NORFOLK AIRPORT AUTHORITY
NORFOLK INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND ON-CALL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
ADDENDUM #1
JUNE 27, 2022

I. Questions and Answers

1. Does the Authority anticipate that all sites will be covered under one document?
   Response – Yes.

2. Are previous NEPA documents available for review?
   Response - The documents attached to this RFQ are the only documents that will be provided at this time.

3. Has the FAA commented on what level of NEPA documentation is required for each project?
   Response - The FAA currently believes that all the listed projects should be under one Environmental Assessment (EA). However, the consultant will assist the Authority in seeking clarification on whether any of the projects can be Categorically Excluded and therefore removed from the EA.

4. The proposed action consists of multiple large construction projects to support projected aviation demands: almost doubling of enplanements from 1.6 M in 2017 to 2.8 M by Planning Activity Levels (PAL) 4, 2038 and 2.4 M in 2028, the five-year period to be covered by the EA. Additionally, Cargo operations are forecasted for steady increase.
   a. Given the potential magnitude of the construction activities and the increase in aviation operations, what has been the general reception of the public? (i.e., types of comments from the meetings listed in Section 1.1.2 of the Master Plan, Public and Stakeholder Program)

      Response – The public and stakeholders support the preferred alternatives from the MPU.

   b. Would public concerns warrant this to be EIS vs an EA?

      Response – No.

5. The RFQ states a 12-month POP from NTP and that a detailed scope of work for the EA will be determined after contractor selection and in coordination with the FAA’s Washington Airports District Office.
   a. Please confirm that the 12-month POP includes internal scoping with WADO. If affirmative, what is the general timeline anticipated for the WADO approval process?

      Response – The 12-month period of performance does not include scoping.
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b. Are the supporting studies such as traffic, noise, environmental site assessment completed?

Response – No additional studies have been completed.

c. Will external scoping meetings be required in addition to the correspondence and public notice?

Response – To be determined during scope of work development.

6. The RFQ states that the ‘EA is for multiple proposed projects from the Authority’s preferred development alternative within the recent Master Plan Update.’ It further states that the EA is intended to address all major and known development alternatives which will be undertaken by the Authority within the next five years.

a. Are the “known development alternatives” the preferred options included in the overall Master Plan Update preferred development alternative, or do some of the projects have other alternatives that the EA will also analyze? For instance, Figure 9 of the Section 163 Screening Package shows two alternatives for the CONRAC/QTA. Will both alternatives be analyzed fully in the EA? Will alternatives (other than the preferred alternative) for other individual Master Plan Update projects be analyzed fully in the EA?

Response – The EA is intended to cover the projects included in the Section 163 document provided and which the Section 163 Determination list as subject to NEPA.

7. Will there be cooperating agencies for EA? For example, for the projects that are not under FAA purview but NEPA is required—such as the Departures Bld. and terminal curbside expansion—who is the approving authority?

Response – The projects listed as examples are considered Federal Actions due to the proposed funding source and the FAA will remain the approving Authority. The Authority does not anticipate cooperating agencies at this time.

8. The RFQ states that the on-call environmental services will be used to address projects which are currently unanticipated by the Authority.

a. Does the Authority envision that these unanticipated projects would be incorporated into the Master Plan Update EA, or does the Authority envision them as supplemental or independent EAs?

Response – It is anticipated that these unknown projects will require independent Section 163, Categorical Exclusion and EA efforts during the term of the contract.

9. “The selected firm shall verify the need to incorporate each project into the EA with the FAA during the scoping project.”

a. On what basis, other than FAA not having Airport Layout Plan approval authority and funding source, does Norfolk Airport Authority anticipate that Master Plan Update projects could be eliminated from consideration in the EA? Given that this EA will cover multiple projects that all fall under the umbrella of a Master Plan Update, it seems that all projects in the Master Plan Update would need to be included in the EA—if not in the main analysis, then as related actions to be considered under cumulative effects.

Response – On the basis that the project has an independent utility.
10. Any site visits for viewing project areas, meetings including scoping, etc.? If so, how many are anticipated?
   Response – Yes. Type and number to be determined during scope of work development.

11. Is a company with DBE status in other states eligible to submit as a Virginia DBE while the Interstate Application is processing?
   Response – A company that is not currently registered as a DBE in Virginia can submit a response but that company cannot be counted toward a DBE goal or plan to address the DBE goal. If a company is in the DBE application process with Virginia it must submit all supporting documentation to assist the Authority in reviewing the company’s pending DBE status.

12. Projects for which the FAA does not retain approval authority may still require approvals from USFWS, USACE, VDWR, etc. Was the wetland delineation that was listed in the WHMP as complete as of 12/31/2015 the most recent delineation/survey?
   Response – Yes.

13. Were the wooded areas evaluated for potential habitat for bats or other rare, threatened, or endangered species?
   Response – No.

14. It appears that the CONRAC/QTA and Robin Hood Road realignment projects will also require tree removal to facilitate access and roadway reconfiguration. Were these wooded areas also previously surveyed as part of the WHMP?
   Response – The wooded areas were not evaluated for potential habitat. The areas are within the General Zone described in the provided section of the WHMP.

15. Has a study been conducted or coordination with the VDCR division of Floodplain Management occurred to determine the potential impacts of tree removal on the adjacent 100- and 500-year floodplains?
   Response – No.

16. Does the Airport anticipate an update to its Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as part of the contract?
   Response – No.

17. Does the Airport anticipate an update to its Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan as part of the contract?
   Response – No.

II. No further addenda will be issued

III. End of Addendum #1