

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

---

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

---

**Proposed Airfield and Terminal Modernization Project**

Los Angeles International Airport  
Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California



For further information

David B. Kessler  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Western-Pacific Region  
Office of Airports  
777 South Aviation Boulevard, Suite 150  
El Segundo, California 90245  
424-405-7315

December 13, 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 and Terminal Modernization Project (ATMP) at Los Angeles International Airport located in Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment dated December 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 Alternative, which are evaluated in detail in this FONSI and ROD. This document also identifies the environmentally preferable alternative and the agency-preferred alternative. This document identifies applicable and required mitigation.

**BACKGROUND.** In May 2021, the City of Los Angeles, through its Airport Department, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA). The Draft EA addressed the potential environmental effects of the proposed ATMP 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*. LAWA published the Notice of Availability for the Draft EA and Draft General Conformity Determination on May 27, 2021. LAWA received in total, 31 comment letters comprising 175 bracketed comments. Two comment letters were rescinded and replaced. Each rescinded comment letter counts as one; therefore, the 31 comment letters include two rescinded letters on the draft EA and the draft General Conformity Determination during the public comment period held between May 27, 2021 and July 27, 2021. There were no specific comments on the Draft General Conformity Determination. LAWA received two late-filed comment in September 2021 from the City of Culver City and the Airline Airport Affairs Committee that substituted their timely filed comment letters with replacement letters. The Final EA became a Federal document when the Responsible FAA signed the document on December 2, 2021.

**WHAT SHOULD YOU DO?** Read the FONSI and ROD to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed ATMP at Los Angeles International Airport.

**WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS?** The LAWA 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 AND TERMINAL MODERNIZATION PROJECT**

**LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT  
LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

- 1. Introduction.** This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the environment and Record of Decision (ROD) (FONSI/ROD) of the proposed Airfield and Terminal Modernization Project (ATMP) at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California. The City of Los Angeles, through its Airport Department, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), is the sponsor for LAX. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before being able to take the proposed federal actions. 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 ATMP 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, as amended (Public Laws 97-248, 100-223, and 115-254).
- 2. Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project.** The overall purpose of and the need for the Proposed Project is to develop and maintain safe and efficient airport facilities that are consistent with the airport sponsor’s (LAWA) goals and objectives. Section 1.2.2 of the Final EA describes the specific *purpose* of the Proposed Project is to improve taxiway components on the north airfield to meet FAA airport design standards, and improve operational flexibility, provide new terminal and concourse facilities to improve passenger quality-of-service, and provide roadway access to the new passenger processing facilities while also improving access to the Central Terminal Area (CTA). Table 1-1 in the Final EA discloses the historical and forecast composition of the annual aircraft operations at LAX. The majority of aircraft operations at LAX are commercial aircraft operations. Table 1-2 discloses the historic and forecast passenger enplanements at LAX. Section 1.2 of the Final EA states FAA’s purpose and need is to ensure the components of the Proposed Project subject to FAA approval do not derogate aviation safety and meet FAA airport design standards at LAX.

Table 1-3 of the Final EA identifies both the *purpose* and the *need* for the various Proposed Project components. The need for the Proposed Project is based on the existing airfield configuration, the limitations on existing terminal and gate arrangement, and the limitations

on the existing LAX access roadway system. Table 1-3 divides the ***purpose*** and ***need*** into three basic categories: Airfield, Terminal, and Landside.

The following describes the ***need*** for the various ATMP components:

***Airfield:***

- Taxiway intersections at Runway 6R-24L do not meet current FAA airport design standards and do not provide desirable lines-of-sight for pilots when crossing Runway 6R-24L.
- Limited number and existing design of taxiways connecting Runways 6L-24R and 6R-24L limit the runway exit taxiways arriving aircraft can use and limit the ability to hold aircraft between the runways, which limits operational flexibility to manage arrival and departure operations between Runways 6L-24R and 6R-24L
- The lack of full-length parallel taxiways limits options to manage aircraft movement between the dual parallel taxiways and the inboard runways, which hinders effective operational management of aircraft movement during peak periods.
- Limited taxiway-to-taxiway segments that provide Airplane Design Group (ADG) VI separation standards, which hinders effective operational management of aircraft when ADG VI aircraft are operating on the airfield.

***Terminal:***

- West Remote Gates are inefficient and provide a poor level of service for passengers as they can only be accessed by buses from existing terminals within the CTA
- West Remote Gates provide no passenger amenities or concessions within the holding areas
- Limited connectivity among international and domestic carriers that share the same passengers
- Limited international passenger processing capabilities at the eastern end of the CTA

***Landside:***

- LAX Landside Access Modernization Program Phase 2 roadway system improvements did not contemplate proposed terminal facilities and need to be modified to provide access to the proposed facilities.
- Access into and egress from the CTA relies on limited off-airport roadway capacity and complex entry/exit points to and from the airport roadways which creates traffic congestion during peak airport periods on the public roadways near the main entrance to the CTA and impacts non-airport through-traffic flow for surrounding communities.

This FONSI/ROD addresses LAWA's proposed improvements as described below.

