

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

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

**Proposed Runway 6L-24R and 6R-24L Safety Area Project
and Associated Improvements**

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



For further information

David B. Kessler, AICP
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
Western-Pacific Region
P.O. Box 92007
Los Angeles, CA 90009-2007
310-725-3615

July 16, 2014

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 Runway 6L-24R and 6R-24L Safety Area Improvement Project and Associated Improvements at Los Angeles International Airport located in Los Angeles, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment dated June 2014. This document discusses all alternatives considered by FAA in reaching its decision, summarizes the analysis used to evaluate the alternatives, and briefly summarizes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative, which are evaluated in detail in this FONSI and ROD. This document also identifies the environmentally preferred alternative and the agency preferred alternative. This document identifies applicable and required mitigation.

BACKGROUND. In May 2014, the City of Los Angeles, through its Airport Department – Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA). The DEA addressed the potential environmental effects of the proposed Runway 6L-24R and 6R-24L Safety Area Improvement Project and Associated Improvements 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], and FAA Orders 1050.1E, *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 on May 16, 2014. LAWA received no comments on the draft between May 16, 2014 and June 16, 2014. FAA approved the Final EA on June 26, 2014.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO? Read the Finding of No Significant Impact and Record of Decision to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed Runway 6L-24R and 6R-24L Safety Area Project and Associated Improvements at Los Angeles International Airport.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS? The City of Los Angeles may begin to implement the Proposed Action.

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

PROPOSED RUNWAY 6L-24R AND 6R-24L
SAFETY AREA PROJECT AND ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS

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) as a result of proposed Runway 6L-24R and 6R-24L Safety Area Project and Associated Improvements 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 federal actions of approval of those portions of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depict the proposed projects. Approval of the ALP is authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (Public Laws 97-248 and 100-223).
2. **Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action.** The proposed action is to meet FAA Airport Design Standards for the Runway Safety Area (RSA) for Runway 6L-24R and improve the RSA for 6R-24L at LAX to the extent practicable. LAX is a commercial service airport that accommodates both air carrier aircraft as well as a small amount of general aviation activity. The existing Runway Safety Area for both Runways 6L-24R and 6R-24L, the two parallel runways in the North Runway Complex at the airport, do not meet current FAA airport design standards as described in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A, *Airport Design*.

The southernmost runway at LAX, Runway 7R-25L, was relocated in the year 2007 about 55-feet to the south to allow for construction of parallel Taxiway H, between the two runways. Relocation of Runway 7R-25L was part of the LAX Master Plan approved by the Los Angeles City Council in December 2004. FAA approved a Record of Decision for the LAX Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in May 2005. Runway 7R-25L has Runway Safety Areas that meets FAA Airport Design Standards. In September 2013, FAA approved a Finding of No Significant Impact and Record of Decision for the proposed RSA improvements to Runway 7L-25R (the inboard runway in the South Runway Complex) and Associated Improvement.

In April 2013, LAWA completed a planning effort known as the Specific Plan Amendment Study or SPAS that included various development proposals for the north Runway Complex. However, SPAS proposals are beyond the scope of this RSA project in the North Runway Complex. The SPAS analysis was required under a 2006 Stipulated Settlement Agreement between the City of Los Angeles and the Petitioners on the LAX Master Plan that was approved in December 2004. At this time, the City of Los Angeles has not provided FAA with a proposal to relocate any of the runways in the North Complex through an Airport Layout

Plan. Consequently, there is no action for FAA to consider under cumulative impacts for this proposal.

The FAA's statutory mission is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. Pursuant to Title 49 United States Code (USC), Subtitle VII, as amended, FAA must ensure the proposed project does not derogate the safety of aircraft and airport operations at Los Angeles International Airport. Legislation under *The Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, The District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006* (Public Law 109-115), November 30, 2005, requires completion of Runway Safety Area improvements at all airports certificated under Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 139, to meet FAA design standards by December 31, 2015. The LAX Master Plan did not contemplate compliance with Public Law 109-115 because the law was enacted after the LAX Master Plan was adopted by the City of Los Angeles and after FAA approved its Record of Decision for the Final EIS in May 2005.

