

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

***FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
AND
RECORD OF DECISION***

Proposed Airfield Improvements and Terminal 1 Replacement Project

San Diego International Airport
San Diego, San Diego County, California



For further information contact:

Michael Lamprecht
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
Western-Pacific Region
Airports Division
Los Angeles Airports District Office
777 South Aviation Boulevard, Suite 150
El Segundo, California 90245
202-267-6496

October 22, 2021

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) and Record of Decision (ROD) for the proposed Airfield Improvements and Terminal 1 Replacement Project at San Diego International Airport (SAN) located in San Diego, San Diego County, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment dated October 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 Project and the No Action Alternatives, which are summarized in this FONSI/ROD. This document also identifies the environmentally preferred alternative and the agency-preferred alternative. This document identifies applicable and required mitigation.

BACKGROUND. On June 16, 2021, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) published a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA). The DEA addressed the potential environmental effects of the proposed airfield improvements and terminal replacement 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) [40 CFR Parts 1500-1508] [1978], and FAA Orders 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. SDCRAA received seven comments on the draft between June 16, 2021 and August 2, 2021. SDCRAA received one additional, late-filed, comment after the comment period closed, in August 2021. All substantive comments were responded to in the Final EA, Appendix N. FAA accepted the Final EA on October 20, 2021.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO? Read the FONSI/ROD to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed Airfield Improvements and Terminal 1 Replacement Project at SAN.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS? The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority may begin to implement the Proposed Project.

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

PROPOSED AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENTS AND TERMINAL 1 REPLACEMENT PROJECT

**SAN DIEGO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
SAN DIEGO, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

- 1. Introduction.** This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Record of Decision (ROD) (FONSI/ROD) for the proposed Airfield Improvements and Terminal 1 Replacement Project at San Diego International Airport (SAN) located in San Diego, San Diego County, California. The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) is the airport sponsor for SAN. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and other applicable statutes before being able to take the proposed federal actions that are necessary prior to implementation of the project. Pursuant to Section 163 of the *Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2018* (Public Law 115-254), Congress limited FAA’s approval authority to portions of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that meet certain statutorily defined criteria, including those portions necessary for aeronautical purposes. Therefore, FAA approval of the Airport Layout Plan depicting the Proposed Project is limited to approval of those portions of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depict the proposed projects within FAA’s authority to approve. FAA approval of the ALP is authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982.
- 2. Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project.** Section 1.2 of the Final EA describes SAN as a commercial service airport that accommodates both air carrier aircraft as well as a small amount of general aviation activity. SAN covers 661 acres and based on annual aircraft operations, is the busiest single-runway commercial service airport in the nation.

The current airport layout requires aircraft using the northern ends of the Terminal 1 and Terminal 2-East concourses to push back directly onto active Taxiway B. This conflicts with arriving flights needing to exit Runway 9-27, impedes free flow taxi movements on Taxiway B, and results in the need for FAA Air Traffic Control intervention and increasing controller workload to hold aircraft on the apron short of the runway exits. This adds to congestion in the apron area and at the existing gates. The existing taxiway system does not accommodate bi-directional aircraft movement and does not enable an optimal path for aircraft to exit the runway. This lack of bi-directional flow results in aircraft being held/delayed, especially while aircraft flow in the opposite direction and/or wait at gates for pushback.

SAN has three terminals. The oldest terminal, Terminal 1, built in 1967, does not meet current building codes, including seismic resiliency, accessibility requirements, and energy efficiency standards. Terminal 1 is operating beyond its design capability. With the forecasted aviation activity levels, the level (quality) of service is expected to further decline due to the overcrowding of the facility. Additional passenger processing space is needed to efficiently serve this forecasted demand. As activity levels grow, longer lines and wait times would occur in the ticketing areas, security checkpoints, and at most passenger amenities (i.e., bathrooms, restaurants, and concession stores). Eventually, some SAN passengers would be bused to remote hardstands to board their flights. These hardstand operations would further lower the

quality of service to passengers. Accordingly, 11 additional gates are needed based upon airport planning guidance and industry research to better accommodate projected passengers and aircraft operations. The additional gates would also serve to improve on-time flight performance due to improved gate availability and schedule reliability.

As activity levels grow, passengers would experience difficulty finding on-airport parking, resulting in vehicles circulating within the airport parking facilities in search of a parking spot. In addition, some drivers, who are unable to find on-site parking, may choose to continue to recirculate on airport roadways until a parking stall becomes available, increasing roadway congestion. Today, SAN is accessed by motorists via an arterial roadway system, which is also heavily used by local commuters and visitors to the San Diego Bay waterfront. Unlike many large commercial service airports, there is no direct highway access to/from SAN. SAN's forecasted increase in enplanements would continue to contribute to area roadway congestion.

Section 1.4 of the Final EA describes the purpose and need for the Proposed Project is to support development and maintenance of safe and efficient facilities at SAN addressing airside and landside deficiencies, including opportunities for improved passenger experience, and airfield operation, consistent with the goals and objectives of SDCRAA's Proposed Project. The SDCRAA's goals and objectives are outlined below.

- Address inefficient airfield circulation adjacent to the terminals that delay airplanes going to or departing from their gates.
- Modernize the oldest terminal (Terminal 1) at SAN to meet the current California building code requirements, especially for seismic resiliency and energy efficiency, while improving the level of service to existing and projected future passengers and increasing gate availability within the constraints of the existing airfield's runway capacity.
- Alleviate congestion caused by airport traffic on Harbor Drive, increase parking availability, and improve connection to the terminal complex.

The Proposed Project includes several individual development components that collectively would address inefficient airfield circulation, provide a modern terminal that meets the latest building requirements and provides sufficient space to meet passenger demands and improve connectivity to the terminal by reducing surface traffic on Harbor Drive North and providing ample parking. This FONSI/ROD addresses SDCRAA's proposed improvements under the proposed project as described below.

3. Proposed Project and Federal Actions. The Proposed Project, dependent on Federal actions, is evaluated in this FONSI/ROD and includes the following major project components (See Figure 1-2 and Table 1-1 of the Final EA):

- Relocate parallel Taxiway B south, replacing asphalt pavement sections with concrete
- Construct new parallel Taxiway A, south of relocated parallel Taxiway B
- Construct 30-gate replacement Terminal 1
- Relocate three FAA Airport Surface Detection Equipment, Model X (ASDE-X) sensors
- Relocate five Remain Over Night (RON) positions east of the new Terminal 1

- Eliminate two current RON positions
- Construct new circulation roadways, including elevated departure curbs, for new Terminal 1
- Construct new on airport entry roadway

Other elements of the Proposed Project where there is **no** Federal Action but are required for the Proposed Project to function properly are:

- Demolition of the SDCRAA administration building
- Construction of the replacement SDCRAA administration building
- Construction of a new 5,500 space automobile parking structure adjacent to new Terminal 1
- Expansion of the stormwater capture and reuse system
- Expansion of the Central Utility Plant (CUP)

FAA will take the following Federal actions to authorize implementation of the Proposed Project:

- Unconditional approval of the ALP to depict the proposed improvements subject to FAA approval pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 47107(a)(16).
- Determinations under 49 U.S.C. §§ 47106 and 47107 that are associated with the eligibility of the Proposed Project for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program and under 49 U.S.C. § 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR § 158.25, to use passenger facility charges collected at the airport to assist with construction of potentially eligible development items from the ALP.
- Approval for and relocation of ASDE-X sensors (49 U.S.C 44502 (a)(1)).

