

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

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Proposed Terminal Replacement Project

Del Norte County Regional Airport
Jack McNamara Field
Crescent City, Del Norte County, California



For further information:

Camille Garibaldi
Environmental Protection Specialist
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
San Francisco Airports District Office
831 Mitten Road, Room 210
Burlingame, CA 94010
(650) 876-2778 extension 613

August 9, 2011

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

TERMINAL REPLACEMENT PROJECT

**DEL NORTE COUNTY AIRPORT
JACK MCNAMARA FIELD
CRESCENT CITY, CALIFORNIA**

1. Introduction

This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the environment as a result of a proposed replacement of the passenger terminal and associated facilities at Del Norte County Airport, Jack McNamara Field (CEC) located in Crescent City, Del Norte County, California. The Border Coast Regional Airport Authority (BCRAA or Sponsor), as the operator of CEC proposes to construct a new terminal building and associated facilities to include an aircraft apron, and a parking lot approximately 550 feet southwest of the existing terminal, to meet existing and forecasted aviation activity levels at CEC. The Sponsor intends to seek federal financial assistance to complete these improvements.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before taking the federal actions of processing an application for federal funding assistance for eligible airport development and approval of the proposed terminal area improvements in a revised CEC Airport Layout Plan (ALP). FAA approval of ALPs is authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (Public Laws 97-248 and 100-223).

In accordance with Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1501.3 of the President's Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (CEQ), the implementing federal regulations for NEPA, the FAA supervised preparation of a Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) for the Proposed Terminal Replacement Project at CEC dated May 2011. The Final EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the FAA's NEPA implementing guidance as defined in FAA Order 1050.1E, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airports Actions*.

2. Project Purpose and Need

The purpose and need for the Sponsor's proposed action is to construct facilities to meet the existing and projected aviation demand. The existing 2,020 square foot (sqft) terminal is in substandard condition and does not have adequate space to accommodate all the typical functions needed for commercial passenger operations as required by Transportation Security Administration (TSA) regulations, nor does it comply with seismic codes and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Currently, TSA passenger screening and post screening passenger holding occurs in a double-wide modular building located adjacent to the existing terminal. The configuration of the facilities in the terminal does not provide the square footage necessary to sufficiently accommodate ADA concerns such as wheelchair movement. The existing terminal aircraft apron is also undersized and recent safety inspections have noted aircraft apron and ramp congestion limit and constrict aircraft movement. The proposed project will construct a new terminal building, new aircraft apron, associated parking lots, utility improvements and a terminal access road. The existing terminal will be demolished. A hangar currently located in the area of the proposed new terminal will be moved to the existing hangar area within CEC.

The FAA's statutory mission is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. The FAA must ensure the proposed action does not derogate the safety of aircraft and airport operations at CEC. The proposed new terminal, aircraft apron and terminal ramp area will enhance the safety and efficiency of aircraft operations at the airport.

3. Proposed Project and Federal Actions:

The following is a listing of the Terminal Replacement Project construction components evaluated in the Final EA and this FONSI:

Landside Project Components

- New terminal building up to 17,867 sqft;
- New short-term parking lot and improvement of existing north parking lot to accommodate approximately 231 parking spaces;
- Improve Dale Rupert Road and an existing gravel road to develop a loop airport access road that connects to the parking areas and meets County standards;
- Infrastructure and utility improvements (i.e., electrical connections, water/wastewater piping, drainage systems, lighting, parking meters/machines, etc.) necessary to support construction and operation of the terminal building, parking lot, and aircraft apron area;
- Demolish the existing 2,020 sqft terminal building;
- Relocation of an existing hangar within CEC.

Airside Project Components

- New aircraft apron area (approximately 350 feet by 190 feet).

