

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
WESTERN-PACIFIC REGION

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Airport Terminal and Apron Expansion

**Fresno-Yosemite International Airport
Fresno, California**



For further information

Richard Doucette
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
New England Region
Richard.Doucette@FAA.gov
781-238-7613

January 24, 2022

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

WHAT'S IN THIS DOCUMENT? This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed terminal and apron expansion at Fresno-Yosemite International Airport in Fresno, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment dated December 15, 2021. This document discusses all alternatives considered by FAA in reaching its decision, summarizes the analysis used to evaluate the alternatives, and briefly summarizes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action Alternative and the No Action Alternative, which are evaluated in detail in this FONSI.

BACKGROUND. In November, 2021, the City of Fresno, California, through its Airports Department, prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA). The DEA addressed the potential environmental effects of the proposed terminal and apron expansion including various reasonable alternatives to that proposal. The Draft EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [Public Law 91-190, 42 USC 4321-4347], the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) [Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) Parts 1500-1508], and FAA Orders 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. The City of Fresno published the Notice of Availability for the Draft EA in the *Fresno Bee* on November 1, 2021. No written comments were received.

FAA approved the Final EA on December 15, 2021.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO? Read the FONSI to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed airfield pavement and facilities improvements at Oceano Airport.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS? The City of Fresno Department of Airports may begin to implement the Proposed Action Alternative.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**TERMINAL AND APRON EXPANSION
FRESNO-YOSEMITE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
CITY OF FRESNO, CALIFORNIA**

- 1. Introduction.** This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) for the airport terminal and apron expansion at Fresno-Yosemite International Airport, Fresno California. The City of Fresno, through its Airports Department, is the airport sponsor. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with NEPA and other applicable statutes before taking any federal actions that are necessary prior to implementation of the project. NEPA requires that after preparing an Environmental Assessment, federal agencies must decide whether to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact and approve the proposed project, or prepare an environmental impact statement prior to rendering a final decision on approval of a proposed project. The FAA has completed the environmental assessment, considered its analysis, and determined that no further environmental review is required. Therefore, the FAA is issuing this FONSI, accompanied and supported by the FAA's Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) completing environmental review requirements for the project.
- 2. Purpose and Need.** Chapter 1 of the Final EA describes the purpose and need for the proposed project. The purpose and need includes the following elements.

The purpose for the Proposed Project is: 1) to accommodate the existing and forecast increase in passengers; and 2) to improve passenger safety and security.

- 1.** The airport has a need to provide expanded security checkpoint capacity, additional holdrooms, enlarged FIS space and more efficient baggage handling to support its domestic and international passengers.

Currently, international passengers are deplaned outside on an open-air ramp adjacent to the existing FIS facility. The aircraft is then towed to a concourse gate for departing passenger boarding. This procedure is inefficient, less secure than a passenger boarding bridge, and the level of passenger service is less than desired. For example, passengers waiting to process through the existing, undersized, FIS are exposed to the elements (i.e., rain, heat, cold, etc.) and inherent risks on a functioning apron (i.e., tug traffic and jet blast).

Two aircraft can park at the existing FIS facility, but due to the limited capacity of the FIS primary inspection and queuing areas, the United States (U.S.) Customs and Border Protection requires passengers to be held onboard the second aircraft until passengers from the first aircraft have been cleared through the FIS facility. An expansion of the terminal to the east with two new holdrooms, passenger boarding bridges and a secure connection to a new FIS facility will enable both aircraft to deplane simultaneously and allow passengers to wait in the comfort of a secure holdroom in the FIS (with passenger amenities) until they are processed through customs. The international aircraft can then remain at the same gate for boarding. Once the passenger boarding bridges is cleared of arriving international passengers, it will be reopened to the new concourse holdrooms for both international and domestic departures as well as domestic arrivals.

2. The existing east commercial apron does not provide enough space for safe circulation and parking of aircraft and ground support equipment for a terminal expansion and must be enlarged accordingly.

Thus, the purpose of the Proposed Project is to resolve the above needs by:

- Providing an expansion of the passenger terminal with additional gates, holdrooms and a larger FIS to accommodate domestic and international travel
- Providing an enlarged apron to allow for safe circulation of aircraft and ground support equipment to accommodate the expanded passenger terminal

3. **Proposed Project and Federal Actions.** The Proposed Action evaluated in this FONSI includes the following major project components:

The Proposed Project (known locally as *FATForward*) would expand and reconfigure existing landside facilities (passenger terminal and FIS building) and a connected airside aircraft apron area within an area directly east of the existing passenger terminal building. Construction of these landside and airside components would be phased sequentially to ensure continuity of operations. See *Proposed Project Construction and Phasing* section.

