The southern tract and the southern portion of the northern tract are located within "Zone X", areas determined to be outside of the 500-year floodplain. The FEMA Flood Hazard Zones Map is provided as **Figure 2a-b**.

The United States Geologic Survey (USGS) topographic map for the project area [Collin County, Mosaic, Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS 2019)] depicts the East Fork Trinity River in the northern portion of the northern tract and one intermittent stream, an unnamed tributary to the East Fork Trinity River, in the southern portion of the northern tract. The East Fork Trinity River and intermittent stream extend beyond the western and eastern site boundaries of the northern tract. An on-channel pond is depicted in the southwestern portion of the northern tract. No features are depicted in the southern tract of the site (**Figure 3a-b**). Elevation on the site ranges from 510-580 feet above mean sea level (msl).

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Wetlands Mapper depicts surface waters regardless of their federal or state jurisdiction. The USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Map is provided as **Figure 4a-b** and depicts six features within the northern tract and no features in the southern tract of the site. The NWI features mapped within the site is summarized below.

Feature Type	Description	Location(s)
PEM1/FO1A	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Forested,	One located in the southwestern
	Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Temporary	portion of the northern tract.
	Flooded	
PEM1C	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent,	One located in the central portion
	Seasonally Flooded	of the northern tract.
PFO1A	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved	One extends northwest through the
	Deciduous, Temporary Flooded	central portion of the northern
		tract.
PFO1C	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved	One extends west across the
	Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded	northern portion of the northern
		tract.
R4SBC	Riverine, Intermittent Streambed,	One extends northeast through the
	Seasonally Flooded	central portion of the northern
		tract.
R5UBH	Riverine, Unknown Perennial,	One extends northwest in the
	Unconsolidated Bottom, Permanently	eastern portion of the northern
	Flooded	tract.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS) was reviewed to characterize the site's soils. The USDA Soils Map is provided as **Figure 5a-b** and depicts nine soil units mapped within the site that are summarized below.

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Landform	Natural Drainage Class	Frequency of Ponding	Frequency of Flooding	Depth to Water Table	Hydric Soil Rating
AlD2	Altoga silty clay, 5 to 8 percent slopes, eroded	Terraces	Well drained	None	None	More than 80 inches	No
AuC2	Austin silty clay, 2 to 5 percent slopes, moderately eroded	Ridges	Well drained	None	None	More than 80 inches	No
EdD2	Eddy gravelly clay loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes, eroded	Ridges	Well drained	None	None	More than 80 inches	No
HoA	Houston Black clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	Plains	Moderately well drained	None	None	More than 80 inches	No
НоВ	Houston Black clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes	Ridges	Moderately well drained	None	None	More than 80 inches	No
НоВ2	Houston Black clay, 2 to 4 percent slopes, eroded	Ridges	Moderately well drained	None	None	More than 80 inches	No
LeC2	Lewisville silty clay, 3 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	Terraces	Well drained	None	None	More than 80 inches	No
Tf	Tinn clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently flooded	Floodplains	Moderately well drained	None	Frequent	More than 80 inches	No
То	Trinity clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	Floodplains	Moderately well drained	None	Occasional	More than 80 inches	No

A delineation of wetlands, other special aquatic sites and other waters showed approximately 3,733 LF of perennial stream, 3,736 LF of intermittent stream, 13.64 acres of emergent (non-forested) wetland, and 2.686 acres of forested wetland (**Figure 6a-6c**).

Dominant vegetation in wetlands includes Carex crus-corvi (ravenfoot sedge), Celtis laevigata (sugarberry), Echinochloa colona (jungle rice), Eleocharis palustris (common spike-rush), Salix nigra (black willow), Trifolium repens (white clover), and Ulmus americana (American elm). Dominant vegetation in the upland areas includes Ambrosia artemisiifolia (annual ragweed), Bromus tectorum (cheatgrass), Callicarpa americana (American beautyberry), Cardiospermum halicacabum (balloon vine), Celtis laevigata (sugarberry), Cynodon dactylon (Bermuda grass), Elymus virginicus (Virginia wild rye), Festuca versuta (Texas fescue), Fraxinus pennsylvanica (green ash), Gleditsia triacanthos (honey locust), Lonicer japonica (Japanese honeysuckle), Maclura pomifera, (osage orange), Melilotus officinalis (yellow sweet clover), Quercus rubra (red oak), Rumex crispus (curly dock), Smilax bona-nox (saw greenbrier), Toxicodendren radicans (poison ivy), and Ulmus americana (American elm).