**3. Proposed Project and Federal Action.** The Proposed Project includes site preparation, grading, as needed, installation of drainage structures, paving, marking and lighting of various airfield pavement, and construction of the following component listing in Section 1.3.1 of the Final EA. The Proposed Project evaluated in this FONSI/ROD includes the following major project components:

▪ **Airfield Elements**

- Remove and replace Runway 6L-24R acute-angled runway exit Taxiways Y and Z between Runway 6R-24L and parallel Taxiway E with four new acute-angled runway exit taxiways with updated signage and lighting, including lighting compatible with FAA's Runway Status Light (RWSL) system.<sup>i</sup>
- Extend parallel Taxiway D from Taxiway C14 west to meet Taxiway E17, relocate a vehicle service road (VSR) south according to ADG VI FAA separation design standards and install updated signage and lighting.
- Construct improvements and an easterly extension of Taxiway C from Taxiway C3 to Taxiway B1 and relocate VSR C to meet ADG VI FAA separation standards and install updated signage and lighting.
- Terminal/Concourse-related airfield elements
  - Extend Taxiway E east of Taxiway D7 for access to Concourse 0 and maintain unrestricted ADG V and restricted ADG VI capability
  - Extend Taxiway D east of Taxiway D7 and relocate the VSR between Taxiway E and Taxiway D south of the extended Taxiway D for access to Concourse 0 and provide simultaneous unrestricted ADG VI movement on Taxiway E and unrestricted ADG V movement on Taxiway D
  - Construct paved area located at the eastern ends of extended Taxiway D and Taxiway E that could be used for aircraft pushbacks for the northeastern gate at Concourse 0 and temporarily hold departing aircraft waiting to access Runway 6R-24L for takeoff
  - Construct aircraft parking apron and taxiways connecting Concourse 0 to the north airfield
  - Construct aircraft parking apron and a taxiway connecting Terminal 9 to the south airfield

▪ **Terminal Elements**

- Remove 15 of the existing 18 West Remote Gates and construct Concourse 0 and Terminal 9
  - Decommission 15 passenger gates and associated holding areas located at the West Remote Gates in the western part of LAX
  - Construct Concourse 0 east of Terminal 1 with up to 11 narrow body aircraft passenger gates servicing domestic and international passengers and remove two existing

---

<sup>i</sup> Runway Status Lights tell pilots and vehicle operators to stop when runways are not safe. Embedded in the pavement of runways and taxiways, the lights automatically turn red when other traffic makes it dangerous to enter, cross, or begin takeoff. The lights provide direct, immediate alerts and require no input from controllers.

passenger gates at Terminal 1 resulting in a net gain of nine new narrow body aircraft passenger gates at the northeast area of the CTA<sup>ii,iii</sup>

- Construct Terminal 9 east of S. Sepulveda Boulevard and south of W. Century Boulevard with up to 12 wide body aircraft passenger gates servicing domestic and international passengers resulting in a net gain of 12 new wide body aircraft passenger gates at the southeast area of the CTA<sup>iv</sup>

- **Roadway Improvements**

- Construct access and egress roadways for Terminal 9 to and from off-airport roadways and the CTA as illustrated on Figure 1-6 of the Final EA.

Construct roadway segment improvements listed in Table 1-4 of the Final EA and shown on Figure 1-6 of the Final EA in the vicinity of the W. Century Boulevard/S. Sepulveda Boulevard intersection to improve efficient movement into and out of the CTA that are dedicated airport access and egress roadway segments exclusively used for airport patrons and employees on airport-owned land or rights-of-way acquired or controlled by LAWA.

The federal actions necessary to carry out 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.
- Construction, installation, relocation and/or upgrade of various navigational aids, weather-observing equipment, and visual aids including but not limited to Runway Status Lights, runway edge lights, taxiway edge lighting and signage and associated utility lines. This equipment is necessary to ensure the safety of air navigation for aircraft operations at the airport.

---

<sup>ii</sup> Development of Concourse 0 could accommodate up to five wide body aircraft and three narrow body aircraft, instead of 11 narrow body aircraft, using the same gates and passenger boarding bridges available for 11 narrow body aircraft; however, because the primary operator at Concourse 0 is anticipated to be Southwest Airlines for the foreseeable future, which currently only has narrow body aircraft in its fleet, the primary use of the subject facility is anticipated and environmentally assessed in the EA to be for narrow body aircraft. As part of the development of Concourse 0, two existing passenger gates at Terminal 1 would be removed, resulting in a net increase of nine narrow body aircraft passenger gates. Based on the range, the net gain of passenger gates would be between six and nine passenger gates.

<sup>iii</sup> Per FAA AC 150/5060-5, “Capacity (throughput capacity) is a measure of the maximum number of aircraft operations which can be accommodated on the airport or airport component in an hour.” Airfield capacity is, therefore, a function of the number of runways and hourly throughput – **not a function of the number of passenger gates**. The increase in passenger gates does not affect airfield capacity. See U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, *Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5060-5, Airport Capacity and Delay*, paragraph 1-3(c), September 23, 1983. Available: [https://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/Advisory\\_Circular/150\\_5060\\_5.pdf](https://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/Advisory_Circular/150_5060_5.pdf).

<sup>iv</sup> Terminal 9 is proposed to include a Multiple Aircraft Ramp System (MARS) to provide LAWA with the operational flexibility to serve multiple aircraft fleet-mixes over time. The gates at Terminal 9 could accommodate up to 12 wide body aircraft (e.g., Boeing B777 and B787 and Airbus A350 and A380), or up to 18 narrow body aircraft, or various combinations thereof. Terminal 9 would primarily serve international flights, with capabilities to also serve domestic flights. In light of anticipated future growth in international flights to and from LAX, it is anticipated that Terminal 9 would be utilized primarily by wide body aircraft. Therefore, for purposes of the environmental analysis in the EA, it is assumed Terminal 9 would be operated with 12 wide body aircraft passenger gates.