4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered. Chapter 2 of the Final EA, used a detailed two-step alternatives analysis screening process described below:

Step 1 – Would the Proposed Alternatives meet the purpose and need, by addressing inefficient airfield circulation adjacent to the terminals, modernizing the oldest terminal to meet current building codes while providing an improved level of service and finally alleviating surface traffic congestion on North Harbor Drive, increasing parking availability and improving connection to the terminal complex?

Step 2 – Would the alternative be feasible to construct with the physical constraints of the airport environment? In this case, feasibility was reviewed to ensure that the alternative could be implemented, or be practical, from a technical or economic perspective.

The Final EA screened three “off-site” alternatives and four “on-site” alternatives, and finally the No Action Alternative to the Proposed Project. Analysis of the No Action Alternative is required pursuant to 40 CFR § 1502.14(d).

Section 2.3.1 of the Final EA describes and evaluates the three (3) basic off-site alternatives. These include building a new airport; using another existing airport; and using other modes of transportation. Section 2.3.2 of the EA screens the four (4) “on site” alternatives: Extend Taxiway C with Terminal 1 Renovations, Extend Taxiway C with Constructing North Side Terminal, Add Taxiway A with Removal of Portions of Terminal 1; and Add Taxiway A and Replace Terminal 1 with Larger Terminal Extending Southeast (the Proposed Project). Last, Section 2.3.3 screens the No Action Alternative. Paragraph 6-2.1 of FAA Order 1050.1F states in part: *“There is no requirement for a specific number of alternatives or a specific range of alternatives to be included in an EA. An EA may limit the range of alternatives to the proposed action and no action when there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. Alternatives are to be considered to the degree commensurate with the nature of the proposed action and agency experience with the environmental issues involved.”*

Table 2-1 in the Final EA summarizes the results of the alternatives screening process. The No Action Alternative, and all of the action alternatives with the exception of the preferred alternative did not pass Step 1. Only the preferred Alternative made it to Step 2 and passed. Thus, the Proposed Project Alternative and No Action Alternative were retained for analysis in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the Final EA for detailed impact analysis.

- 5. Environmental Consequences.** The potential environmental impacts were identified and evaluated in a Final EA prepared in October 2021. The FAA has reviewed the Final EA and determined that the Final EA for the proposed project adequately describes the potential impacts of the Proposed Project.

The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories: Air Quality; Biological Resources; Climate; Coastal Resources; Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) and Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, Section 6(f) Resources and Land and Water Conservation Fund Action, Section 6(f) Resources; Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; Historic, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources; Land Use; Natural Resources and Energy Supply; Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use; Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice and Children’s Health and Safety Risks; Visual Effects; and Water Resources. Each of these resources is also evaluated under a cumulative impacts analysis.

Section 3.3 of the Final EA discloses that the following environmental impact categories of Farmlands; Floodplains; Wetlands; and Wild and Scenic Rivers were not evaluated further because the Proposed Project at SAN would not affect these environmental resources.

- A. Air Quality.** Sections 3.4 and 4.3 of the Final EA, state the area including the San Diego International Airport is designated Attainment under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO₂, SO₂, and Pb and as Nonattainment for O₃ NAAQS (for both the 2008 and 2015 standards). The Air basin is designated a Maintenance area for CO. Section 176(c) of the CAA Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) requires federal agencies to ensure that their actions conform to the appropriate SIP for air basins that are in non-attainment with the NAAQS or are maintenance areas. Conformity is defined as demonstrating that an action conforms to the SIP’s purpose of eliminating or reducing the

severity and number of violations of the NAAQS and achieving expeditious attainment of such standards. Federally funded and approved actions at airports are subject to the USEPA's General Conformity Regulations (40 CFR Part 93). A General Conformity Determination for the Proposed Project is required if the total direct and indirect pollutant emissions resulting from a Proposed Project are above *de minimis* emissions threshold levels specified in the General Conformity Regulations.

Section 1.1.1 of the Final EA's Appendix B, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Technical Report, states that, "... *future year operational levels do not change (increase of operations or fleet mix) between the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Project in each of the evaluated years, as projected aircraft activity levels would be consistent under both the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Project.*"

Section 4.3.3 of the Final EA provides construction and operational emissions inventory for the Proposed Project. Section 4.3.3.1 of the Final EA describes the No Action Alternative would have no construction emissions related to the project but operational emissions would increase as travel activity increases in keeping with the forecast. Under the Proposed Project, there would be construction emissions but operational emissions would decrease because of improved aircraft taxiing efficiency associated with the new linear concourse for Terminal 1 coupled with a new Taxiway A and emission reductions from project design features including, but not limited to, ground support equipment conversion to alternative fuels.

There are no components of the proposed project that would require approval by either the Federal Highway Administration or the Federal Transit Administration under Transportation Conformity. Thus, FAA evaluation of the proposed project is under General Conformity pursuant to the Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended. Section 4.12.3.2 states "Implementation of the Proposed Project would not change the number of aircraft operations, type of aircraft, nor flight paths that would otherwise occur in 2026 and 2031 under the No Action Alternative." Table 4.3-6 provides the General Conformity Applicability Analysis with *de minimis* thresholds and the Proposed Project's construction and operations emissions. This table shows that the project would not exceed the thresholds. The Proposed Project would produce emissions well below the *de minimis* thresholds. Therefore, a general conformity determination is not required in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93. Thus, the Proposed Project emissions would **not** cause or contribute to an exceedance of the NAAQS or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS.

- B. Biological Resources.** Section 4.4 of the Final EA describes the potential impacts to biological resources. A significant impact would occur when the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) determines that the action would be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed threatened or endangered species, or the destruction or adverse modification of federally designated critical habitat. The FAA has not established a significance threshold for non-listed species. Based on coordination between the SDCRAA, the FAA, and the USFWS, the No-Action Alternative would not have a significant impact on listed species or their critical habitat after applying the mitigation measures (described below and in Section 4.4.4 of the EA) and avoidance and minimization measures (described in Appendix A.4 of the Final EA).

Section 3.5.2 described the species that could potentially be present. The USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office provided an Official Species List on August 20, 2020, which identified 10 federally threatened and endangered species of plants, birds, and mammals that may be present in the area of the Proposed Project (the Official Species List

is included as an appendix to the Biological Assessment [BA] - refer to Appendix C2). The 10 species are: Orcutt's spineflower (*Chorizanthe orcuttiana*); San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*); San Diego button-celery (*Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii*); San Diego thornmint (*Acanthomintha ilicifolia*); California Least Tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*); coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*); least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*); southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*); western snowy plover (*Charadrius nivosus nivosus*); and Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*).