This FONSI/ROD addresses LAWA's proposed improvements to Runway 6L-24R, a portion of the RSA for Runway 6R-24L and other related projects described below. The proposed action would correct this design standard deficiency to the extent practicable consistent with FAA Order 5200.8, *Runway Safety Area Program*. FAA recognizes the RSA design standard length of 1000 feet beyond each end of Runway 6L-24R will be met by this proposed action using a combination of grading and establishment of declared distances.

3. **Proposed Project and Federal Actions.** The proposed action includes site preparation, grading, as needed, installation of drainage structures, paving, marking and lighting of various airfield pavement (See Exhibits 1-6, and 1-7, and the project component listing on page 2-61 of the Final Environmental Assessment (EA).

The proposed action evaluated in this FONSI/ROD includes the following actions:

Runway 6L-24R and Runway 6R-24L Runway Safety Area Improvements:

- Implementation of declared distances on Runway 6L and 6R;
- Service roads in the eastern portion of the 6L-24R RSA would be relocated or realigned outside the RSA;
- Service road segments would be constructed between Runway 6L-24R RSA and the Runway 6R-24L RSA.
- Construct two segments of service roads to access navigational aids east of the Runways;
- Construct a culvert in a 720-foot long segment of the Argo Ditch.

Associated Improvements:

- Reconstruct the eastern 7,250 feet of Runway 6L-24R including replacement of centerline and touchdown zone lighting, and remarking the pavement;
- Reconstruct the portion of Taxiway AA between Runway 6R and 6L; including realignment of centerline lights and new striping.
- Close Vehicle Service Roads located within the RSA for Runway 6R-24L;

- Relocate two airfield security gates;
- Relocate Air Operations Area Fence;
- Close LAWA construction equipment parking areas east of the Runways.
- Realign Taxiway hold Bars on Taxiways AA, Y and Z, including relocation of associated lighting (in-pavement hold bar lights and elevated guard lights), centerline lights, relocation of status lights and hold position airfield signage, removal and restriping of taxiway markings.
- Protect in-place the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power water line.
- Constructing Staging Areas.

The federal actions necessary to carry out the proposed projects include:

- Unconditional approval of the ALP to depict the proposed improvements pursuant to 49 USC §§ 40103(b) and 47107(a)(16). 14 CFR Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace*; and 14 CFR Part 157, *Notice of Construction, Alteration, Activation, and Deactivation of Airports*.
- Determination under 49 USC § 44502(b) that the airport development is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense.
- Approval of a Construction Safety and Phasing Plan to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-2F, *Operational Safety on Airports During Construction*, [14 CFR Part 139 (49 USC § 44706)].
- Implementation of revised air traffic control procedures below 3,000 feet above ground level;
- Establishment of new Standard Instrument Departure (SID) and Standard Terminal Arrival Route (STAR) procedures.
- Determinations under 49 U.S.C. § 47106 and § 47107 relating to the eligibility
- Approval changes to the airport certification manual pursuant to 14 CFR Part 139, (49 USC § 44706).
- Determinations under 49 U.S.C §§ 47106 and 47107 relating to project grant application approval conditioned on satisfaction of project requirements, and project grant application approval conditioned on assurances about airport operations the proposed project for Federal funding assistance under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and 49 USC § 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR § 158.25, to impose and use passenger facility charges (PFCs) for the proposed project as shown on the ALP¹.
- Determination of eligibility for federal assistance for the near-term development projects under the Federal grant-in-aid program authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (49 USC § 47101 et seq.).

¹ Certain requirements for AIP funding overlap with environmental review requirements for approval of the ALP and so are addressed as part of the EA for the ALP. These determinations are a prerequisite to funding but do not complete the determinations that are necessary for funding. The decision to approve AIP and PFC funding are completed in separate processes.

