

required mitigation measures and associated regulatory/permit requirements.

The ACSI will coordinate with the FAA's EPS to determine whether any measures of the WHMP may require NEPA review beyond a categorical exclusion, and to ensure compliance with any other applicable environmental law. Approval letters will indicate which measures are not yet approved for implementation due to a need for additional FAA NEPA or special purpose law compliance, which measures are approved with conditions that the Certificate Holder must satisfy prior to implementation of the measure, and which measures are approved outright and ready for implementation.

- *Environmental Protection Specialists (EPS's)*. The EPS will coordinate with the ACSI to review all available information to determine whether FAA may categorically exclude the approval of any or all of the WHMP measures comprising the WHMP in accordance with paragraph 5–6.2(e) of FAA Order 1050.1F, or whether any may require preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). To avoid segmentation, the FAA's EPS will, as part of the review of extraordinary circumstances, consider whether any measures considered for approval under a categorical exclusion are connected to other measures that may require further environmental review or interagency coordination. The EPS will provide the ACSI with language (for inclusion in the letter to the Certificate Holder) explaining which measures and aspects of the Plan are approved, approved with conditions (like obtaining a 404 permit) but without requiring further FAA action, or disapproved or requiring further environmental analysis or consultation by FAA. The EPS will also advise the Certificate Holder regarding which agency is responsible for coordination with the applicable resource agencies.⁷ If there are additional environmental reviews needed before the Certificate Holder can implement a specific action, the EPS will help draft conditions requiring such coordination and completion of the environmental review before implementation of the action is undertaken by the Certificate Holder.

Certification Status: Certificate Holders should note that, pursuant to

⁷ The FAA is also reviewing its Policy and Guidance Letter 78 (dated June 21, 2004), which addresses Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The FAA will either update, revise or rescind that policy as appropriate after coordination with the USFWS.

Section 139.337(e), FAA's approval of a WHMP satisfies their requirements as long as the Certificate Holder implements the approved provisions and works to obtain approval of the remaining measures. To the extent there are measures that require additional NEPA review and/or other interagency coordination, the Certificate Holder may not implement those measures unless and until the FAA and/or the appropriate resource agency have reached a favorable environmental determination. The Certificate Holder must then carry out the approved measures to remain in compliance with Part 139 certification requirements. This does not relieve the Certificate Holder of their responsibility to continue to monitor wildlife hazards and take relevant and appropriate measures to minimize the risks, to the extent permissible under the WHMP and all applicable environmental laws and regulations.

If the WHMP has no measures that can be implemented immediately, the Certificate Holder must consider and document interim mitigation measures, in consultation with the FAA's ACSI and EPS. For example, if the WHMP calls for certain depredation measures which require approval by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, then the Certificate Holder may commit to monitoring wildlife numbers and activities, and seek under any available emergency provisions to conduct the least invasive measure in the interim. In extraordinarily rare circumstances, it may be possible for a Certificate Holder to demonstrate that wildlife hazards represent such an immediate threat to the safety of the traveling public that the emergency provisions of NEPA and the Endangered Species Act offer some latitude for interim action. This would be rare, however, because the FAA expects Certificate Holders to monitor wildlife hazards and initiate required coordination early enough to mitigate risks while complying with all applicable environmental laws and regulations.

Applicability to non-139 airports: The FAA encourages all airport operators to actively monitor and manage wildlife hazards on and near the airport environs. Other airports (such as those that are certificated under 14 CFR part 139 but that have not had a triggering event that would mandate a WHMP, or for airports not certificated under Part 139) are still encouraged to undertake Wildlife Hazard Assessments or Wildlife Hazard Site Visits, and to establish and implement WHMPs when

justified.⁸ However, the FAA would not approve such plans, so unless implementation of the WHMP required a change to the ALP, or involved federal funding, there would most likely be no Federal action from the FAA's perspective. Airport owners and operators would have to comply with all applicable Federal environmental laws and regulations related to any measures contained within such WHMPs if they have the potential to impact threatened and endangered species, wetlands, archeological sites or other protected environmental resources. The FAA would make its expert wildlife and environmental resources available to the airport in such circumstances, and may support interagency coordination if necessary depending upon the proposed measures.

Effective date: Once the FAA has received and reviewed any comments submitted in response to this **Federal Register** notice, the FAA will publish a final revision of Policy 92, which will be effective as of the date of its publication for any new or updated WHMP that has not yet been submitted to the FAA for review and approval as of that date. However, this does not relieve airport Certificate Holders of their responsibilities for additional permitting and interagency coordination that may already be required under applicable federal environmental laws for implementation of certain measures, even if those measures were submitted as part of a WHMP that was previously approved by the FAA but not yet implemented.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 14, 2016.

Elliott Black,

Director, Office of Airport Planning and Programming.

[FR Doc. 2016–25285 Filed 10–18–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Request To Release Airport Property

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

⁸ The FAA previously issued a **Federal Register** notice for public comment on December 10, 2012 (77 FR 73511). The FRN presented a clarification of Grant Assurance #19 (Operation and Maintenance), which would have clarified the expectation for all federally-obligated airports to conduct Wildlife Hazard Site Visits (WHSVs) or Wildlife Hazard Assessments (WHAs). Based in part on comments received in response to that **Federal Register** notice, the FAA has decided not to proceed with this clarification at this time.