Section 3.5.2 further states that no designated or proposed critical habitat occurs within the Proposed Project area. The only federally listed species known to occur at the project site is the California Least Tern (CLT), as further discussed below.

The only biological resource potentially affected by the Proposed Project is the federally listed CLT. The fencing around the airfield prevents most wildlife from entering the property with the exception of those species able to fly.

Section 4.4.1 of the Final EA states the FAA has determined that the Proposed Project “may affect, not likely to adversely affect” the CLT. The FAA initiated Informal Section 7 consultation with the USFWS on December 17, 2020. The USFWS concurred with FAA’s determination of effect in a letter dated April 27, 2021, after requiring 17 conservation measures to avoid and minimize impacts to the CLT (see Final EA, Appendix C). FAA is requiring, as a condition of this FONSI/ROD, that SDCRAA implement the 17 conservation measures described in Section 4.4.4 of the EA and are as follows:

CM 1. New facilities will be designed to minimize potential perching locations for avian predators, and will include anti-perch structures and materials where appropriate. All structures taller than 10 feet that are necessary within 800 feet of the nesting ovals (including light poles, sign structures, and buildings) will incorporate treatments such as stainless-steel bird spike barriers (e.g., Nixalite®, Bird-be-gone), electrical strips, or other anti-perch materials to reduce potential perches for avian predators. SDCRAA will coordinate with the CFWO regarding anti-perch structures and materials.

CM 2. Permanent lighting and signage within 800 feet of the nesting ovals will be minimized to the extent consistent with public safety, including along the pedestrian pathway. In addition, lights within 800 feet of the nesting ovals will be fully downcast and of the minimum illumination necessary to meet public safety requirements. SDCRAA will coordinate with the CFWO regarding lighting and signage within 800 feet of the nesting ovals.

CM 3. SDCRAA will coordinate with the CFWO regarding landscaping proposed within 800 feet of the nesting ovals to ensure that selected landscaping plants and materials will include only plant species and materials not conducive to perching by avian predators. Plant species selected for landscaping in this area will be plants that grow to less than 6 feet high when mature.

CM 4. All project construction within 800 feet of the nesting ovals will occur between September 16 and March 31 to avoid the least tern nesting season.

CM 5. A least tern biologist (i.e., can identify the least tern, recognize their vocalizations, and identify agitated or distressed tern behavior) will monitor

construction occurring between 800 and 1,200 feet of any nesting ovals during the least tern nesting season (April 1–September 15) to ensure that activities and personnel do not disrupt the least tern. For example, construction activities will be conducted in a manner that prevents individuals or groups of least terns from displaying agitated or stressed behavior and/or suddenly leaving their nest(s) and not resettling on the nest(s) within 5 minutes. The biologist will immediately notify the Resident Engineer (RE; or acting RE) of any construction activity that may disrupt least tern nesting. If the least tern biologist determines that construction has disrupted least terns, the RE will be notified and all project construction activities will cease immediately, except those activities necessary to make SDIA safe and operational. The least tern biologist, in coordination with the RE, will contact the FAA and CFWO immediately after stopping construction. Construction will not resume until approved by the FAA and CFWO.

CM 6. The least tern biologist will submit daily field reports to the FAA and CFWO on the status of the nesting activity, any construction-related incidents that disrupted least tern nesting, and any action taken by the RE to avoid further incidents, within 24 hours of each monitoring date. The least tern biologist will also submit a final summary report of monitoring to the FAA and CFWO S within 30 days of completing project construction.

CM 7. Trash will be properly disposed of, in covered trash receptacles. SDCRAA will require the contractor to provide trash dumpsters or other covered trash receptacles for use by construction personnel. All food items or containers that previously held food items obtained/handled/controlled by construction personnel will be immediately disposed of in these dumpsters or containers, so as not to attract avian or mammalian predators of the least tern.

CM 8. Construction personnel will not be permitted to feed cats, gulls, pigeons, ravens, or any other wildlife, as this may result in an increase in the numbers of these potential predators in the vicinity of least tern chicks and eggs.

CM 9. Crane booms or similar equipment that have heights of 25 feet or greater and are located between 800 feet to 1,200 feet of any nesting oval during the least tern nesting season (April 1–September 15) will be lowered at the close of each construction day.

CM 10. All contractor personnel and construction staff will be required to attend a pre-construction briefing to ensure their awareness of least tern nesting and specific minimization measures required during construction. Project status meetings will be regularly held to remind personnel of the measures required to protect the tern as well as any modifications made to ensure their effectiveness. The CFWO will be notified of the date and time of the preconstruction and status meetings in order to attend, if needed or desired. Contractor personnel and construction staff required to attend the meeting include all those involved with project activities between 800 and 1,200 feet of the nesting ovals during the least tern nesting season (April 1- September 15).

CM 11. The SDCRAA will schedule nighttime construction to occur more than 1,200 feet from Oval O-3S, where feasible; however, it is possible that some nighttime construction between 800 and 1,200 feet from the nesting ovals will be unavoidable. For nighttime construction that is necessary during the least tern nesting season (April

1–September 15), and will occur between 800 feet and 1,200 feet from the nesting ovals, a least tern biologist will be onsite and perform the duties specified above.

CM 12. Night lighting for project construction occurring between 800 feet and 1,200 feet of the nesting ovals will be kept to a minimum during the least tern nesting season, and will not be used unless active construction or other essential work is occurring. Should such nighttime construction or other essential work be conducted, all lighting associated with the work will be shielded from or directed away from the nesting ovals.

CM 13. Equipment will be staged at least 1,200 feet from the nesting ovals.

CM 14. Diligent maintenance of fencing around the perimeter of the nesting ovals shall continue in order to shield the least terns from lighting, predators, and unauthorized human access.

CM 15. SDCRAA will implement annual habitat management for least terns on nesting ovals, including maintenance of a chick fence, annual application of herbicide, and removal of vegetation to support a vegetation cover goal of less than 20 percent vegetative cover during the nesting season. Work will be done in coordination with the biological monitor, and close attention will be paid to precipitation patterns to maximize effectiveness of vegetation management.

CM 16. SDCRAA will implement least tern habitat enhancement on O-3S on an annual basis and in coordination with the CFWO, biological monitors, and airfield operation personnel. Least tern habitat enhancement will occur only where consistent with airfield operations, and may include application of sand, shell or pebble material, and appropriate chick shelters or native vegetation to help shield chicks.

CM 17. SDCRAA will monitor illumination that results from necessary lighting, and address any unanticipated illumination of the least tern nesting area in coordination with the Service, biological monitors, and airfield operation personnel.