4. **Reasonable Alternatives Considered.** Table 2-2 in Chapter 2 of the Final EA, used a detailed three-step alternatives analysis screening process for each of the major project components of Airfield, Terminal and Landside. This FONSI/ROD summarizes the screening used below:

**Step 1 – Would the Alternative Meet the Purpose and Need?**

*Airfield:* Does the airfield component alternative reconfigure north airfield runway exit taxiways and runway/taxiway intersections to meet current FAA airport design standards to enhance safety of the north airfield complex? Does the airfield component alternative provide additional flexibility for management of aircraft movements on the north airfield by providing additional runway exit taxiways and taxiway options that can hold aircraft between runways? Does the airfield component alternative provide full length dual parallel taxiways to the inboard runways and meet separation standards along the proposed segment to enhance operational management of aircraft movements on the airfield?

*Terminal:* Would the terminal component alternative improve passenger experience by replacing West Remote Gates with new passenger gates accessed from contiguous CTA processing facilities? Would the terminal component alternative improve international passenger processing and connectivity capabilities to terminals in a distributed manner throughout the CTA with access to more than one mode of transportation?

*Landside:* Does the landside component alternative enhance the previously-approved LAX Landside Access Modernization Program Phase 2 roadway system improvements to provide access to all terminal facilities including proposed terminals if appropriate, refinements to reduce congestion on nearby public roads, including S. Sepulveda Boulevard, and reduce complexity of CTA access?

**Step 2 – Would the Alternative be feasible to construct within operational and physical constraints at the airport?** The following applies to all three major components: Airfield, Terminal, and Landside: Would the alternative or component alternative be feasible to construct within the physical constraints of the airport environment? Does the alternative or component alternative maximize operational feasibility?

**Step 3 – Further detailed analysis of environmental impacts in the EA.**

Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the Final EA, evaluated the “Use of Other Public Airports,” and “Aircraft Operations Demand Management” alternatives in addition to the proposed on-airport build alternatives and the No Action Alternative to the Proposed Project. Analysis of the No Action Alternative is required pursuant to 40 CFR § 1502.14(d)[1978. ]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.”*

The No Action Alternative has fewer environmental effects than the Proposed Project. However, the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the proposed project.

Section 2.4.4 of the Final EA describes and evaluates the Component alternatives of proposed ATMP at LAX. Table 2-3 in the Final EA summarizes the results of the alternatives screening process. The Use of Other Public Airports and Aircraft Operations Demand Management Alternatives did not pass Step 1. The Proposed Project and No Action alternative passed Step 2 and were retained for Step 3 analysis in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the Final EA for detailed impact analysis. Appendix C of the Final EA provides more details on the results of the alternatives analysis.

5. **Environmental Consequences.** The potential environmental impacts were identified and evaluated in a Final EA prepared in December 2021. The FAA has reviewed the Final EA and the FAA 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; Climate, Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(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, Water Resources and Cumulative Impacts.

Section 3.2 and 4 of the Final EA discloses that the environmental impact categories of Biological Resources; Coastal Resources; Farmlands; and the water resources of wetlands, floodplains, and wild and scenic rivers were not evaluated further because the proposed project at LAX would not affect these environmental resources.

- A. Air Quality.** Sections 4.1 of the Final EA, state the analysis of air quality for the Proposed Project was guided by an Air Quality Protocol that the FAA coordinated with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), California Air Resources Board (CARB), Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) that was completed and each agency concurred with in January and February 2020. The reason for using this method of analysis was the Proposed Project is located in the part of the South Coast Air Basin that does not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

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 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project will not increase aircraft operations, change the aircraft fleet operating at LAX or result in an increase in passengers when related to the No Action Alternative at LAX.

Table 4.1-2 of the Final EA provides the annual criteria pollutant emissions inventory for direct and indirect project construction emissions. This table shows that the *de minimis* thresholds are **exceeded** for CO, VOC and NO<sub>x</sub><sup>v</sup>. FAA prepared and published concurrently a Final General Conformity Determination and is included in the Final EA in Appendix I. The Determination includes a letter from the SCAQMD to LAWA dated April 12, 2021 (See Attachment B in Appendix I of the Final EA). This letter concludes in part “ *...the proposed project will conform to the latest EPA approved AQMP as the emissions from the project are accommodated within the AQMP’s emissions budgets, and the proposed project is not expected to result in any new or additional violations of the NAAQS or impede the projected attainment of the NAAQS.*”

Operational emissions for the Proposed Project were evaluated and were determined to be below the *de minimis* thresholds for all applicable pollutants, and therefore not significant. Table 4.1-5 provides the General Conformity *de minimis* thresholds and total emissions for the Proposed Project for the year 2028. The table shows none of the *de minimis* thresholds are exceeded. Table 4.1-6 of the Final EA discloses the Project operational emission inventory for the year 2033. Section 4.1.4.2.3 of the Final EA concludes that the estimated operational emissions from the proposed project compared to the No Action Alternative for the years 2028 and 2033 would not exceed any of the criteria pollutant *de minimis* thresholds. Thus, the Proposed Project emissions would **not** cause or contribute to an exceedance of the NAAQS or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS.

The *1050.1F Desk Reference* states the general conformity process is conducted in three phases: applicability, evaluation, and determination. Section 4.1.4.2 of the Final EA, and Chapter 6 of the General Conformity Determination provides the analysis of impacts of the proposed project as they relate to the NAAQS. This section of the Final EA states that the construction and operational emissions of the Proposed Project are included in the SIP budget, the action would conform to the SIP that allows for attainment of the NAAQS. Table 11 of the Final GCD states that CO Peak emissions for the year 2024 generated from the proposed project would conform to the SIP. Section 6.2.2 of the General Conformity Determination states SCAQMD has determined that the emissions from the Proposed Project construction are included in the general conformity budget for NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC

---

<sup>v</sup> The General Conformity Rule establishes the *de minimis* levels to identify those actions with the potential to have air quality impacts large enough to require a conformity determination. If a project’s net emissions are less than the *de minimis* levels, then the Federal action is considered to be too small to adversely affect the air quality status of the area and is automatically considered to conform with the applicable SIP/FIP, therefore the general conformity requirements have been complied with and the process is complete. See Order 1050.1F Desk Reference.

emissions in the AQMP. Therefore, the proposed project would **not** cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS.