- Appropriate amendments to air carrier operations specifications pursuant to 49 USC § 44705.
 - FAA determination of the Proposed Action's effects on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace.
4. **Reasonable Alternatives Considered.** Chapter 2 of the Final EA, used a three step alternatives analysis screening process including:

Step 1 – Would the Proposed Alternatives enhance the Runway 6L-24R Safety Area consistent with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A, *Airport Design*?

Step 2 – Would the Alternative be practicable and consistent with FAA Order 5200.8, *Runway Safety Area Program*, considering existing technology and logistics in light of overall project purpose, including implementation and completion by December 31, 2015, as specified in Public Law 109-115?

Step 3 – Would the Alternative result in a safe and efficient use of navigable airspace and minimize airfield operational impacts?

The Draft EA evaluated three off-airport and five on-airport alternatives, in addition to the No Action Alternative to the proposed action. Analysis of the No Action Alternative is required pursuant to 40 CFR § 1502.14(d).

Section 2.2.2 of the Final EA, evaluated the two off-airport non-construction alternatives of "Use Other Alternative Modes of Transportation;" and "Use of Other Area Public Airports." There are no feasible off-Airport alternatives for the location of the Runway 6L-24R and Runway 6R-24L Safety Area improvements because compliance with PL 109-115 requires the Airport sponsor meet the FAA's standards for RSAs. Therefore, off-airport alternatives were eliminated from consideration. Paragraph 405(d) of FAA Order 1050.1E states in part: "*An EA must consider the proposed action and a discussion of the consequences of taking no action, and may limit the range of alternatives to action and no action when there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.*" Therefore, both off-airport alternatives were eliminated for further review because they would not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action.

The on-airport non-construction alternative of "Use of Alternative Aircraft" was also evaluated. This alternative does not meet the purpose and need because the RSA for Runway 6L-24R would still fail to meet the applicable FAA Airport Design Standards as required by Public Law 109-115.

The primary considerations for the FAA in selection of a preferred alternative include the Purpose and Need for the project and the environmental impacts of the project. In its consideration of alternatives, the FAA is mindful of its statutory charter to encourage the development and safety of civil aeronautics in the United States (49 USC § 40104). The No Action Alternative has fewer environmental effects than the Proposed Action. However, the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the proposed project and LAWA would not comply with Public Law 109-115.

Section 2.2.4 of the Final EA describe and evaluates the six (6) various runway safety area improvement alternatives for runway 6L-24R and 6R-24L at LAX. Table 2-4 summarizes the results of the Alternatives Screening Process. Of the six on-airport alternatives, the proposed action (Declared Distances Refinement Number 2) and the No Action Alternatives were carried forward for detailed impact analysis. Refinement No. 2 (LAWA's proposed action) is a variation of the Declared Distances alternative. This alternative includes covering a portion of the Argo Ditch, relocation of the a portion of a service road along Lincoln Boulevard, closure of a portion of a service road located within the Runway 6L-24R RSA south of the runway.

Therefore the proposed action for improving the RSA for Runway 6L-24R is to include declared distances, as defined in paragraph 102(bb), Definitions, of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A, *Airport Design* as *"The distances the airport owner declares available for a turbine powered aircraft's takeoff run, takeoff distance, accelerate-stop distance, and landing distance requirements."* Refinement Number 2 for the RSA for Runway 6L-24R includes using declared distances to maintain the existing runway length along with a traditional graded RSA on the west end of the runway. Paragraph 323 of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A, describes the application and use of declared distances at an airport.

The other associated improvements including the reconstruction of the eastern portion of Runway 6L-24R, the portion of Taxiway AA, between Runways 6L-24R and 6R-24, realignment of hold bars and associated marking, signage and lighting for Taxiways AA, Y and Z to meet FAA Airport Design Standards.

5. **Assessment.** The potential environmental impacts and possible adverse effects were identified and evaluated in a Final EA prepared in June 2014. The Final EA has been reviewed by the FAA and found to be adequate for the purpose of the proposed Federal action. The FAA determined that the Final EA for the proposed project adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed action. No new issues surfaced as a result of the public review process.