- C. Climate.** Section 4.5.2 of the Final EA states that *“As indicated in Section 3.3.4 of the Desk Reference for FAA Order 1050, there are no significance thresholds for aviation and commercial space launch GHG emissions, and the FAA has not identified specific factors to consider in making a significance determination for GHG emissions. Additionally, there are currently no accepted methods of determining significance applicable to aviation projects given the small percentage of GHG emissions that they contribute worldwide. Accordingly, it is not useful to attempt to determine the significance of such impacts for the Proposed Project.”* Table 4.5-2 of the Final EA discloses the annual emissions of GHG during construction of the Proposed Project. Table 4.5-3 of the Final EA discloses the operations emissions for 2026 and 2031 years. While there is a small increase in GHG emissions for construction, there is a greater **decrease** in operations emissions when comparing the Proposed Project to the No Action Alternative. Section 4.5.3 states that the reductions in GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Project would be due to a combination of improved aircraft taxiing efficiency and emission reductions from design features and other commitments. These features, listed in Appendix A.4, that would be part of the Proposed Project include, but are not limited to, ground support equipment conversion to alternative fuels and several commitments related to improved ground transportation. Since emissions would decrease with implementing the Proposed Project, no mitigation measures are necessary.

D. Coastal Resources. Section 4.6.2 of the Final EA states that the FAA has not established a significance threshold for coastal resources in FAA Order 1050.1F, but rather identifies factors to be considered. Section 4.6.3 lists the construction impacts for both the No Action and Proposed Project Alternatives. Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Project would not be constructed or operated. The existing operation of SAN would not interfere with public access to the shoreline, coastal recreation uses and scenic views would be preserved, and biological habitats and water quality would be protected. Under the Proposed Project both the FAA and the SDCRAA would have actions that require coordination with the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The FAA would be responsible for moving three ASDE-X antennas from the current SDCRAA Administration Building to the existing Airline Support Building. The FAA determined the ASDE-X relocation is consistent “to the maximum extent practicable” with Section 30240(a) of the California Coastal Act and has made a Negative Determination, meaning the project will not have reasonably foreseeable effects on any coastal uses or resources, and therefore, does not require a consistency determination. The FAA submitted this Negative Determination to the CCC on June 8, 2021. On July 1, 2021, the CCC concurred with FAA’s negative determination (see Appendix J3).

The SDCRAA has submitted three separate applications for coastal development permits covering the various Proposed Project components. The following provides the results of each application (see Appendix J2):

1. New administration office building: Coastal development permit (Item 16a – Application No. 6-20-0154) approved at the August 13, 2020 hearing;
2. Airside improvements and stormwater capture program: Coastal development permit (Item 11a – Application No. 6-20-0447) approved at the June 10, 2021 hearing; and
3. Terminal, roadway/circulation, and parking structure: Coastal development permit (Application No. 6-20-0611) approved at the September 10, 2021 hearing.

As described in Appendix J1, the Proposed Project would be consistent with each applicable policy, and public access to the shoreline would be maintained, coastal recreation uses and scenic views would be preserved, biological habitats and water quality would be protected, and no risks to human safety or property or other adverse impacts to the coastal environment that cannot be mitigated would occur. Impacts of the Proposed Project on coastal resources would not be significant, when compared to the No Action Alternative.

E. Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) and Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act, Section 6(f) Resources. Section 4.7.3 of the Final EA describes the construction and operational impacts for both the No Action and Proposed Project Alternatives. Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Project would not be implemented and there would be no impacts from construction or ongoing operations to Section 4(f) or Section 6(f) resources. Figure 3.8-1 shows that the detailed study area (airport boundary), where the Proposed Project will be constructed, does not contain any land that is considered a park or is used for recreational purposes. Figure 3.8-1 also shows that there are four Section 6(f) resources within the general study area. However, no direct or constructive use of any of these properties would occur nor would there be any conversion of a 6(f) property.

There are, however, two properties determined eligible for listing in the Historic Register (See Appendix E) within the airport boundary, the Convair Wind Tunnel Building and the United Airlines Hangar Terminal (UAHT) Building. As stated in Section 3.10.2 of the Final

EA, the UAHT will be relocated under a separate and independent project prior to the project construction. Section 4.7.3.2 of the Final EA states that the distance between the Proposed Project site and the two buildings would preclude indirect construction-related impacts such as dust, noise, or construction traffic, and the project will not inhibit access to either building by the public. In addition, as described in more detail in Section 4.9.3.2, of the Final EA implementation of the Proposed Project would not directly impact or constructively use either of these historic buildings.

Since there would be no physical or constructive use of any 4(f) resource by the Proposed Project Alternative, a separate DOT Act Section 4(f) evaluation is not required. In addition, there is no conversion of any 6(f) resource. Therefore, no mitigation measures for DOT Section 4(f) or Section 6(f) impacts are proposed.

- F. Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste.** As discussed in Section 3.9.1.2 and in Appendix D of the Final EA, past contamination at the Proposed Project site, although remediated at the former Naval Training Center (NTC) landfill and Teledyne Ryan (TDY) site, still exists at several locations east of the existing Terminal 1. A number of soil samples taken at the site exceed the Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) for total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH), and several groundwater samples exceed maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Therefore, the Proposed Project's ground disturbing activities could encounter contaminated soils and/or contaminated groundwater. Prior to construction, the construction contractor would prepare a Hazardous Materials Management Plan (HMMP) subject to review by SDCRAA, which would establish procedures for identification, screening, and agency notification, when contaminated soil and/or groundwater is encountered during site excavation. Areas identified as having contamination above acceptable limits would require encapsulation, removal and disposal, or other remediation measures set forth in a site-specific treatment plan and as required by applicable federal, state, and local laws.

In addition, soil gas was detected and remediated below regulatory thresholds at the TDY site, a portion of which underlies the proposed footprint of the new Terminal 1. The presence of soil gas could pose a risk during project operation by migrating into the proposed new Terminal 1 building and accumulating in levels that could pose a risk to human health. Based on the information that soil gas vapor was present at the former TDY site, it is not possible to conclude that soil vapor gas would not be present underneath the proposed new Terminal 1 building. SDCRAA has, as a project minimizing component, committed to implementing specific measures during site development in order to address areas of known or suspected contamination, summarized below and listed in full in Appendix A4:

A soil vapor survey with accompanying human health risk assessment shall be prepared for the area proposed for the new Terminal 1 building. If results of that assessment warrant remediation, such as in-situ soil vapor extraction (SVE) or ex-situ excavation and treatment, it shall be implemented to reduce levels to below site-specific risk-based concentrations (RBCs), or a vapor intrusion mitigation system shall be incorporated into the design of the new Terminal 1 building to ensure that indoor air concentrations do not exceed regulatory thresholds.

Finally, Section 4.8.3.2 of the Final EA identified asbestos and lead paint as two materials that are in some of the buildings to be demolished. Abatement of both materials would be completed according to Federal, State and local requirements.