LAWA also received comments from members of the public on air quality issues in general in the vicinity of LAX. Detailed responses to comments on the Draft EA were prepared to each of these comments and are included in Appendix O of the Final EA. The commenters suggested that the Proposed Project would exacerbate the existing poor air quality and requested that the U.S. EPA and SCAQMD review the analysis used in the EA. FAA's analysis protocols used in the General Conformity Determination in Appendix I to the Final EA were coordinated with the U.S. EPA, CARB, SCAQMD and SCAG. SCAQMD's April 12, 2021 letter to LAWA states: *"South Coast AQMD staff has reviewed the proposed project emissions and determined the NOx and VOC emission above de minimis thresholds can be accommodated within the general conformity budgets established in the 2016 AQMP."*

The SCAQMD's letter concludes with *"In summary, based on our evaluation, the proposed project will conform to the latest EPA approved AQMP as the emissions from the project are accommodated within the AQMP's emissions budgets, and the proposed project is not expected to result in any new or additional violations of the NAAQS or impede the projected attainment of the NAAQS."*

FAA and LAWA did not receive comments on the Draft General Conformity Determination from the U.S. EPA, CARB, SCAG, or the SCAQMD. While some commenters said their comments applied to both the Draft EA and the Draft General Conformity Determination, none of the comments received addressed specific text in the General Conformity Determination.

Section 4.1.5 of the Final EA states that since the Proposed Project would not exceed the NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS when compared to the No Action alternative, no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required. Appendix B to the Final EA includes the list of LAWA-incorporated project features and commitments to minimize effects related to air pollutant emissions.

- B. Climate.** Section 4.2.2 of the Final EA states there are no established a significance thresholds for climate and Green House Gas (GHG) emissions. FAA Order 1050.1F has not identified specific factors to consider in making a significance determination for GHG emissions, especially as it may be applied to a particular project. Tables 4.2-1 of the Final EA discloses the annual construction and operational emissions of GHG from 2022 through 2028 for the Proposed Project with a total of 110,666 Metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e). Table 4.2-2 of the Final EA discloses Operational GHG emissions for both the Proposed Project and the No Action Alternative for the years 2028 and 2033.. This table shows for aircraft emissions during 2028 and 2033 there is a small net reduction in GHG emissions with the Proposed Project compared to the No Action alternative. Including all emission sources there is a 0.9 percent increase in 2028 and a 0.5 percent increase in GHG emissions for the year 2033. Section 4.2.4.2 of the Final EA states . *"In*

*comparison, GHG emissions in the State of California were approximately 431,000,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2019.<sup>vi</sup> The increase in GHG emissions from operations for the Proposed Project represents approximately 0.005 percent of total GHG emissions of the State of California.”* The primary sources of GHG that account for the increase in GHG emissions are automobiles and stationary sources. As noted in Section 4.2.5 of the Final EA states these there are no significance thresholds identified for aviation related GHG emissions and FAA has not identified specific factors to consider in making a significance determination for GHG emissions. Therefore no mitigation measures are proposed.

**C. Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) and Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, Section 6(f) Resources.** Section 4.3.3.2 of the Final EA states the Detailed Study Area does not include any DOT Section 4(f) resources. This section of the Final EA also states that there are a number of Section 4(f) resources that exist in the General Study Area including a the former aircraft school building that FAA determined is eligible for inclusion into the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). This historic property is also protected under DOT Section 4(f). Section 4.5 of the final EA states the Proposed Project would not result in a physical use of the property, nor would construction affect the characteristics or integrity of the property. Hangar One, located on the south side of the airport is a historic property and a Section 4(f) resource listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Hangar One is within the General Study Area for the Proposed Project. However, the Proposed Project would not result in any physical use of Hangar One. Hangar One is not open to the public because it is actively being used by an airport tenant. The Proposed Project would not have a direct or constructive use of Hangar One. Both the former aircraft school building and Hangar One are part of an existing airport environment which includes sound from aircraft operations. Since a quiet environment is not a characteristic that contributes to both of the historic properties’ respective eligibility for listing on the NRHP, construction and changes in aircraft noise due to the temporary runway closures during construction would not cause a constructive use of either property.

Section 4.3.4.2 of the Final EA states there are three Section 6(f) resources (parks and facilities) that have received funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act in the General Study Area. However, none of these Section 6(f) resources would be directly impacted by the Proposed Project. In addition, the Proposed Project would not increase aircraft noise levels or introduce visual impacts to any of these resources when compared to the No Action Alternative. Therefore, no physical or constructive use of any DOT Act Section 4(f) resources would occur, nor would any LWCF Section 6(f) resources be impacted.<sup>vii</sup>

---

<sup>vi</sup> California Air Resources Board, California Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2000-2019 – Trends of Emissions and Other Indicators, July 28, 2021.

<sup>vii</sup> FAA notes in its 2005 Final Environmental Impact Statement for the LAX Master Plan that the Westchester Golf Course and the Carl E. Nelson Youth Park exist within the airport boundary and are not considered to be Section 4(f) protected resources because they are owned by a transportation agency and the resources are being used as parks on an interim basis.