The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories: Noise; Compatible Land Use; Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice and Children's Health and Safety Risks, Surface Transportation; Air Quality; Water Resources, Light Emissions; Light Emissions and Visual Impacts; Natural Resources and Energy Supply; Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste; and Cumulative Impacts.

The following environmental impact categories of Coastal Zones and Barriers Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f) and Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, Section 6(f) Resources, Farmlands, Fish, Wildlife and Plants, Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources, Floodplains and Wild and Scenic Rivers were not evaluated further because the proposed action at LAX would not pose an impact to these environmental resources.

A. Noise. Section 4.2 of the Final EA describes noise impacts resulting from the Proposed Action –Refinement No. 2 and the No Action Alternatives. The proposed runway safety area improvements will not induce or change the overall number of aircraft operations into and out of LAX. Section 4.2.3 of the Final EA compares the construction noise impacts of the No Action and Proposed Action - Refinement No. 2 Alternatives. For the year 2015, Table 4-2 of the Final EA states within the 65 dB CNEL noise contour for construction noise, there would be a population of 364 people that would experience an increase of 1.5 dB CNEL or greater within the 65 dB CNEL contour. Section 4.2.3.2 of the Final EA states the redistribution of

aircraft operations during the construction period due to the closure of Runway 6L-24R creates this 1.5 dB increase when compared to the No Action Alternative. While the total population within this area of temporary increase is 364, the majority of these residents are located within homes that have been had sound insulation added to the structures.

Additional noise analysis conducted in the Final EA indicates there are seven noise sensitive properties that have would experience a 1.5 CNEL increase in noise that is off airport property during the construction activities that do not already have noise insulation from City of Inglewood's existing Residential Sound Insulation Program. These properties are depicted along with the 1.5+ dB CNEL contour on Exhibit 4-2 of the Final EA. One property owner refused LAWA's offer of noise insulation. The remaining six property owners have not responded to multiple requests by LAWA and the City of Inglewood. Section 4.2.5 of the Final EA states the Proposed Action would not result in significant operational noise impacts but would result in temporary significant construction-related noise impacts due to the shift of aircraft operations while Runway 6L-24R is closed. For those seven properties that are eligible to participate in the Residential Sound Insulation Program that did not responded or previously declined to participate in the RISP, LAWA will invite them again to participate in the program. If the affected property owners agree to participate in the RISP, sound insulation would be completed prior to July 2015 when construction of the Proposed Action and the temporary closure of Runway 6L-24R would begin. Implementation of this measure for these seven properties is a condition of approval of this FONSI and ROD.

B. Compatible Land Use. Section 3.3.2 of the Final EA states the airport is located in the City of Los Angeles. The Los Angeles General Plan – Land Use Element includes the LAX Plan. Section 3.3.2.1 also describes several applicable City of Los Angeles Specific Plans including the LAX Specific Plan and the Los Angeles Airport/El Segundo Dunes Specific Plan. Section 4.3.34 of the Final EA states the No-Action, and the Proposed Action would not result in changes to existing land uses in the vicinity of the airport. Therefore, the proposed RSA program is consistent with community planning. Since the runway is not being extended, there is no requirement for the Land Use Assurance Letter as required by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended.

C. Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risk are discussed in Section 4.4 of the Final EA. The Final EA states the proposed RSA and associated improvements would occur entirely on airport property. Therefore, the proposed action would not create any adverse off-airport socioeconomic impacts. Section 4.4.3.2, of the Final EA, states there are two Census Tracts in the General Study Area for the airport that can be characterized as having "meaningfully greater" minority or low-income population. The subsection of this section states that an analysis of air quality, noise and traffic indicates no significant impacts are anticipated for the Proposed Action Alternative. Furthermore, no significant impacts related to lighting and visual character, hazardous materials or water resources are anticipated. Therefore the Proposed Action, and No Action Alternatives will not result in disproportionate impacts on any minority or low-income populations. The temporary closure of Runway 6L-24R during construction would result in a change of 1.5 dB CNEL over seven noise sensitive properties in Inglewood that have not been included in the City of Inglewood's Residential Sound Insulation Program. As described above, LAWA will invite those property owners again to participate in the Residential Sound Insulation Program. If the property owners accept LAWA's offer, the insulation would be installed before the runway closure scheduled for July 2015. Noise and air quality impacts on these facilities and similar residential and recreational areas within the General Study Area would not exceed applicable thresholds of significance under the Proposed Action alternative.