ACTION: Notice of Intent To Rule on Request To Release Airport Property at Waterloo Regional Airport, Waterloo, Iowa. (ALO)

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the release of land at Waterloo Regional Airport, Waterloo, Iowa, under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 47107(h)(2).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 18, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered to the FAA at the following address: Lynn D. Martin, Airports Compliance Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, ACE-610C, 901 Locust Room 364, Kansas City, MO 64106.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to: Keith Kaspari, Director of Aviation, 2790 Livingston Ln., Waterloo, IA 50703, (319) 291-4483

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lynn D. Martin, Airports Compliance Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, ACE-610C, 901 Locust Room 364, Kansas City, MO 64106, (816) 329-2644, lynn.martin@faa.gov. The request to release property may be reviewed, by appointment, in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA invites public comment on the request to release approximately 12.33+ acres of airport property at Waterloo Regional Airport (ALO) under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 47107(h)(2). On March 29, 2016, the Director of Aviation at Waterloo Regional Airport requested from the FAA that approximately 12.33+ acres of property be released for sale to Dahlstrom Development for industrial/business development consistent with the zoning ordinances of the City. On October 6, 2016, the FAA determined that the request to release property at Waterloo Regional Airport (ALO) submitted by the Sponsor meets the procedural requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration and the release of the property does not and will not impact future aviation needs at the airport. The FAA may approve the request, in whole or in part, no sooner than thirty days after the publication of this notice.

The following is a brief overview of the request:

The Waterloo Regional Airport (ALO) is proposing the release of airport property totaling 12.33 acres, more or less. This land is to be used for industrial/business development to Dahlstrom Development. The release of

land is necessary to comply with Federal Aviation Administration Grant Assurances that do not allow federally acquired airport property to be used for non-aviation purposes. The sale of the subject property will result in the land at Waterloo Regional Airport (ALO) being changed from aeronautical to non-aeronautical use and release the lands from the conditions of the Airport Improvement Program Grant Agreement Grant Assurances. In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 47107(c)(2)(B)(i) and (iii), the airport will receive fair market value for the property, which will be subsequently reinvested in another eligible airport improvement project for general aviation facilities at Waterloo Regional Airport.

Any person may inspect, by appointment, the request in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. In addition, any person may, upon appointment and request, inspect the application, notice and other documents determined by the FAA to be related to the application in person at Waterloo Regional Airport.

Issued in Kansas City, MO on October 13, 2016.

Jim A. Johnson,
Manager, Airports Division.

[FR Doc. 2016-25286 Filed 10-18-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Los Angeles County, California

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Amended notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA, on behalf of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), is issuing this amended notice to advise the public that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared for proposed highway improvements on Interstate 605 (I-605). The I-605 Corridor Improvement Project (Project) will consist of improvements on the I-605 corridor from the Interstate 10 (I-10) Interchange to the Interstate 105 (I-105) Interchange. The proposed Project also includes improvements along State Route 60 (SR-60) from Santa Anita Avenue to east of Turnbull Canyon Road, and on Interstate 5 (I-5) from Florence Avenue to Paramount Boulevard in the cities of Baldwin Park, El Monte, City of Industry, Pico Rivera, South El Monte, Whittier, Downey, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, and

unincorporated Los Angeles County. The Project limits include the I-605/I-5 and I-605/SR-60 corridors. These corridors were previously analyzed as separate projects; however, the Project limits along these corridors are being combined to connect logical termini. A Project Study Report-Project Development Support Study (PSR-PDS) for the I-605/I-5 corridor was approved in July 2014, and a PSR-PDS for the I-605/SR-60 corridor was approved in December 2015 (not attached).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald Kosinski, Deputy District Director, Division of Environmental Planning, District 7, 100 South Main Street, Suite 100, Los Angeles, CA 90012, (213) 897-0703.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Effective July 1, 2007, the FHWA assigned, and Caltrans assumed, environmental responsibilities for this Project pursuant to 23 United States Code (U.S.C.) 327. Caltrans will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Project. The purpose of the Project is to reduce congestion, improve freeway operations, improve and enhance safety, and improve local and system interchange operations.

Project Description

The Project proposes widening along the southbound and northbound I-605 corridor from the I-10 Interchange to the I-105 Interchange. The proposed Project includes improvements along SR-60 from Santa Anita Avenue to east of Turnbull Canyon Road, and on I-5 from Florence Avenue to Paramount Boulevard. The study area includes the cities of Baldwin Park, El Monte, City of Industry, Pico Rivera, South El Monte, Whittier, Downey, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, and unincorporated Los Angeles County. Improvements to local streets and interchanges may be required as part of the Project including the following interchanges that would be affected: I-605/Imperial Highway, I-605/Firestone Boulevard, I-605/Telegraph Road, I-605/Slauson Avenue, I-605/Florence Ave., I-605/Washington Boulevard, I-605/Whittier Boulevard, I-605/Beverly Boulevard, I-605/Rose Hills Road, I-605/Peck Road, I-605/SR-60, I-605/Valley Boulevard, SR-60/Peck Road, SR-60/7th Ave., I-5/Florence Ave., I-5/Lakewood Boulevard, I-5/Paramount Blvd., and I-605/I-5 Interchanges.

The following Project alternatives are under consideration.

Alternative 1: No Build Alternative

In this alternative, there would be no reconstruction or improvements to the