- D. Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste.** Section 4.4.2.2 of the Final EA states construction of the Proposed Project would use common hazardous materials including, but not limited to, gasoline, motor oils, solvents, and paints, which would be stored and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. Therefore, storage and use of hazardous materials during construction would not adversely affect human health or the environment compared to the No Action Alternative. The Final EA states although construction of Proposed Project elements would occur on or near four areas that are hazardous material sites of concern in the vicinity of the Proposed Project, it would not result in adverse impacts to human health or the environment as described in Table 4.4-1 of the Final EA and as further detailed in Appendix F to the Final EA. Thus, there would be no impacts compared to the No Action Alternative.
- E. Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources.** As documented in Section 3.8 of the Final EA, the FAA delineated an Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed undertaking and coordinated the APE with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) by letter dated July 29, 2019. The California SHPO concurred with the FAA's delineation of the Proposed Project's APE by letter dated August 13, 2019 (see Appendix G to the Final EA).

Section 4.5.3.2.1 of the Final EA discloses the Proposed Project would not adversely affect the former Aircraft School Building, an FAA determined historic property eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). This historic property is located within the APE) for the Proposed Project.

Appendix G of the Final EA, also includes a copy of FAA's determination and findings of effect letter to the California SHPO prepared under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. The California SHPO concurred with FAA's determination of eligibility and findings of effect by letter dated October 12, 2020 (See Appendix G to the Final EA).

The California Native American Heritage Commission provided FAA with a listing of contacts for six tribes. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, requested a telephone conference with the FAA on the proposed undertaking. This conference was held via telephone on Friday, February 28, 2020. Following the call, FAA provided the tribe additional documentation and conducted several subsequent telephone calls with the tribe. FAA and the Tribe agreed upon the following text included in Table 4.5-1 for this proposed undertaking as documented in an email dated July 6, 2020. Implementation of the unanticipated discovery measures identified in Table 4.5-1 and specifically listed below, is a condition of FAA's approval of this FONSI/ROD. Prior to initiation of project-related grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed LAX Airfield and Terminal Modernization Project, Terminal 4 Improvements, and Terminal 6 Improvements projects, LAWA would:

- **Bring in a Tribal monitor to determine if an action is subject to archaeological and tribal monitoring.** As part of that consultation, the Tribal monitor/consultant would work with LAWA to determine the excavation activities in undisturbed soils. Based on specific design information and information on the depth of fill and soil disturbance, LAWA, and the tribal monitor would determine the probability of encountering cultural or archaeological resources and identify the areas/construction elements that would be subject to archaeological and cultural resource monitoring. If after excavation, an archaeological resource is found that the monitor determines to be a Tribal Cultural Resource, the tribal monitor would decide on the treatment of the resource, as described below.
- **LAWA would require the construction contractor to have a Tribal monitor present during excavation / ground disturbance activities for any areas that have a medium to high probability of containing undisturbed soils.** Monitoring would occur during ground disturbing activities at depths greater than 5 feet beneath unpaved areas of the airport, greater than 10 feet beneath existing paved areas of the airport, or greater than 20 feet below existing terminal buildings. The Tribal monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified.
- **The Tribal monitor must be approved by the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation Tribal Government and be listed under the Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC) Tribal Contact list for the LAX area.** It would be the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation's responsibility to ensure that Tribal monitor/consultants are available for LAWA projects upon 30 days written notice of upcoming project consultations and monitoring activities. If the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation were not able to provide an approved Tribal monitor/consultant for project consultation or monitoring activities, LAWA would proceed with the project in compliance with the existing LAX Archaeological Treatment Plan (ATP) (Attachment – LAX Archaeological Treatment Plan).
- **The Tribal monitor will work independently from any other cultural resource monitor for each project to monitor ground disturbing activities identified at project initiation to have the potential for encountering archaeological resources in undisturbed soils.** Upon discovery of any Tribal Cultural Resources, construction activities shall cease in the immediate vicinity of the find (not less than the surrounding 100 feet) until the find can be assessed. All Tribal Cultural Resources unearthed by project activities shall be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and Tribal monitor approved by the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation Tribal Government. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation Tribal Government will retain it/them in the form and/or manner the Tribe deems appropriate, for educational, cultural and/or historic purposes. If human remains and/or grave goods are discovered or recognized at the Project Site, all ground disturbance shall immediately cease, and the county coroner shall be notified per

Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5. Human remains and grave/burial goods shall be treated alike per California Public Resources Code section 5097.98(d)(1) and (2). Work may continue on other parts of the Project Site while evaluation and, if necessary, mitigation takes place.

If a non-Native American resource is discovered, the procedures for cultural resource monitoring, identification of resources, recovery/recordation and/or preservation of resources, would comply with the procedures stipulated in the LAX ATP.

- F. Land Use.** Section 3.9 of the Final EA, identifies the various communities surrounding the airport including the City of El Segundo, the unincorporated Los Angeles County communities of Del Aire and Lennox, and the City of Inglewood. Vista Del Mar, Dockweiler State Beach and the Santa Monica Bay are located west of the airport. This Section of the Final EA states that areas of the airport where the North Airfield Improvements, Concourse 0 and Terminal 9 sites are located within the City of Los Angeles and the land use is zoned "LAX." The LAX zone is a land use zone that subjects the property to the LAX Specific Plan and it only applies to land owned by LAWA. The proposed landside improvements are located on parcels within the boundaries of the LAX Plan and the LAX Specific Plan and the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan area. Each of these various plans are components of the City of Los Angeles General Plan.