D. Air Quality. Section 4.5 of the Final EA, states the proposed action will not change aircraft operations at the Los Angeles International Airport. Section 4.5.3 provides construction and operational emissions inventory for the Final EA. Construction emissions for the Proposed Action were evaluated and were determined to be below the *de minimis* thresholds for all applicable pollutants, and therefore not significant. Table 4-8 provides the emissions inventories to for the proposed action alternative with the *de minimis* thresholds. The Proposed Action would not exceed the *de minimis* thresholds for air pollutant emissions.

Construction operations would cause specific impacts resulting from and limited to construction of the Runway Safety Area Improvements. These impacts are distinct and temporary in duration and decrease as work is finished. Best management techniques would be used to reduce the impacts due to the construction work to a less than significant level.

E. Water Resources. Section 4.6 of the Final EA states the Proposed Action would not create a significant impact to water resources. The Proposed Action includes construction of a 720 foot long culvert in the eastern most portion of the Argo Ditch. Section 4.6.4.2 of the Final EA states for stormwater treatment and discharge the Proposed Action would not alter the drainage patterns on the airport. This section of the Final EA also states the proposed action and the No Action Alternative will have no effect on potable water sources used at the airport.

F. Wetlands. Section 4.7 of the Final EA states the Proposed Action includes construction of a 720-foot long concrete box channel culvert in the Argo Ditch. Section 4.7.1 of the Final EA states the Proposed Action would impact 0.093 acres (about 4,000 square feet) of jurisdictional wetlands that were previously mitigation in conjunction with the channel clearing that was authorized by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to Nationwide Permit No. 31 in 1998. The Proposed Action would be an allowable activity under Nationwide Permit No. 39.

G. Light Emissions and Visual Impacts. Section 4.8 of the Final EA states the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative would not have a significant impact on light emissions. Nighttime construction work would use construction lighting. Section 4.8.5 of the Final EA states that LAWA will conduct reviews of lighting type and placement to ensure that lighting will not interfere with aeronautical lights or create glare for pilots and Air Traffic Controllers in the Airport Traffic Control Tower.

H. Natural Resources and Energy Supply. Section 4.9 of the Final EA states the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternatives would not have a significant impact on natural resources that are unusual or in short supply. The Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative would not increase aircraft operations or use of the Airport compared to the No Action Alternative.

I. Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste. Section 4.10 of the Final EA notes construction associated with the Proposed Action would involve shallow excavation in the areas where the runway, taxiway pavements are to be reconstructed. Section 4.10.3.2, notes there are no known or listed hazardous material or clean-up sites located within the Detailed Study Area that would be excavated or graded during the construction activities for the Proposed Action. Implementation of Best Management Practices to avoid spillages of fuels, greases, and oils, would reduce potential impacts.

J. Cumulative Impacts. The past, present and reasonably foreseeable cumulative actions included in the cumulative impact analysis are presented in Section 3.16, Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions. An evaluation of cumulative impacts from these cumulative actions is discussed in Section 4.11 of the Final EA and no significant cumulative impacts were identified.

K. 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 Action and the No Action Alternatives. The FAA determined that all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the Proposed Action have been adopted and there would be no significant environmental impacts from the Proposed RSA improvements and other associated 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 Action – Refinement No. 2 alternative and thus would be the environmentally preferred alternative. However, the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the proposed project and does not allow the LAWA to comply with the provisions of Public Law 109-115.

Thus, the FAA's preferred alternative is the Proposed Action – Refinement No. 2 defined in the Final EA. FAA selected this alternative because it meets the Purpose and Need of the proposed project with minimum adverse environmental effects. Further, it meets FAA's statutory mission to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by enhancing aviation safety through improved runway safety areas at LAX and complies with Public Law 109-115, LAWA's previous proposed action identified in the Draft EA.