Overall, 14.6 acres would be disturbed by the project. The area of disturbance is shown to the fence line as a “worst case” estimate of construction activity. The Proposed Project would result in an increase in impervious surface of 3.3 acres.

East Terminal Apron Reconfiguration

The east terminal apron reconfiguration would remove 6.7 acres of apron and construct 3 acre of new Portland cement concrete (PCC) apron to align with the two new international/domestic terminal loading gates. These gates would replace existing international gates that are not equipped with boarding bridges.

Additional actions include:

- Remove and replace existing security fence
- Reroute an existing airport service road around the reconfigured apron (included in the pavement totals provided above)
- Install electrical improvements consisting of apron edge lights and new duct banks
- Construct additional storm drain improvements, including installation of inlets, manholes, trench drains, and reinforced concrete pipe (RCP). These improvements would tie into the existing storm drain system

Passenger Terminal Expansion and Remodel

At the same time as the new apron construction begins, the remodel of a portion of the terminal building in the area where the new concourse would tie into the existing passenger screening checkpoint would begin. The existing east wall of the passenger screening checkpoint was originally designed to allow the building to expand to the east, making the building expansion relatively simple to phase and construct. Expansion of the passenger screening checkpoint would also require minor demolition and addition of a fire wall in the concourse just north of the existing checkpoint.

The passenger terminal expansion would increase the size of the existing terminal to the east by approximately 88,616 square feet (sf). The new ground floor space would be

approximately 62,786 sf; an additional 25,830 sf would be a new second floor area. The new building space would increase the passenger screening area and provide concession space, passenger hold rooms, a new FIS for international arrivals, as well as new in-line EDS (Explosive Detection System) baggage screening space and baggage makeup area for departures. PCC pavement (2.3 acres) would be installed in connection with the new terminal space.

The next phase of the Proposed Project would be the remodel of the existing baggage screening area and baggage makeup area (8,618 sf of existing interior space). This space would become Air Traffic Organization lease space. The space also includes an access hallway between the ticket counter and north exterior yard.

Upon completion of the new FIS, the existing 13,070-sf FIS building and temporary walkways would be demolished. The existing FIS building was constructed in 2006 as a modular prefabricated building. Once the FIS building is removed, the land would be paved for vehicle parking, and new sidewalks and landscaping would be installed.

Additional actions related to the terminal expansion and associated site work include:

- Remove and replace existing security fence
- Construct storm drain improvements that would consist of inlets, manholes, trench drains, and RCP. These improvements would tie into the existing storm drain system
- Install new landscaping, including vegetation and an irrigation system

FAA Actions

FAA will take the following actions to authorize implementation of the proposed projects:

Unconditional approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) depicting the proposed improvements pursuant to Title 49 U.S.C. 40103(b), *Sovereignty and Use of Airspace*, 44718, *Structures Interfering with Air Commerce or National Security*, and 47107(a)(16), *Project Grant Application Approval Conditioned on Assurances about Airport Operations*; Title 14, C.F.R. Part 77, *Safe, Efficient Use, and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace*; and 14 C.F.R. Part 157, *Notice of Construction, Alteration, Activation, and Deactivation of Airports*;

Determinations under Title 49 U.S.C. § 47106, *Project Grant Application Approval Conditioned on Satisfaction of Project Requirements*, and § 47107, *Project Grant Application Approval Conditioned on Assurances about Airport Operations*, relating to the eligibility of the Proposed Action for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and/or under Title 49 U.S.C. § 40117, *Passenger Facility Charges*, as implemented by 14 C.F.R. § 158.25, *Applications*, to impose and use passenger facility charges (PFCs) collected at the Airport for the Proposed Action to assist with construction of potentially eligible development items shown on the ALP; and

If necessary, approval of a construction safety and phasing plan to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to FAA Advisory Circular 150-5370-2F, *Operational Safety on Airports During Construction*, under 14 C.F.R. Part 139, *Airport Certification* (49 U.S.C. § 44706, *Airport Operating Certificates*).