Section 4.6.3 of the Final EA states under the No-Action Alternative the continued operation and maintenance of the airport would not directly or indirectly affect any land uses. Section 4.6.3.2 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project is consistent with various land use plans including the City of Los Angeles's LAX Plan, LAX Specific Plan and Westchester – Play del Rey Community plan as described in Appendix J to the Final EIS. Section 4.6.3.2.3 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project would be consistent with the Policies, programs, goals and objects of the City of Los Angeles's plans and would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use compared to the No Action Alternative.

- G. Natural Resources and Energy Supply.** The Proposed Project alternative would consume more aviation, diesel, and other fuels compared to the No Action Alternative. Section 4.7.4.2.1 of the Final EA states that the operation of the Proposed project would consume electricity, primarily from powering the building systems for the Proposed Concourse 0, Terminal 9, and Terminal 9 parking facility. Electricity would also be used for other activities such as airfield operations, but they would be offset by energy use reductions associate with the decommissioning of the West Remote gates and removal of buildings that would be required to be demolished as part of the Proposed Project. This section of the Final EA states *"operation of the Proposed Project would not cause peak demand to exceed LADWP's peak capacity. In addition, LADWP forecasts that the total power demand within the service area will be approximately 24,738,000 MWh in 2030 (closest forecast to the 2033 analysis year). The increase in electricity consumption relative to the No Action Alternative represents less than 0.2 percent of the 24,738,000 MWh electrical demand forecast for the Los Angeles region in 2030. Electricity demand from operation of the Proposed Project*

*would not exceed electricity supply capacity.”*

Section 4.7.4.2.2 of the Final EA also states that future supplies of natural gas would be adequate to meet the project demands within the Southern California Gas Company service area. Although natural gas demand from operation of the Proposed Project would be greater than the No Action Alternative, natural gas demand under the Proposed Project would be negligible relative to anticipated future supply and demand and would not cause demand to exceed supply.

Section 4.7.4.2.3 of the Final EA states that the Proposed Project would use a net increase in potable water for Concourse 0 and Terminal 9 and the Terminal 9 parking facility, fire water systems, cooling for the concourse and terminal buildings and landscaping. Table 4.7-3 of the Final EA shows a net increase in demand for water of about 85,000 gallons per day. This net increase is within the Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan.

**H. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use.** Section 3.11.1.1 of the Final EA describes the existing airport noise setting around LAX. This section of the Final EA states that LAX operates in a West flow (aircraft traveling to the west) runway configuration about 95 percent of the time. During the late night and early morning hours (12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m.) Over Ocean procedures are in place that route both arrival and departure aircraft over the Pacific Ocean. The Over Ocean procedures have been in place since the early 1970s.

Other sources of noise (unwanted sound) come from major arterial roadways. Section 4.8.2.2 of the Final EA states that the FAA does not have a threshold of significance for roadway noise, however, guidance defined in FAA Order 1050.1F states, “*surface transportation impacts, including construction noise, should be conducted using accepted methodologies from the appropriate modal administration, such as the Federal Highway Administration for highway noise.*”<sup>viii</sup> The FHWA guidance and methodologies are not considered significant impact thresholds by the FAA, but were applied as factors to consider. Section 4.8.2.3 of the Final EA evaluates noise from construction equipment of the Proposed Project. Under the No Action Alternative, none of the Proposed ATMP components would be constructed, thus the noise exposure would remain consistent with what occurs today. This section of the Final EA states that FAA has not adopted a significant threshold for construction equipment noise, but the noise assessment criteria based on the Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol were used as factors to consider in the EA. Section 4.8.3.2.1 of the Final EA evaluated aircraft noise impacts of the Proposed Project. This section of the Final EA states construction of the Proposed Project would require the temporary closure of Runway 6R-24L and Runway 6L-24R for Impacts to noise and noise-compatible land use due to the Proposed Project would be temporary, limited to certain months during construction in 2023 and 2024, as described above. Outside of

---

<sup>viii</sup> U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, July 16, 2015.

this temporary construction period, noise levels would be similar to the No Action Alternative. These short-term impacts would be similar to those related to the closures of both Runway 6R-24L and Runway 6L-24R that occurred as part of the Runway Safety Area (RSA) improvement projects at LAX. The RSA improvements project required the closure of these two runways for durations similar to what would occur during construction of the Proposed Project. The runway closures for the Proposed Project would have similar operational changes related to runway assignments that occurred during the RSA improvement projects..

Table 4.8.2 of the Final EA, identifies the number of people and housing units located within each noise contour developed for the Proposed Project. FAA defines a significant noise impact as 1.5 dB within the 65 dB CNEL noise contour. Figures 4.8-3 and 4.8-4 of the Final EA, aircraft noise contours associated with the Proposed Project are the same as those of the No Action Alternative. Tables 4.8-2 through 4.8-4 also indicate the same number of people, housing, and other noise-sensitive facilities exposed to CNEL levels at or greater than 65 dBA for the Proposed Project compared to the No Action Alternative.

Comments received on the Draft EA from residents in the various communities around LAX about existing aircraft noise impacts from aircraft flying into and out of LAX. Section 1.3 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project does not include any changes to **existing** air traffic procedures or flight paths into and out of LAX. Further, the Proposed Project does not propose new air traffic procedures or flight paths and would not change the number of existing or forecast aircraft operations. The proposed project does not substantively alter the balance of usage of the two runway complexes at LAX.

The aircraft noise analysis conducted in the Final EA is consistent with that required in FAA Order 1050.1F and FAA Order 5050.4B.