Section 4.8.4 of the Final EA states there is no significance threshold for hazardous waste, solid waste, and pollution prevention. However, there are five factors to consider. Of these factors, two (involvement of a contaminated site and adversely affect human health and the environment) may be involved relative to the Proposed Project. However, project avoidance and minimization measures are incorporated into the Proposed Project, so that these factors are addressed. These measures include preparation of a HMMP to identify procedures for managing the contamination, including identification of the appropriate regulatory agency to provide oversight; completion of a monitoring well survey program; abatement of asbestos and lead prior to building demolition; and preparation of the soils vapor survey (see Appendix A4 of this EA). Consequently, impacts related to hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention from implementation of the Proposed Project would not reach a significance threshold and, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

G. Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources. As documented in Section 3.10.2.1 of the Final EA, the FAA delineated an APE for the proposed undertaking and coordinated the APE with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) who concurred with the APE by letter dated October 23, 2020. The California SHPO concurred with the FAA's findings of effect in a letter dated August 17, 2021, completing the Section 106 consultation process (see Appendix E1 of the Final EA). Section 4.9 of the Final EA describes the impacts the Proposed Project would have to historic properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Section 4.9.3.2 identifies two properties that are eligible for inclusion on the NRHP, the United Airlines Hangar and Terminal (UAHT) building and the Convair Wind Tunnel (CWT) building. Appendix E of the Final EA includes a copy of FAA's determination and findings of effect letter to the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

Under the No Action Alternative there would be no construction or operational impacts to either building. Under the Proposed Project, FAA determined that neither of the two historic properties that FAA determined eligible for inclusion into the NRHP would be adversely affected by the way of construction impacts or operational impacts after it was constructed. Thus, the Proposed Project would not involve any direct or indirect impacts to the buildings.

On October 28 and October 30, 2020, the FAA contacted the following tribes by submitting detailed information on the Proposed Project: La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians, San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians, Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians, Mesa Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians, Barona Group of the Capitan Grande, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, Sycuan Band of Kumeyaay Nation, Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, Kwaaymil Laguna Band of Mission Indians, Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, Jamul Indian Village, and the Inaja-Cosmit Band of Indians. FAA received two responses. The first response was an October 29, 2020 email from Ms. Lisa Cumper, the Jamul Indian Village Tribal Historic Preservation Officer. She requested any "*cultural and geo reports that are either available or come available.*" The second response was an October 29, 2020 email from Mr. Ray Teran, the Viejas Tribal Government, Resource Management Director, who stated a desire to enter into consultation. In seeking further clarification on the issues of interest to the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, Mr. Teran, stated in a January 11, 2021 email, that they had already "had a very detailed meeting with the management of the San Diego Airport

and their consultants.” Mr. Teran requested us to contact Mr. Tracy Stropes, the Senior Project Archaeologist, who is aware of their concerns.

Impacts on historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural resources from implementation of the Proposed Project would not be significant; therefore, no mitigation measures are required. However, the FAA requires as a condition of this FONSI/ROD, that SDCRAA implement the following avoidance and minimization measures based on FAA’s consultation with the California SHPO in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA:

- In consultation with the Jamul Indian Village Tribe, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority will provide the tribe with any cultural and geological reports that are either available or come available.
- In consultation with the Viejas Tribal Government, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority has agreed to respect the cultural perspective of the Native American Community that the SDIA property was part of the traditional use area for Native Americans during the prehistoric habitation of the bay area. Because of the Native American history in the area, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority will accommodate the request by the Viejas Tribal Government that a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor be present during excavation activities associated with implementation of the San Diego International Airport - Airport Development Plan. This Excavation Monitoring will be limited to those areas of the construction project that are located beneath the modern dredge and fill soils that were imported to this location to create the airport. Monitoring the excavation of any soil associated with imported fill material will not be required.
- The Excavation Monitoring will be conducted in the area designated for the Airport Development Plan, which includes the replacement of Terminal 1, a new parking facility, and associated roadway and aircraft apron improvements that are within the planning jurisdiction of the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority. Native American monitoring will always be conducted in conjunction with archaeological monitoring, and a qualified archaeologist will be responsible for the determination of when appropriate soil horizons are encountered that would necessitate Native American and archaeological monitoring.
- The Excavation Monitoring will be conducted within the areas identified in Figure 1-2 [of the Draft EA].
- The specifics of the Excavation Monitoring program will be described in a Memorandum of Agreement, which will be prepared and agreed to by the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority and the Viejas Tribal Government.

H. Land Use. Section 4.10 of the Final EA states that SAN is under the jurisdiction of the SDCRAA and is not under the land use authority of the City of San Diego or its General Plan. SAN land use designations are identified in the Airport Land Use Plan, which is a SDCRAA program-level planning guide that depicts the boundaries of SAN and designates locations for the four general land use categories: Airfield, Terminal, Ground Transportation, and Airport Support. Under the No Action Alternative there would be no change in Land Use. Under the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project improvements would be limited to within the existing SAN boundaries and adjacent public rights-of-ways and would not extend into, or cross through, surrounding communities. The terminal modifications and other components of the Proposed Project would be comparable to, and compatible with, the other airport-related uses that currently exist and no new uses would be established. Therefore, the Proposed Project would continue to be consistent with the Airport Land Use Plan’s land designations and would also continue to be consistent with

existing applicable land use plans governing development in areas surrounding SAN, including the Port of San Diego Port Master Plan and San Diego General Plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to land use, when compared to the No Action Alternative.

- I. Natural Resources and Energy Supply.** Section 4.11 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project and the No Action Alternatives would not have a significant impact on natural resources and energy supply. Under the No Action Alternative there would be no change in energy use. Construction of the Proposed Project would increase the use of water and energy for dust suppression and power requirements. However, the water demand will be partially met with recycled (non-potable) water. In addition, the construction of the Proposed Project is expected to consume, on average, approximately 123 acre-feet of water per year over a 5 year period. This is less than the 179 and 200 acre feet of water that is estimated to be used during the operation of the project in 2026 and 2031 respectively, and is less than 0.08% of the San Diego County Water Authority's expected demand for which there are adequate supplies. There is also adequate energy supplies and natural resources to meet the construction and operational needs of the airport.
- J. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use.** Section 4.12 of the Final EA evaluates noise from construction and operation of the Proposed Project and the No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, none of the proposed components would be constructed and there would be no resulting noise impacts. The FAA does not have a significance threshold for construction noise but it can look to accepted methodologies from the appropriate modal administration. The impact threshold for construction noise is defined in the Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (TNAP), which is derived from the Caltrans Standard Specifications for 2018 and provides some insight in determining if a significant impact may occur. The TNAP includes factors to consider, when evaluating noise from construction activities, such as:
- a. Whether activities from construction noise exceed 86 dB at 50 feet from the job site activities from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m.
 - b. Whether construction equipment with internal combustion engines are equipped with the manufacturer recommended muffler.