- 4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered.** Chapter 2 of the Final EA describes a two-step screening process. The first step addresses whether the alternatives are “reasonable.” An alternative is considered reasonable if it meets the purpose and need for the Proposed

Project. If an alternative is deemed reasonable, then the second step determines if an alternative is “feasible.”

Step 1: Reasonable: The following criterion was considered to determine if proposed alternatives were reasonable based on the stated purpose and need of the Proposed Project:

1. *Would the alternative accommodate existing passenger processing constraints and provide for growing domestic and international travel demands?*
2. *Would the alternative provide the space required for safe aircraft circulation to accommodate existing and forecast increases in domestic and international operations?*

Step 2: Feasible: If an alternative is considered reasonable, it is then evaluated in terms of feasibility. The following criteria were considered to determine if proposed alternatives were feasible:

1. *Constructability - Would the alternative result in unacceptable impacts to use of the passenger terminal and airport operations during construction?*
2. *Costs - Would the alternative result in unacceptable costs when compared to other proposed alternatives?*

PROPOSED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The Proposed Project would expand and reconfigure the existing passenger terminal and FIS building, as well as the aircraft apron east of the terminal building. Construction of these landside and airside components would be phased to ensure continuity of operations. The apron would be constructed in two phases to minimize disruption at existing gates that would remain operational during construction. The first phase would include paving a small area on the north portion of the new apron. Upon completion of Phase 1, aircraft circulation to existing gates on the east side of the terminal would be reestablished allowing the remaining portions of the apron to be constructed in the second phase without significantly impacting operations. The east terminal apron reconfiguration would remove 6.7 acres of apron and construct 3 acres of new Portland cement concrete apron.

While the new apron is under construction, the terminal remodel and expansion phase would begin. This element includes the demolition and remodel of a small portion of the terminal building in the area where the new concourse would tie into the existing passenger screening checkpoint. The passenger terminal expansion would increase the size of the existing terminal to the east by approximately 88,616 square feet and would include expanded security checkpoint, modernized checked baggage inspection system and baggage make-up, two international/domestic gates and holdrooms with passenger boarding bridges, new Federal Inspection Station and remodeled Airline Ticket Office space.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action alternative, no additional improvements to the passenger terminal, terminal apron, or FIS building would occur. The present configuration of these airport functions would continue without abatement of existing conditions. Currently, international passengers are deplaned outside on an open-air ramp adjacent to the existing FIS facility. The aircraft is then towed to a concourse gate for departing passenger boarding.

ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS

No other locations are readily available to improve the international passenger operations.

Expansion North of the Terminal

Expanding the passenger terminal/FIS functions to the north of the existing terminal would create impacts to the runway/taxiway system and its safety areas due to a lack of adequate space for additional landside development between the north concourse of the passenger terminal and the airfield. Suitable apron would also not be available without encroaching on the closest taxiway and taxiway connectors. Therefore, this alternative location would not meet the stated purpose and need for the Project.

Expansion West of the Terminal

Another location would be to expand the terminal/FIS functions to the west of the existing terminal. This would position additional building and passenger activity closer to the air traffic control tower. Additional structures or aircraft closer to the tower would likely negatively impact the tower line-of-sight, and be less safe. Therefore, this alternative location would not meet the stated purpose and need for the Project.

5. **Assessment.** The potential environmental impacts and possible adverse effects were identified and evaluated in the EA. The Final EA has been reviewed by the FAA and found to be adequate for the purpose of the proposed Federal actions. The FAA determined that the Final EA for the proposed project adequately describes the potential impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative. No new issues surfaced as a result of the public review.

The Proposed Project would not have adverse impacts in the categories that are listed below. Either these resources do not occur within or in proximity to the project study area, or no change to the existing condition would result from the Proposed Project, or both.

- Coastal Resources
- Section 4(f) Resources
- Farmlands
- Land Use, including land use plan/policy inconsistencies per Title 49 United States Code (U.S.C.) section 47106(a)(1)
- Visual Resources/Visual Character
- Wetlands
- Floodplains
- Wild and Scenic Rivers

The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories: Air Quality Biological Resources, Climate, Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste and Pollution Prevention, Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources, Natural Resources and Energy Supply, Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use, Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks, Visual Effects, Water Resources, and Cumulative Impacts.

A. Air Quality

Implementation of the Proposed Project would generate air pollutant emissions related to construction activities for approximately two years. Since construction-related air pollutant emissions vary based on the duration and level of activity, the corresponding level of emissions would vary each year based on improvements undertaken.