- I. **Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risk** are discussed in Section 4.9 of the Final EA. Section 4.9.1 of the Final EA indicates there are no U.S. Census tracts with known residential population within the Detailed Study Area for the proposed ATMP because the bulk of the Proposed Project would be constructed on existing airport property. Section 4.9.3.2 of the Final EA states that there are some properties located outside of existing airport property that would need to be acquired by LAWA to enable the development of the roadway improvements. These properties are identified in **Table 4.9-2** of the Final EA. Property acquisition would be conducted in compliance with the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act* of 1970, as well as California Government Code § 7260, which establishes a uniform policy for the fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a direct result of programs or projects undertaken by a public entity. The acquisition of the properties would not cause an extensive relocation of community businesses or cause severe economic hardship for affected communities because no population exists in the Detailed Study Area and these businesses are primarily intended for use by LAX passengers and not the local community.



Section 3.12.1.1. of the Final EA, states the Detailed Study Area is primarily on existing LAX property and does not contain residential land uses, as such demographic data for the study area was not included in the analysis. Table 3.12-2 of the Final EA provides the Race/Ethnicity Characteristics of the General Study Area for the proposed project. This table states the population in the General Study Area is 82 percent minority, which is about 9 percent more than Los Angeles County as a whole. Table 3.12-3 of the Final EA states the percentage of low-income population in the General Study Area is 18.7 percent, which is 2.7 percent higher on average than Los Angeles County.

The Environmental Justice text of Section 4.11.3.2 of the Final EA states the operation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to air quality, climate, noise, or socioeconomics, hazardous materials, cultural resources, land use, natural resources, lighting and visual character, or water resources. Thus, the Proposed Project would not create disproportionately high and adverse effects for minority or low income populations. VOC, NOx, and CO emissions would exceed *de minimis* levels for 2024. The SCAQMD confirmed the Proposed Project emissions are within the General Conformity Budget for the South Coast Air Basin. Thus, the proposed project conforms to the State Implementation Plan for the South Coast Air Basin. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in air pollutant emissions that would create disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts on minority or low-income populations.

- J. Visual Effects.** Section 4.10.3.1 of the Final EA states the No Action Alternative would not have an impact on light emissions. Section 4.10.2.2 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project would be located on an existing airport that is well lit at some locations at night. . Further, the site of the Proposed Project is located in an urban area with no distinguishing visual features. Section 4.10.3.2.1 states the nearest light-sensitive land uses to the DSA include the Park West Apartments on Lincoln Boulevard and a residential development along the southern edge of Westchester located approximately 1,200 feet and 1,500 feet, respectively, north of the nearest proposed north airfield area improvements. Given the distance, amount of development, and existing nighttime light in the Detailed Study Area, the Proposed Project would not result in light annoyance impacts or interfere with activity in residential areas during construction compared to the No Action Alternative. Section 4.10.3.2.2 states: Due to the scale and type of development within and immediately surrounding LAX, construction of the Proposed Project would not detract from any existing daytime or nighttime visual resources at LAX or the visual resources beyond the project area. Construction equipment, including cranes and pile drivers, would temporarily be present throughout the DSA. Presence of construction equipment would change the visual character of the CTA and areas east of LAX, particularly within work areas proposed for transportation network improvements. Construction of the Proposed Project would potentially obstruct views within and east of the CTA and would require temporary or permanent removal of certain visual resource elements, including the “LAX” letterforms. The potential for, and design characteristics of, relocating/reconfiguring or permanent removal of nine pylons and the “LAX” letterforms at W. Century Boulevard would occur in

conjunction with more detailed planning of the proposed landside improvements. Section 4.10.4.2.2. of the Final EA states if a permanent removal of nine pylons and the “LAX” letterforms occurs, the permanent removal would change the visual character of the LAX Gateway. However, it would not change the nature of the visual character of the CTA or surrounding area. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not significantly affect the nature of a visual resource, the degree of contrast with visual resources, or obstruct the view of a visual resource when compared to the No Action Alternative located at W. Century Boulevard and 9 of the 26 illuminated pylons at the LAX Gateway.

- K. Water Resources.** Section 3.2 of the Final EA states there are no 100 year flood hazard areas at LAX. Thus, the Proposed Project would not affect a 100-year floodplain. Section 4.9.2.2 of the Final EA states there is adequate supply of potable water for operation of the Proposed Project. Section 4.11.2.2 states groundwater in the Detailed Study Area is not used for drinking water, and no designated groundwater recharge areas are located at the project site. Further, if construction requires dewatering of perched groundwater, it would be discharged to the City of Los Angeles’ wastewater system in compliance with water quality requirements specified in an industrial waste permit. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts to human health or the environment due to discharges to surface water or groundwater when compared to the No Action Alternative.
- L. Cumulative Impacts.** The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative actions included in the cumulative impact analysis are presented in Section 4.14 of the Final EA, Cumulative Impacts. Table 4.12-1 in the Final EA identifies the various past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects from 2011 through 2024. This table of the Final EA states there are a number of projects at LAX in various stages of planning and/or construction. The evaluation of cumulative impacts from these cumulative actions is discussed in Section 4.12 of the Final EA. The No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative would not result in aircraft operational changes to the airport or would increase the type or amount of aircraft operations at the airport. No significant cumulative impacts were identified in the Final EA.

**M. Environmentally Preferable 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. The FAA determined that all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the Proposed Project have been adopted and there would be no significant environmental impacts from the Proposed ATMP improvements at LAX and that the project would not jeopardize the safe and efficient operations at the Airport. The No Action Alternative has fewer environmental effects than the Proposed Project alternative and thus would be the environmentally preferable alternative. However, the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the proposed project.