ADVERSE IMPACTS OFTHE PROPOSED PROJECT: Activities associated with the extension of the runway at McKinney National Airport include permanent, direct impacts to waters of the United States including filling approximately 3,324 LF (0.25 acres) of intermittent stream, 4.95 acres of emergent (non-forested) wetlands, and 0.11 acres of forested wetlands (**Figures 7a-8d**). Based on the proposed development plan, approximately 154 LF of intermittent stream, 8.68 acres of emergent (non-forested) wetlands, and 2.72 acres of forested wetlands would be preserved on site. No indirect or cumulative effects are anticipated.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT: The USACE has not yet evaluated the alternatives analysis prepared by the applicant. The applicant's alternatives analysis is provided below.

The purpose of the proposed project is to extend the existing runway at the McKinney National Airport. Because the purpose of this project is specific to the applicant's property, no off-site alternatives were evaluated. The applicant conducted an alternatives analysis on four on-site alternative development scenarios, in addition to the no action alternative, in an effort to minimize impacts to WOUS identified on the property. As described in FAA Circular AC150/5200-33C, wetlands located on or near airport property are known wildlife attractants, may pose a hazard to aircraft, and should be corrected by the airport.

Alternative 1, "No Action" alternative. This alternative consists of allowing the airport to remain in its current condition; no new facilities or improvements would be added. The length of Runway 18-36 would remain inadequate to serve anticipated future needs at TKI. The No Action Alternative would have no discernible environmental impact; however, it would have potentially negative impacts on the regional economy and transportation system, would not remove the wildlife hazards presented by the wetlands on the airfield, and would not accomplish the stated purpose of the project For these reasons, the No Action alternative was rejected.

Alternative 2. This alternative consists of extending Runway 18-36 1,500 feet on the Runway 36 (south) end. This alternative would impact approximately 254 LF of ephemeral stream but would not provide the needed runway and protection zones to accomplish the stated purpose of the project and would not remove the wildlife hazards presented by the wetlands near the north end of the runway; therefore, this alternative was rejected.

Alternative 3. This alternative consists of extending Runway 18-36 1,500 feet on the Runway 18 (north) end. It would impact 3,324 LF (0.25 acre) of intermittent stream, 8.36 acres of emergent wetlands, and 0.89 acres of forested wetlands, for a total of 10.1 acres of impacts to waters of the U.S. In addition, this alternative would impact 221 LF (0.01 acre) of ephemeral stream and 0.08 acre of emergent wetlands associated with the ephemeral stream. The ephemeral stream and the associated wetlands are not waters of the U.S. as defined in the Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR). Although this alternative accomplishes the purpose and need of the project, this alternative was rejected due to overall project cost due to the extensive amount of fill required to bring the existing topography up to the required grade and the extensive amount of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. that would be impacted by this alternative.

Alternative 4 (Applicant's Preferred Alternative). incorporates a 1,000-foot extension on the Runway 18 end and 500 feet on the Runway 36 end. Alternative 4 would impact 3,324 LF (0.25 acres) of intermittent stream, 4.95 acres of emergent wetlands, and 0.11 acres of forested wetlands, for a total of 5.31 acres of impacts to waters of the U.S. In addition, this alternative would impact 221 LF (0.01 acre) of ephemeral stream and 0.08 acre of emergent wetlands associated with the ephemeral stream. This alternative would reduce the impacts on WOTUS, compared to Alternative 3 and would not require as much fill as Alternative 3 to bring the runway to grade. This alternative is the proposed alternative due to the fact that this alternative meets the stated purpose and need of the project and has the least amount of impacts to waters of the U.S. of any of the practicable alternatives; therefore, it is the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). In addition, this alternative reduces the wildlife hazards as recommended by FAA.

Alternative 5. This alternative incorporates a 1,250-foot extension on the Runway 18 end (north) and 250 feet on the Runway 36 end (south). Alternative 5 would impact 3,262 LF (0.24 acre) of intermittent stream, 7.94 acres of emergent wetlands, and 0.89 acres of forested wetlands, for a total of 9.48 acres of impacts to waters of the U.S. In addition, this alternative would impact 221 LF (0.01 acre) of ephemeral stream and 0.08 acre of emergent wetlands associated with the ephemeral stream. Although this alternative accomplishes the purpose and need of the project, this alternative was rejected due to overall project cost due to grading expenses and the extensive amount of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. that would be impacted by this alternative.

MITIGATION: To offset unavoidable adverse impacts to Waters of the U.S., the applicant proposes to purchase appropriate stream and wetland mitigation bank credits from a USACE-approved mitigation bank in accordance with the methodologies prescribed within the respective banks' USACE-approved mitigation banking instruments.

PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW FACTORS: This application will be reviewed in accordance with 33 CFR 320-332, the Regulatory Program of the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and other pertinent laws, regulations, and executive orders. Our evaluation will also follow the guidelines published by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 404 (b)(1) of the CWA. The decision whether to issue a permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impact, including cumulative impact, of the proposed activity on the public interest. That decision will reflect the national concerns for both protection and utilization of important resources. The

benefits which reasonably may be expected to accrue from the proposal must be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments. All factors which may be relevant to the proposal will be considered, including its cumulative effects. Among the factors addressed are conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, historic properties, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, floodplain values, land use, navigation, shore erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water quality, energy needs, safety, food and fiber production, mineral needs, considerations of property ownership, and, in general, the needs and welfare of the people.

The USACE is soliciting comments from the public; federal, state, and local agencies and officials; Indian Tribes; and other interested parties in order to consider and evaluate the impacts of this proposed activity. Any comments received will be considered by the USACE in determining whether to issue, issue with modifications, or conditions, or deny a permit for this proposal. To make this decision, comments are used to assess impacts on endangered species, historic properties, water quality, general environmental effects, and the other public interest factors listed above. Comments are used in the preparation of an Environmental Assessment and/or an Environmental Impact Statement pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. Comments are also used to determine the need for a public hearing and to determine the overall public interest of the proposed activity.

STATE WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION: This proposed project will trigger review under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality will review this application under Section 401 of the CWA in accordance with Title 30, Texas Administrative Code Section 279.1-13 to determine if the work would comply with State water quality standards. The applicant has contacted Texas Commission on Environmental Quality and has initiated the Section 401 CWA process by submitting a pre-filing meeting request, on March 24, 2021. If you have comments or questions on this proposed project's State water quality certification process, please contact 401certs@tceq.texas.gov. You may also find information on the Section 401 process here: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/cwa-401/basic-information-cwa-section-401-certification">https://www.epa.gov/cwa-401/basic-information-cwa-section-401-certification</a>.

ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES: The USACE has reviewed the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's latest published version of endangered and threatened species to determine if any may occur in the project area. The proposed project would be located in a county where the black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis*), whooping crane (*Grus americana*), piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), and rufa red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*) are known to occur or may occur as migrants. The whooping crane is an endangered species and the piping plover, black rail, and rufa red knot are threatened species. Our initial review indicates that the proposed work would have no effect on federally-listed endangered or threatened species.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES: The USACE has reviewed the latest complete published version of the National Register of Historic Places and found no listed properties to be in the project area. However, presently unknown scientific, archaeological, cultural or architectural data may be lost or destroyed by the proposed work under the requested permit.

FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT: The USACE is sending a copy of this public notice to the local floodplain administrator. In accordance with 44 CFR part 60 (Flood Plain Management Regulations Criteria for Land Management and Use), the floodplain administrators of participating communities are required to review all proposed development to determine if a floodplain development permit is required and maintain records of such review.

SOLICITATION OF COMMENTS: The public notice is being distributed to all known interested persons in order to assist in developing fact upon which a decision by the USACE may be based. For accuracy and completeness of the record, all data in support of or in opposition to the proposed work should be submitted in writing setting forth sufficient detail to furnish a clear understanding of the reasons for support or opposition.

PUBLIC HEARING: Prior to the close of the comment period any person may make a written request for a public hearing setting forth the particular reasons for the request. The District Engineer will determine whether the issues raised are substantial and should be considered in his permit decision. If a public hearing is warranted, all known interested persons will be notified of the time, date, and location.

CLOSE OF COMMENT PERIOD: All comments pertaining to this Public Notice must reach this office on or before May 6, 2021, which is the close of the comment period. Extensions of the comment period may be granted for valid reasons provided a written request is received by the limiting date. If no comments are received by that date, it will be considered that there are no objections. Comments and requests for additional information should be submitted to: Regulatory Division, CESWF-RD; U. S. Army Corps of Engineers; Post Office Box 17300; Fort Worth, Texas 76102-0300. You may visit the Regulatory Division in Room 3A37 of the Federal Building at 819 Taylor Street in Fort Worth between 8:00 A.M. and 3:30 P.M., Monday through Friday. Comments submitted electronically Dephouse Mr. Eric to eric.j.dephouse@usace.army.mil. Telephone inquiries should be directed to (817) 886-1820. Please note that names and addresses of those who submit comments in response to this public notice may be made publicly available.

> DISTRICT ENGINEER FORT WORTH DISTRICT CORPS OF ENGINEERS



