6. Public Participation.

The public was encouraged to review and comment on the Draft EA which was released for public review on May 16, 2014. LAWA published a notice of availability of the Draft EA in the following local newspapers in the vicinity of the airport: *Los Angeles Times*, *Daily Breeze*, *The Argonaut* and *La Opinion*. LAWA made the Draft EA available on their web site, in the local libraries, the Airport administrative offices and the FAA's Western Pacific Region Office and at the FAA's Los Angeles Airports District Office. The 30-day comment period ended on June 16, 2014. No comments were received. Copies of the newspaper Affidavit of Publications are provided in Chapter 5 of the Final EA.

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 Action does not involve construction of a new airport, new runway or major runway extension that has a significant impact on natural resources including fish and wildlife; natural, scenic, and recreational assets; water and air quality; or another factor affecting the environment.

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

The attached Final EA examines each of the various environmental resources that were deemed present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action. The proposed Runway Safety Area Project and Associated Improvements at Los Angeles International Airport would not involve any environmental impacts, after mitigation, that would exceed the threshold of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1E and 5050.4B. Based on the information contained in the Final EA, the FAA has determined that the Proposed Action is the most feasible and prudent alternative. The FAA has decided to implement the Proposed Action as described in Section 3 of this FONSI.

9. Agency Findings.

The FAA makes the following determination 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, including the City of Los Angeles General Plan and the LAX Specific Plan. 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 Action 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.

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 Runway 6R-24L and 6L-24R Safety Area Project and Associated Improvements as the FAA's Preferred Alternative. The FAA must select one of the following choices:

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

Approval signifies that applicable federal requirements relating to the proposed airport development and planning have been met. Approval permits the City of Los Angeles to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Action and associated mitigation measures. Disapproval would prevent the City of Los Angeles from implementing the Proposed Action elements within the Los Angeles International Airport.

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 Airport Layout Plan (ALP) to depict the proposed improvements pursuant to 49 USC §§ 40103(b) and 47107(a)(16). Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, (CFR) Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace*; and 14 CFR Part 157, *Notice of Construction, Alteration, Activation, and Deactivation of Airports*.
2. Determination under 49 USC § 44502(b) that the airport development is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense.
3. Approval of a Construction Safety and Phasing Plan to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-2F, *Operational Safety on Airports During Construction*, [14 CFR Part 139 (49 USC § 44706)].
4. Implementation of revised air traffic control procedures below 3,000 feet above ground level;
5. Establishment of new Standard Instrument Departure (SID) and Standard Terminal Arrival Route (STAR) procedures.
6. Determinations under 49 U.S.C. § 47106 and § 47107 relating to the eligibility
7. Approval changes to the airport certification manual pursuant to 14 CFR Part 139, (49 USC § 44706).
8. Determinations under 49 U.S.C §§ 47106 and 47107 relating to project grant application approval conditioned on satisfaction of project requirements, and project grant application approval conditioned on assurances about airport operations the proposed project for Federal funding assistance under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and 49 USC § 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR § 158.25, to impose and use passenger facility charges (PFCs) for the proposed project as shown on the ALPⁱⁱ.
9. Determination of eligibility for federal assistance for the near-term development projects under the Federal grant-in-aid program authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (49 USC § 47101 et seq.).
10. Appropriate amendments to air carrier operations specifications pursuant to 49 USC § 44705.
11. FAA determination of the Proposed Action's effects on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace.

ⁱⁱ Certain requirements for AIP funding overlap with environmental review requirements for approval of the ALP and so are addressed as part of the EA for the ALP. These determinations are a prerequisite to funding but do not complete the determinations that are necessary for funding. The decision to approve AIP and PFC funding are completed in separate processes.

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). 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 EIS for this action.

APPROVED:



Glen Martin
Regional Administrator, AWP-1

7/16/14

Date

DISAPPROVED:

Glen Martin
Regional Administrator, 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. Any party seeking to stay implementation of the ROD must file an application with the FAA prior to seeking judicial relief as provided in Rule 18(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.