Thus, the FAA's preferred alternative is the Proposed Project as defined in the Final EA and this FONSI and 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.

## **6. Public Participation.**

The public was encouraged to review and comment on the Draft EA, which was released for public review on May 27, 2021. LAWA published a notice of availability of the Draft EA in the following local newspapers in the vicinity of the airport: *Los Angeles Times*, *The Argonaut*, *the Daily Breeze* and *La Opinión*. LAWA also sent out the Notice of Availability of the Draft EA via email to everyone included on the mailing list LAWA had for the proposed project. LAWA made the Draft EA available on its web site: [www.lawa.org/atmp/documents](http://www.lawa.org/atmp/documents), in various local libraries that were open subject to their current restrictions due to the on-going Pandemic. The newspaper Affidavit of Publications of the Draft EA and Draft General Conformity Determination are included in Appendix L of the Final EA. LAWA received a request to extend the public comment period an additional 60-days beyond the initial 46-day comment period from the City of El Segundo. LAWA held a public information workshop and public hearing on Tuesday, June 29, 2021. In response to the request to extend the public comment period, LAWA extended the comment period 15-days consistent with Paragraph 1104 of FAA Order 5050.4B. The public comment period ended on July 27, 2021 with a total of 61 days for public review of the Draft EA and Draft General Conformity Determination. LAWA received a total, of 31 comment letters comprising 175 bracketed comments. Two comment letters were rescinded and replaced. Each rescinded comment letter counts as one; therefore, the 31 comment letters include two rescinded. Although not required, LAWA accepted the late-filed comment letters and included them in the Final EA along with the appropriate responses to comments in Appendix O to the Final EA

A new issue specific to FAA safety actions at LAX was raised, in comments received on the Draft EA. The specific comments addressed the FAA's enhanced Final Approach Runway Occupancy Signal (eFAROS) test project. As stated in Responses to Comment numbers PH004-2 and P012-9, in March 2015, the FAA's project office ceased work on the use of Flashing Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPI) as direct-to-pilot annunciators, due to the potential safety related impacts on pilots and operators.

## **7. 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.

## **8. 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 to be present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Project. The proposed ATMP at LAX would not cause any environmental impacts which, after mitigation, would not exceed any thresholds 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 Proposed Project as it is described in Section 3 of this FONSI and ROD.

## **9. Agency Findings and Determinations.**

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

- a. FAA finds, the proposed 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, including the City of Los Angeles General Plan, LAX Plan, LAX Specific Plan and the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan. The proposed project is also consistent with the applicable regulations and policies of federal, State and local agencies.
- b. FAA finds the proposed project is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense [49 U.S.C. § 44502(b)].**
- c. Independent and Objective Evaluation:** As required by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR § 1506.5)[1978] 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.
- d. National Historic Preservation Act:** FAA finds the proposed project will not adversely affect the any historic properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. FAA conducted the required consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Officer pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

- e. **Air Quality.** LAX is located in the South Coast Air Basin. This air basin is classified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as an extreme non-attainment area for Ozone, serious non-attainment for Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and Non-attainment for Lead (Pb). Implementation of the Proposed ATMP project along with the various other on-going projects in the area of LAX will not have a significant cumulative impact on air pollutants. Airport operational and surface traffic emissions will increase since there would be an increase in the number and aircraft and vehicle traffic operating at LAX resulting from this project. The South Coast Air Quality Management District has stated by letter dated April 12, 2021 (See Attachment B in Appendix I of the Final EA) the emissions from the Proposed Project are within the State Implementation Plan budget for the South Coast Air Basin.
- f. **General Conformity.** FAA has determined the Proposed Federal Action will comply with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) in accordance with Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments (42 U.S.C. § 7506(c)). FAA prepared a Draft and Final General Conformity Determination for the proposed project, which is included in Appendix B to the Final EA. FAA has determined that air quality impacts associated with the proposed project conform to the SIP under Section 176(c)(1) of the Clean Air Act, as amended [42 U.S.C. 7506(c)(1)] and 40 CFR Part 93.
- g. **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 Action 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.
- h. **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 Action.
- i. **Surface Transportation.** The ATMP would not induce additional aircraft and surface operations at LAX. The proposed roadway segment improvements of the ATMP listed in Table 1-4 of the Final EA and shown on Figure 1-6 of the Final EA in the vicinity of the W. Century Boulevard/S. Sepulveda Boulevard intersection to improve efficient movement into and out of the CTA that are dedicated airport access and egress roadway segments exclusively used for airport patrons and employees on airport-owned land or rights-of-way acquired or controlled by LAWA FAA finds the proposed project would improve surface traffic conditions during normal airport operations.

- j. 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 (49 USC § 44706)].
- k. 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]
- l. 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 ATMP 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 Los Angeles World Airports to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Project and associated mitigation measures. Disapproval would prevent Los Angeles World Airports from implementing the Proposed Project within LAX.

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 and ROD.

- 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.
- Construction, installation, relocation and/or upgrade of various navigational aids, weather-observing equipment, and visual aids including but not limited to Runway Status Lights, runway edge lights, taxiway edge lighting and signage and associated

utility lines. This equipment is necessary to ensure the safety of air navigation for aircraft operations at the airport.

As a condition of approval of this Finding of No Significant Impact and Record of Decision, the Los Angeles World Airports shall implement all the mitigation measures identified the various subsections entitled *Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures* in the Final EA.

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: 2021.12.13 14:09:45 -08'00'

\_\_\_\_\_  
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.*