Section 4.12.3.2 of the Final EA evaluates construction noise impacts under a worst-case scenario that all of the pieces of construction equipment were operating on the same site at the same time. The total L_{eq} at a distance of 50 feet from the activity would be 96.9 dB. Based on a point-source noise (i.e., construction equipment noise) fall-off rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance, construction noise would decrease to 86 dB (i.e., the threshold of significance) at a distance of 175 feet from the edge of construction activity. The majority of the Proposed Project site is surrounded by airport uses, such as on-airport roads and parking facilities to the southwest, existing terminals to the west, aircraft taxiways and the runway to the north and northeast, and surface parking to the east. There are no noise-sensitive uses located within 175 feet of construction activity areas associated with the Proposed Project. Additionally, equipping internal combustion engines with appropriate mufflers, as provided by the manufacturer, is a standard requirement of construction contracts for projects at SAN. Based on the above, no significant construction noise impacts would occur from the Proposed Project, when compared to the No Action Alternative.

Section 4.12.3.2 also evaluated operational noise of the Proposed Project. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not change the number of aircraft operations, type of aircraft, nor flight paths that would otherwise occur in 2026 and 2031 under the No Action Alternative. CNEL contours associated with the Proposed Project in 2026 and 2031 are the same as those of the No Action Alternative. Section 4.12.3.2 states: *“Implementation of the Proposed Project would not change the number of aircraft operations, type of aircraft, nor flight paths that would otherwise occur in 2026 and 2031 under the No Action Alternative.”* The only difference in aircraft operations would be where aircraft are parked and this would not change the CNEL contours. There would be no significant noise impact from the Proposed Project compared to the No Action Alternative.

K. Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks. Section 4.13 of the Final EA discusses each of these topics in subsections within the section.

Socioeconomic. Section 4.13.1.3 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project would occur within the existing SAN boundaries and surrounding rights-of way and no displacement of people or residents would occur during construction, because there are no residences or people living on or adjacent to the Proposed Project site. The socioeconomic data for the 32 census tracts that are located within, or intersect with the GSA were examined in the Final EA, along with corresponding data for the City of San Diego and County of San Diego to assess potential impacts to socioeconomics resulting from the Proposed Project.

A traffic study evaluated the effects of the Proposed Project on 43 intersections and 44 roadway segments within the GSA for future years 2026 and 2031. Figure 3.14-4 shows the location of the transportation facilities surrounding SAN evaluated in the Final EA.

Section 4.13.1.3 of the Final EA states the No Action Alternative would have no construction impacts, and operations and maintenance would continue as they currently operate; therefore, there would be no change or effect to socioeconomic impacts.

Under the Proposed Project Alternative, construction of Phase B would displace existing concessionaires within the existing Terminal 1 when the existing Terminal 1 is demolished. New concession opportunities would be available at the same time in the portion of the replacement Terminal 1 constructed in Phase A. The temporary displacement of concessionaire businesses would not cause economic hardship on the local community.

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would generate increased traffic associated with construction employees and deliveries in the vicinity of SAN. As part of the Proposed Project, SDCRAA will implement a Construction Traffic Management Program. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities and limited disruption to local traffic patterns and reduction in the LOS of roads serving SAN and its surrounding communities, construction-related traffic for the Proposed Project would not substantially reduce the levels of service of roads serving the airport and the surrounding community.

Under operations of the Proposed Project, projected increases in long-term employment would occur at a similar, but higher levels, as would occur under the No Action Alternative. This is due to the increased size of the replacement Terminal 1, which would likely increase the number of security, janitorial, and concessionaire staff needed to support the facility. The operational traffic analysis results for all 43 intersections and 44 roadway

segments evaluated shows that there would not be a degradation of level of service (LOS) from LOS A, B, C, or D to LOS E or F between the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Project for any intersection or roadway segment in either 2026 or 2031. Only one intersection in the LOS group of E or F (Intersection #3 – Pacific Highway at Enterprise Street) would have a modest increase in delay (1.7 seconds). Further, as shown in Tables 4.13-2 and 4.13-4, the average daily traffic along North Harbor Drive roadway segments would be substantially reduced which, in turn, would result in an improvement, as compared to the No Action Alternative. As such, when compared to the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Project would not disrupt local traffic patterns.

Impacts associated with socioeconomics from implementation of the Proposed Project would not be significant, when compared to the No Action Alternative.

Environmental Justice. As identified in Section 3.13.2 of the Final EA, the average percentage of minority population in the study area is approximately 15 percent lower than San Diego County as a whole and approximately 18 percent lower than the City as a whole. The percentage of low-income population (below the national poverty level) in the study area is approximately 5.7 percent (approximately 5.9 percent lower than the County on average and 7.1 percent lower than the City as a whole). Thus, on average, the minority or low-income population of the analysis area is not “meaningfully greater” than that of the surrounding areas.

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction impacts, and operations and maintenance would continue as they currently operate; therefore, there would be no change or effect to minority or low-income populations.

Section 4.13.2.3 states that no significant adverse impacts during construction are anticipated, including impacts to air quality, climate, noise, or traffic. Further, there is no impact that would affect a minority or low-income population in a unique manner or place impacts on minority and low-income populations greater than the overall population. Therefore, there would not be disproportionately high or adverse impacts to an environmental justice community from constructing the Proposed Project.

While the minority or low-income population of the analysis area is not “meaningfully greater” than that of the surrounding areas, seven of the 32 census tracts within the GSA have a minority population of 50 percent or greater and, therefore, can be considered environmental justice populations. These individual census tracts typically located near the edges of the study area, which, given the greater distance from SAN, are less affected by the Proposed Project (including associated aircraft and traffic noise, air pollutant emissions, and traffic) than the communities closer to SAN and, thus, would not be disproportionately impacted. As described above, the Proposed Project would not disrupt local traffic patterns or substantially reduce the levels of service of roads serving an airport and its surrounding communities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not create a disproportionately high or adverse impact to minority or low-income populations.

Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks. Section 4.13.3 of the Final EA states that the GSA was used to evaluate children’s environmental health and safety. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction activity; the SDCRAA would continue to operate the airport, perform maintenance and serve the public. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in a disproportionate health or safety risk to children.

Under the Proposed Project, construction-related air quality impacts on the residential and recreational areas, including schools, near and within the Proposed Project area, would not exceed applicable significance thresholds (see Section 4.3). Similarly, no significant noise, hazardous materials, or health-related impacts are expected during construction. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in disproportionate health and safety risks to children. For operational impacts, as described throughout this EA, no significant adverse impacts relative to air, climate, land use, noise or other resource areas would occur during construction or operation of the Proposed Project, as compared to the No Action Alternative. Additionally, no relocation, acquisition, or alteration of schools, residences, day cares, parks, or any other facilities associated with children or childcare would occur. Therefore, the operation of the Proposed Project would not create environmental health or safety risks that may disproportionately affect children.

- L. Visual Effects.** Section 4.14 of the Final EA states that no construction activities would occur under the No Action Alternative. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in construction-related or operational visual or light emission impacts.