Table 4A in the EA summarizes the estimated *construction* emissions in tons per year (per the NAAQS) for the Proposed Project. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not generate construction emissions above any *de minimis* levels applied for the CAA applicability test. Also, no exceedances of local air quality thresholds would occur. **Table 4B** identifies *operational* emissions that could result from ongoing electrical demand and vehicular emissions related to the terminal expansion and apron reconfiguration. Once fully operational, the terminal expansion is expected to produce emissions due to the energy demands for lighting, climate control, and other airport operational needs. Some emissions are also expected due to vehicular traffic generated by additional employees or deliveries. All operational emissions would be below the federal *de minimis* and local thresholds.

No changes to the airfield capacity are proposed under the Proposed Project. Therefore, no changes to aircraft operational emissions associated with the implementation of the Proposed Project would occur. However, indirect beneficial impacts to air quality may result since aircraft would no longer be required to sit on the ramp for extended periods of time waiting for international passengers to deplane.

Conclusion. The Proposed Project would not result in air pollutant concentrations that would exceed one or more NAAQS and, therefore, would not result in a significant impact on air quality.

B. Biological Resources

A Biological Evaluation was completed for the Proposed Project, and is found in Appendix B of the EA. The Evaluation was based on a field survey of the biological study area. No federally listed species or federally designated critical habitat are present in the study area or would be adversely impacted due to the Proposed Project. Field surveys were completed in May 2019 and May 2020.

Conclusion. The Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact to federally listed species or designated critical habitat. Although FAA has not established a significance threshold for non-listed species, avoidance and minimization measures would be implemented to ensure potential direct or indirect impacts to ground-nesting birds do not occur.

C. Climate

An estimate of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions attributable to *construction* and *operational* emissions due to the Proposed Project is provided in the EA. The Proposed Project would not result in increases in GHG emissions related to the ongoing aviation activity at the airport since it would not permanently change airport operations or aircraft traffic patterns.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would generate GHGs related to *construction* activities for approximately two years. The information presented in the EA identifies the total project GHGs (in metric tons per year [MT/yr]) calculated by CalEEMod for each GHG per calendar year of construction. These amounts are then multiplied by the global warming potential (GWP) for each GHG to determine the final carbon dioxide equivalentⁱ (CO₂e) total for that calendar year.

Operational Impacts of the Proposed Project was individually modeled through CalEEMod as it would become operational. At full buildout, all the individual elements of the project are summed for a total annual GHG emissions output for the project. Potential beneficial impacts

ⁱ CO₂e factors in the individual GWPs for carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). This allows the computation of overall global warming impacts by accounting for how much energy the emissions of one ton of a particular gas would absorb over a given period compared to the emissions of one ton of CO₂.

related to a decrease in the airport's GHG production would occur since aircraft would no longer be required to sit on the ramp for extended periods of time waiting for international passengers to deplane. In addition, the indirect effect of offering an improved regional airport in Fresno would potentially decrease vehicular trips and miles traveled (and related GHG emissions) associated with air travel in the state overall.

Conclusion. The Proposed Project would contribute to increases in GHGs temporarily during construction but may result in a decrease in GHGs in the long term due to the potential indirect benefits of the project discussed above.

D. Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Project would result in demolition and construction activities that would involve the use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials as well as the generation of hazardous waste. However, as a commercial service airport, the airport enforces spill prevention, control, and countermeasure (SPCC) plans, as appropriate, as well as a hazardous materials business response plan. Compliance with these, and other rigorous state and local regulatory requirements, would ensure that impacts related to hazardous materials and waste products during project construction activities are avoided or minimized.

No new types of hazardous materials or adverse effects on the human environment would occur because of the Proposed Project. The airport's hazardous materials business response plan contains an emergency response/contingency plan module (per 14 C.F.R. 139.325) that addresses emergency procedures for all parts of the facility.

Conclusion. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact on the environment associated with the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials due to the existing regulatory environment for the treatment of hazardous materials and hazardous waste.

E. Solid Waste and Pollution Prevention

Estimates of construction solid waste were obtained by the project engineers based on preliminary design and estimates of construction activity. For operational solid waste estimates, average solid waste generation factors based on land use are available from CalRecycle. These estimates include information from city and county planning departments, as well as environmental departments across the state (CalRecycle website 2020).

