obsoleta), diamond-backed water snake (*Natrix rhombifora*), eastern ribbon snake (*Thamnophis sauritus*), and western cottonmouth (*Agkistrodon piscivorus*) (Blair 1950).

Hazardous Wildlife Attractants

Per a request from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District to the Applicant during the October 25, 2011 meeting, the following information is presented to address the projects compliance with Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or near Public-Use Airports in accordance with FAA regulations.

The FAA Advisory Circular (AC) No. 150/5200-33 specifically states: "The holders of Airport Operating Certificates issued under Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 139 Certification of Airports, Subpart D (Part 139) may use the standards, practices, and recommendations contained in the AC to comply with the wildlife hazard management requirements of Part 139. Airports that have received Federal grant-in-aid assistance must use these standards."

The proposed action is a privately funded GA airport and associated facilities as described in Section 1.0 of this document, which has not and will not accept any Federal grant-in-aid assistance. Hence, CTA is not required to use these guidelines. Although CTA is not required to use these guidelines, CTA intends to facilitate hazardous wildlife controls at the proposed project area.

Additionally, AC No. 150/5200-33, Section 3 "Land Uses That May Be Compatible with Safe Airport Operations" discusses several items. Section 3-1 states "Even though they may, under certain circumstances, attract hazardous wildlife, the land use practices discussed in this section have flexibility regarding their location or operation and may even be under the airport operator's control. In general, the FAA does not consider the activities discussed below as hazardous to aviation if there is no apparent attraction to hazardous wildlife, or wildlife hazard mitigation techniques are implemented to deal effectively with any wildlife hazard that may arise."

Section 3-7 states: "The movement of storm water away from runways, taxiways, and aprons is a normal function on most airports and is necessary for safe aircraft operation. Detention ponds hold storm water for short periods, while retention ponds hold water indefinitely. Both types of ponds control runoff, protect water quality, and can attract hazardous wildlife. Retention ponds are more attractive to hazardous wildlife than detention ponds because they provide a more reliable water source."

Sections 3-1 and 3-7 specifically address the use of a detention pond at an airport facility. The proposed CTA detention pond is located to the east of the proposed airport site, and is far away from aircraft movement areas to minimize aircraft-wildlife interactions. A comprehensive flood study was completed and submitted to FEMA for review as part of the Applicant's CLOMR application request. The detention pond was

designed to meet the requirements of the pre-project flows, so that the post-project flows would not increase. As stated in the FAA Advisory Circular above, detention ponds are more desirable and manageable than retention ponds because they hold storm water for shorter periods of time. The Applicant will implement Best Management Practices and wildlife hazard mitigation techniques relative to the hazardous wildlife attractants associated with the on-site detention pond.

The Secured Airport Area will be protected by an extensive perimeter fencing and gate system. All airport operations areas need to be secured for several reasons, one being the hazardous wildlife control, and others being security and safety. All airport and site operations will to be continuously monitored to effectively maintain security and safety within the proposed project area and the community.

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 - The property does not currently support a high wildlife value based on the following information: 1) the property has been a cattle ranch for approximately 50 years; and 2) as a result of the cattle ranching, water resources onsite are substantially degraded.

The entire property has been an intensively-operated cattle ranch for approximately 50 years and therefore currently supports a monoculture of coastal bermudagrass. Coastal bermudagrass, the dominant plant species on the property, is a non-native grassland species that is poor habitat for species other than livestock.

Continuous cattle ranching operations have degraded the quality of onsite water resources that may have been historically utilized by wildlife. The vast majority (8.55 acres, or approximately 91 percent) of the impacts to jurisdictional waters associated with the authorization of this permit are from the removal of a degraded man-made stock tank that is currently utilized by 500 head of cattle on a daily basis. The remainder of the impacts resulting from this development (0.87 acre) would be to ephemeral drainages that have long lost their natural and traditional character and are currently dominated by non-native coastal bermudagrass.

Minimal impacts to ground-dwelling species may occur as a result of loss of some open pasture areas. Less than five percent (5%) of the CTA site has canopy vegetation, and less than half of the canopy vegetation would be removed for the proposed CTA. There are no wetlands or riparian corridors on the proposed CTA site. No significant impacts to wildlife are anticipated as a result of the construction of the proposed CTA.

4.8 Migratory Birds

Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), it is unlawful “by any means or manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, [or] kill” any migratory birds except as permitted by regulation (16 U.S.C. 703-704). Structures that may contain migratory birds, including bridges, are not within the proposed project area.