Section 4.14.3.2 of the Final EA states that all construction activities would incorporate temporary construction fencing/barriers to screen construction activities and equipment and would be further screened from off-site adjacent areas by existing airport buildings, elevated roadways, and landscaping. Construction activities would not block or obstruct public views of a visual resource. Construction activities would occur primarily during the daytime; any nighttime construction activities would generate similar sources of light compared to existing conditions and would need to adhere to FAA guidance to avoid causing light impacts or glare to aircraft or air traffic controllers. The light emissions from construction activities would not create annoyance or interfere with normal activities. Refer to Section 4.4, Biological Resources, and Appendix C1 for discussion of conservation measures that would be implemented should nighttime construction be necessary within the vicinity of the CLT nesting ovals. In summary, construction of the Proposed Project would not produce any of the factors that FAA considers significant for visual effects.

As shown in the conceptual visual simulation in Appendix H, the proposed new facilities (with building heights ranging between 60 and 90 feet) would be compatible and consistent with the existing urban character of the surrounding environment, and they would not block or obstruct public views of a visual resource. The same would be true relative to the proposed relocation of three FAA ASDE-X sensors. The size and design of the sensors are not of a nature that would block views or be inconsistent with the existing urban character of the surround environment.

The Proposed Project would contribute new sources of lighting typical of a modern airport, which currently contains moderate to high levels of ambient lighting. The Proposed Project would incorporate adequate nighttime lighting similar to existing development at SAN, and all lighting for new facilities would be shielded and directed downward to minimize light spillover. These measures, as well as diligent maintenance of fencing around the perimeter of the CLT ovals, would shield the California least terns from adverse lighting effect (refer to Section 4.4, Biological Resources). Thus, the light emissions from the proposed new facilities would not create annoyance or interfere with normal activities. Refer to Appendix C1 and Appendix A4 for discussion of operations and site enhancement conservation measures that would be implemented within the vicinity of the CLT nesting ovals.

In summary, operation of the Proposed Project would not produce any of the factors that FAA considers potentially significant for visual effects. Since the construction phase and the operational phase of the Proposed Project would not produce any factor that may lead to a significant impact to visual effects, the Proposed Project would not have a significant visual impact.

- M. Water Resources.** Under the No Action Alternative, construction of the proposed facilities would not occur and there would be no construction impacts to water resources. However, under this scenario the SAN Stormwater Capture and Reuse System would not be expanded, and new sub-surface infiltration areas associated with the Proposed Project would not be built and, as such, continued release of copper and zinc would occur in increasing quantities as aviation activities continued to increase.

Under the Proposed Project, as addressed in Section 4.8.3.2 and Appendix D of the Final EA, there is the potential for contaminated groundwater to be encountered. Prior to construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan would be prepared, subject to approval by SDCRAA, establishing procedures for identification, screening, and notification, of contaminated groundwater encountered during site excavation. Remediation measures would be set forth in a site-specific treatment plan, as required by applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Construction of the Proposed Project would include materials containing chemicals and other potential water quality pollutants, which if released to the environment could lead to a violation in water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Such materials are regulated by various federal, state, and local requirements related to hazardous materials/wastes. Additionally, construction of the Proposed Project would be subject to the requirements of the SWRCB Construction General Permit (Order No. 2010-0014-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002), which requires construction projects with coverage under the Construction General Permit to implement a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP.) Based on the above, the potential for the Proposed Project's construction impacts would not be significant, when compared to the No Action Alternative.

Section 4.15.3.2 states that there is no surface water on SAN property. Groundwater underlying SAN ranges from approximately seven to 12 feet below ground surface and does not support beneficial uses. Thus, operation of the Proposed Project would not affect public drinking water sources. Implementation of the Proposed Project would involve development of airfield components, a new/replacement terminal and other buildings, apron areas, and roadway improvements, all of which are similar in nature and operation to those of existing facilities at SAN. However, under the proposed project, the SAN Stormwater Capture and Reuse System, designed to capture at least 80 percent of the average annual runoff volume, would decrease the flow and volume of stormwater exiting the airport through the outfalls. The Proposed Project's storm water management plan and the storm water elements would help ensure that the SDCRAA will comply with the State's MS4 Permit and the Industrial General Permit, treating copper and zinc and meeting the numeric action levels in the Industrial General Permit, and the SDCRAA's goals listed in the San Diego Bay Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan. Based on the above, the Proposed Project's operations-related pollutants would not cause an exceedance of water quality standards established by federal, state, local, or tribal regulatory; therefore, the Proposed Project's impact would not be significant.

N. Cumulative Impacts. The past, present and reasonably foreseeable cumulative actions included in the cumulative impact analysis are presented in Section 4.16 of the Final EA, Cumulative Impacts. Tables 4.16-1, 4.16-2 and 4.16-3 of the Final EA identify the various Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects from Civic San Diego and City of San Diego, the Port of San Diego and SAN respectively. The evaluation of cumulative impacts from these cumulative actions is discussed in Section 4.16 of the Final EA. No significant cumulative impacts were identified when comparing the Proposed Project to the No Action Alternative.

6. Environmentally Preferred Alternative and FAA Preferred Alternative.

In connection with its decision to approve the proposed ALP revisions, the FAA considered the environmental impacts from the Proposed Project and the No Action Alternative. Based on the analysis of environmental impacts in the Final EA, the No Action Alternative has fewer environmental effects than the Proposed Project Alternative and thus would be the environmentally preferred alternative. In addition to identifying the environmentally preferred alternative, the FAA also identifies the FAA preferred alternative. In selecting the agency's preferred alternative, the FAA considers a variety of factors, including the ability of the alternatives to satisfy the purpose and need of the project as well as environmental impacts of the alternatives examined in the EA. However, the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project. Furthermore, after mitigation, there are no significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project. Finally, the Proposed Project fully satisfies the purpose and need. Thus, the FAA's preferred alternative is the Proposed Project as defined in the Final EA and this FONSI/ROD. FAA selected this alternative because it meets the Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project with various mitigation measures resulting in no significant adverse environmental effects.

7. Public Participation.

SDCRAA issued a Notice of Availability of the Draft EA on June 16, 2021. The Notice of Availability also announced that a Public Meeting would take place on July 19, 2021. The Notice of Availability was published in the San Diego Union-Tribune (including the Spanish language version) and the Daily Transcript newspapers on June 16, 2021 and placed on the SDCRAA's website the same day at www.san.org/plan. Hard copies of the Draft EA were available for public review at the SDCRAA Airport Authority Administration Building and nearby public libraries. The Draft EA was also available electronically (in PDF format) for download from the SDCRAA's website at www.san.org/plan. The Draft EA was available for review and comment by the public, government agencies, and interested parties until the close of the comment period on August 2, 2021. Eight comment submittals (two submittals via U.S. mail and six submittals via electronic mail [email]) were received on the Draft EA. The submittals and responses to these submittals are presented in Appendix N. No issues were raised in these comments that resulted in a change in a determination of effects.