Conclusion. No significant impacts to solid waste disposal or the Cedar Avenue Recycling and Transfer Facility or American Avenue landfill capacities to handle solid waste reuse or disposal would occur due to implementation of the Proposed Project.

F. Historical Resources

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the demolition of the FIS building (constructed in 2006) and a minor portion of the passenger terminal. As none of the buildings to be demolished are on or eligible for the NRHP, demolition of the buildings identified would not result in a significant impact on historic properties.

FAA has determined no historic properties would be affected by the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have a significant impact on historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural resources. By letter dated August 31, 2021, the FAA initiated a NHPA, Section 106 consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

By letter dated October 14, 2021, the California SHPO concurred with the FAA determination that no historic properties would be affected by the Proposed Project, completing the NHPA, Section 106 consultation process.

As part of its Section 106 responsibilities under the NHPA, FAA also contacted the Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government, Kings River Choinumni Farm Tribe, Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe, Table Mountain Rancheria, and Waksache Indian Tribe/Eshorn Valley Band regarding the Proposed Project. No comments or information from these tribes was received by FAA in response to its letters or emails.

Conclusion. No impacts to known historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural resources would occur due to the Proposed Project. Impacts to unknown cultural resources or the unanticipated discovery of human remains are, however, always a possibility. This EA includes avoidance and minimization measures in case of an unanticipated discovery of resources.

G. Natural Resources and Energy Supply

Minimal changes in the amount of water demand at the airport would occur due to the Proposed Project. The airport, as an end user of water from the city, is required to comply with the City of Fresno's 2015 *Urban Water Management* Plan (UWMP) and Section 6-520(a) of the city's Municipal Code. The UWMP includes a set of restrictions on water usage that help promote water conservation and overall water usage reduction. Landscaped areas of the Proposed Project would implement the city's approved outdoor watering schedules and other landscaping restrictions.

Based on the CalEEMod outputs obtained in the air quality analysis, the Proposed Project would require an estimated 834,763 kilowatt hours (kWh) per year of electricity and 1,194,480 kilo-British thermal units of natural gas (kBtu) per year once the project is completed and operational (**Table 4G**). This estimate is based on the area (in square feet) of the terminal building expansion, and the energy required to light, heat, cool, and provide energy sources for other building functions. The airport currently gets 60 percent of its electricity from its on-airport solar farm.

All new buildings would be constructed to meet CALGreen (CCR, Title 24, part 11), which includes mandatory measures for nonresidential development in a variety of categories, one of which relates to materials conservation and resource efficiency. CCR, Title 24, part 6 building regulations would apply to all new development or redevelopment, including: compliance with American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) 90.1 national standards; efficiency requirements for elevators and digital controls; and energy efficiency measures pertaining to building envelopes, mechanical systems, lighting (indoor, outdoor, and signage), electrical power distribution, and solar readiness.

Conclusion. The Proposed Project would not cause demand to exceed available or future supplies of natural or energy resources. No significant impacts related to this resource category would occur.

H. Noise

Exhibit 4B in the EA shows the Forecast Conditions (2022) Noise Exposure Map from the 2017 Noise Exposure Update. Acreage within the CNEL 65 dB or higher noise contours, including the portions over the airport, is 4.64 acres (HMMH Consultants 2017). It should be noted that noise at the airport is driven in part by the military activity associated with the California Air National Guard and has not significantly changed due to the pandemic. The airport continues to implement its sound insulation program based on the 2022 Noise Exposure Map. Once constructed, the Proposed Project would not result in additional aircraft

operations at the airport. No change in this forecast condition would occur because of the Proposed Project.

Conclusion. No significant noise impacts based on FAA significance thresholds would occur because of the Proposed Project.

I. Socioeconomics

No adverse impacts to economic growth in the region are expected because of the Proposed Project. According to the City of Fresno, Report to the City Council for the *FATForward* project, dated March 19, 2020, there will be no impact to the city's General Fund or to the ratepayers of the City of Fresno (Meikle, Kevin, Director of Aviation, City of Fresno Airports Department 2020). Additional indirect economic benefits to the region would likely accompany the enhanced air travel accommodated by the project. If the airport becomes more desirable, the economic activity associated with it is expected to continue to grow.

Conclusion. The Proposed Project would contribute to increases in direct and indirect economic activity associated with the airport. The amount of economic growth specifically resulting from just the Proposed Project is speculative and cannot be reasonably quantified.