8. Inter-Agency Coordination.

In accordance with 49 USC § 47101(h), the FAA has determined that no further coordination with the U.S. Department of Interior or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is necessary because the Proposed Project 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.

9. Reasons for the Determination that the Proposed Project will have No Significant Impacts.

The attached Final EA examines each of the various environmental resources that were determined present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Project. The proposed Airfield Improvements and Terminal 1 Replacement Project at SAN would not involve any environmental impacts, after mitigation, that 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 that the Proposed Project meets the purpose and need for the proposed action, would not cause any significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated, and is the most reasonable, feasible and prudent alternative. The FAA has decided to approve the FAA's Federal actions relative to the Proposed Project as is described in Section 3 of this FONSI/ROD.

10. Agency Findings.

The FAA makes the following determinations for this project based on information and analysis set forth in the Final EA and other portions of the administrative record.

- a. **The project is reasonably consistent with existing plans of public agencies for development of the area [49 U.S.C. 47106(a)].** The proposed project is consistent with the plans, goals and policies for the area. The Proposed Project improvements would be limited to within the existing SAN boundaries and adjacent public rights-of-ways and would not extend into or cross through surrounding communities. SAN is under the jurisdiction of the SDCRAA and is not under the land use authority of the City of San Diego or its General Plan. As described in Section 4.10.3.2 of the Final EA, the Proposed Project would be consistent with, and not conflict with, the applicable land use plans. The Proposed Project is also consistent with the applicable regulations and policies of federal, State and local agencies.
- b. **Independent and Objective Evaluation:** As required by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR § 1506.5) the FAA has independently and objectively evaluated this proposed project. As described in the Final EA, the Proposed Project and the No Action Alternatives were studied extensively to determine the potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures for those impacts. The FAA provided input, advice, and expertise throughout the analysis, along with administrative and legal review of the project
- c. **National Historic Preservation Act:** The Proposed Project will not adversely affect the two buildings (UAHT and CWT buildings) determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. FAA conducted the required consultation with the California SHPO pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. FAA requires as a condition of this FONSI/ROD, the avoidance and minimization measures described in Section 5(G) above to ensure compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA.
- d. **Air Quality.** SAN is located in the San Diego County Air Basin. This air basin is classified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as a severe non-attainment area for Ozone and maintenance for Carbon Monoxide (CO). As shown in Tables 4.3-4 and 4.3-5, operational emissions in 2026 and 2031 would be substantially less than the operational emissions that would otherwise occur under the No Action Alternative. The reduced

emissions associated with the Proposed Project are due to a combination of improved aircraft taxiing efficiency associated with the new linear concourse for Terminal 1 coupled with a new Taxiway A and emission reductions from project design features including, but not limited to, ground support equipment conversion to alternative fuels. Since emissions are less than *de minimis*, a general conformity determination is not required. The Proposed Project will not induce additional aircraft traffic into or out of SAN nor would it change aircraft type. Airport operational emissions will not change since there would be no change in the number and type of aircraft operating at SAN resulting from these projects.

- e. **Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations: and Department of Transportation Order 5610.2, Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations:** The Proposed Project would not cause a significant impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in surface traffic impacts that would create disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts on minority or low-income populations. There is no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts on minority or low-income populations caused by the Proposed Project.
- f. **Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks:** The FAA has determined there would be no change in risk to health or safety for children caused by the Proposed Project.
- g. **Surface Transportation.** The Proposed Project would not induce additional aircraft and surface operations at SAN.
- h. **Avoidance and Minimization Measures.** Based on the information contained in the Final EA, the FAA has determined that all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the Proposed Project have been adopted. The Proposed Project avoids and minimizes environmental harm in a variety of ways by including minimization elements for air quality and climate, biological resources, hazardous materials, archaeological and cultural resource and construction traffic. These minimization measures include, but are not limited to, converting vehicles to zero emissions, providing gate electrification at all new gates, requiring LEED Silver Certification and a cool roof for the terminal, providing charging stations for the public, minimizing impacts to the California least tern from noise, light and other construction impacts, implementing a hazardous materials management plan, asbestos and lead paint removal, conducting a vapor intrusion assessment and constructing a vapor barrier if necessary, having a cultural monitor at excavation areas, establishing a construction coordination office that will work with the traffic department, and requiring an orientation for all construction personnel. See Appendix A4 for a complete list. Therefore, the FAA has concluded that all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the selected alternative have been adopted.
- i. As necessary, before construction begins, FAA review 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*, [14 CFR Part 139 and 49 USC § 44706].
- j. As necessary, after construction is completed, FAA review of changes to the airport's certification manual following completion of construction of the proposed project pursuant to [14 C.F.R. Part 139].

- k. As necessary, after construction is completed, FAA review of appropriate amendments to air carrier operations specifications pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 44705.

10. Decision and Orders.

Based on the information in this FONSI/ROD and supported by detailed discussion in the Final EA, the FAA has selected the proposed Airfield Improvements and Terminal 1 Replacement Project as the FAA's Preferred Alternative. The FAA must select one of the following choices:

- Approve agency actions necessary to implement the Proposed Project, or
- Disapprove agency actions to implement the Proposed Project.

Approval signifies that applicable federal requirements relating to the proposed airport development and planning have been met. Approval permits the SDCRAA to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Project and associated mitigation measures. Disapproval would prevent the SDCRAA from implementing the Proposed Project elements within SAN.

Under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, I find that the project is reasonably supported. I, therefore, direct that action be taken to carry out the agency actions discussed more fully in Section 3 of this FONSI/ROD.

1. Unconditional approval of the ALP to depict the proposed improvements subject to FAA approval pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 47107(a)(16).
2. Determinations under 49 U.S.C. §§ 47106 and 47107 that are associated with the eligibility of the Proposed Project for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program and under 49 U.S.C. § 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR § 158.25, to use passenger facility charges collected at the airport to assist with construction of potentially eligible development items from the ALP.
3. Approval for and relocation of ASDE-X sensors (49 U.S.C 44502 (a)(1)).

This order is issued under applicable statutory authorities, including 49 USC §§ 40101(d), 40103(b), 40113(a), 44701, 44706, 44718(b), and 47101 et seq.

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

APPROVED:

RAQUEL GIRVIN

Digitally signed by RAQUEL
GIRVIN
Date: 2021.10.22 12:50:13 -07'00'

Raquel Girvin
Regional Administrator
Western-Pacific Region, AWP-1

Date

DISAPPROVED:

Raquel Girvin
Regional Administrator
Western-Pacific Region, AWP-1

Date

RIGHT OF APPEAL

This FONSI/ROD constitutes a final order of the FAA Administrator and is subject to exclusive judicial review under 49 U.S.C. § 46110 by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person contesting the decision resides or has its principal place of business. Any party having substantial interest in this order may apply for review of the decision by filing a petition for review in the appropriate U.S. Court of Appeals no later than 60 days after the order is issued in accordance with the provisions of 49 U.S.C. § 46110.