J. Environmental Justice

Disproportionately high and adverse effects would occur if an adverse effect is predominantly borne by a minority or low-income population or would be appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that would be suffered by the non-minority population and/or low-income population.

The U.S Census Bureau's 2019 American Community Survey (ACS) was used to determine the number and percentage of environmental justice populations living within the census tract containing the project study area and the airport.

The project study area and airport do not contain residences or environmental justice populations. The closest residential neighborhood to the project study area is approximately 1/3 mile away, south of E. McKinley Avenue. This neighborhood is separated from the project study area by a light industrial/office complex, as well as the airport's vehicular parking lot. No disproportionate impacts (including dust, noise, or traffic) would occur to environmental justice populations.

K. Visual Effects

Additional lighting (such as apron edge lighting and building security lighting) would result from the proposed terminal building and apron expansion. However, the Proposed Project would be contained on airport property, which is buffered from light or glare-sensitive land uses, such as residential areas, by surrounding light industrial and office development. Thus, no light or glare impacts would occur from the Proposed Project.

L. Water Resources

Surface Waters

The Proposed Project would not change the quality of the stormwater (i.e., the type of potential pollutants) generated at the airport since the project does not introduce new types of development. The airport presently complies with the state's NPDES Industrial General Permit (Order 2014-0057-DWQ) for discharges of stormwater associated with industrial activities. In accordance with the NPDES permit, the city and the airport have prepared a stormwater management plan that outlines BMPs, which would be implemented to prevent the discharge of pollutants in stormwater. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have an indirect impact on water quality.

Groundwater

The Groundwater Protection Section of the U.S. EPA has reviewed the Proposed Project and determined that the project is not likely to affect the water quality of the Fresno sole source aquifer (Nord, E. 2021). There is no potential to intercept the aquifer or directly expose groundwater to contamination due to construction or operations at the airport. In addition, the Proposed Project is not close to Leaky Acres, the City of Fresno's intentional groundwater recharge area. This 225-acre area is more than one mile away from the project area.

Conclusion. The Proposed Project would not cause an exceedance of applicable water quality standards, nor would it contaminate a public drinking water supply. No significant impacts related to water resources would occur.

M. Cumulative Impacts

Section 3.13 of the EA lists the projects considered under the cumulative analysis of this EA. For this analysis, cumulative projects were selected based on projects within the airport boundaries that could have a close causal relationship to the Proposed Project. Several projects on airport property have been undertaken within the past five years, are ongoing, or are planned to be undertaken in the next five years. No cumulative impacts would occur under the No Action alternative since that alternative would not result in any physical changes at the airport.

6. Public Participation.

The public was encouraged to review and comment on the Draft EA that was released for public review on November 1, 2021. The city of Fresno published a notice of availability of the Draft EA in the following local newspaper in the vicinity of the airport: *Fresno Bee*. The city of Fresno made the Draft EA available on their web site and at the Airports Department and Planning and Development Department offices. The public comment period ended on November 30, 2021. No comments were received and no new issues were raised.

7. Inter-Agency Coordination.

Consultation was conducted with the EPA due to the presence of an EPA designated Sole Source Aquifer underlying the airport. In accordance with 49 USC § 47101(h), the FAA has determined that no further agency coordination is necessary because the Proposed Action Alternative does not involve construction of a new airport, new runway or major runway extension that has a significant impact on natural resources including fish and wildlife; natural, scenic, and recreational assets; water and air quality; or another factor affecting the environment.

8. Reasons for the Determination that the Proposed Action Alternative will have No Significant Impacts.

The attached Final EA examines each of the various environmental resources that were deemed present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action Alternative. The proposed airfield pavement and facilities improvements would not involve any environmental impacts, which would exceed a threshold of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B. Based on the information contained in the Final EA,

the FAA has determined the Proposed Action preferred alternative, is most feasible and prudent alternative. FAA has decided to implement the proposed project as described in the attached Final EA.

9. Finding off No Significant Impact

I have carefully and thoroughly considered the facts contained in the attached EA. Based on that information, I find that the proposed Federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and other applicable requirements. I also find the proposed Federal Action, with the required mitigation referenced above will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or otherwise include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to section 102 (2)(C) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an EIS for this action.

APPROVED:

Laurie Suttmeier
Manager, San Francisco Airports District Office

Date

DISAPPROVED:

Laurie Suttmeier
Manager, San Francisco Airports District Office

Date