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

- Unconditionally approve the portion of the ALP that depicts proposed Terminal Replacement Project improvements pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b), 44718 and 47107(a)(16) and Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 and Part 157. The proposed CEC ALP changes are evaluated in airspace case number 2011 AWP 565-NRA.
- Determination of eligibility for federal assistance under the Federal grant-in-aid program authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (49 U.S.C. § 47101 et. seq.).
- Approval of further processing of an application for federal assistance for eligible terminal project components using federal funds from the Airport Improvement Program.
- Continued close coordination with the BCRAA and appropriate FAA program offices, as required, to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 44706.
- Approval of amendments, as appropriate, to the airport certification manual pursuant to 14 CFR Part 139 and 49 U.S.C. § 44706.

4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered

As described in Chapter 3 of the Final EA, the alternative courses of action evaluated in the EA include the Proposed Project; Alternatives A-1, A-2, B-1 and B-2, which involved different combinations of terminal and associated infrastructure layout than the Proposed Project; use of alternative modes of transportation; development of a new airport on another site; develop facilities at another existing airport and the No Action alternative.

The Final EA concluded only the Proposed Project alternative would meet the purpose and need with the least potential environmental effect, therefore only the Proposed Project alternative and the No Action alternative were evaluated in detail. A No Action alternative is required to be reviewed pursuant to Title 40 CFR § 1502.14 (d).

Alternatives A-1, A-2, B-1 and B-2, were eliminated from further consideration because the proposed terminal locations could not meet FAA Airport Design standards without creating unacceptable constraints in the aviation operations area and would also have greater environmental impacts. Development of a terminal facilities at another airport, creating an airport at a new location, and use of alternate modes of transportation would not meet the Purpose and Need for the project.

5. Assessment

The potential environmental impacts and possible adverse effects were identified and evaluated in Chapter 5 of the Final EA. The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories: Noise; Compatible Land Use; Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks; Air Quality; Water Resources; Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste; Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources; Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f); Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Wetlands; Coastal Resources; Energy Supply and Natural Resources; Visual/Aesthetics and Light Emissions; Construction Impacts; Secondary (Induced) Impacts; and Cumulative Impacts.

The environmental impact categories of Wild and Scenic Rivers, Farmlands, and Floodplains were not evaluated because there would be no affect to these resources.

FAA Order 1050.1E, *Appendix A - Analysis of Environmental Impact Categories*, establishes the thresholds for determination of significant environmental impacts evaluated by the FAA, and those significance levels were used in the Final EA to assess environmental impacts as summarized below.

Noise: Section 5.2 of the Final EA states the Terminal Replacement Project would not change the number of existing or forecast aircraft operations at CEC. Tables 2-1a and Table 2-2 provide the existing and FAA approved forecast activity levels for aviation operations at CEC. The FAA considered data from the Air Carrier Activity Information System (ACAIS) and the Flight Schedule Data System (FSDS) to substantiate the passenger enplanement and Air Taxi/Commuter operations levels. The total forecast aircraft operations for 2016 is 10,275 which includes 2,400 Air Taxi/Commuter operations.

Under the Proposed Project alternative shown in Figures 5.2-2 and 5.2-4 and the No Action alternative shown in Figures 5.2-1 and 5.2-3, the Community Noise Exposure Level (CNEL) 65 dB contour remains within the property boundary of CEC. The Proposed Project will not result in any noise impacts from airport operations.

The Final EA Section 5.2.4.2 discusses that construction noise from implementation of the Proposed Project would be of limited scope and duration and would not result in a permanent increase in noise levels. Therefore, no noise impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project alternative.

Compatible Land Use: As discussed above, the CNEL 65 dB noise contour is within the property boundary of CEC. Section 5.3 of the Final EA describes the land use zoning to the southeast as agricultural and residential, and zoning to the north, east and west of CEC as open space and resource conversation. Land uses immediately adjacent to CEC are compatible with the operations of the airport and implementation of the Proposed Project alternative would not result in a change in land use. No impact to compatible land use would occur from implementing the Proposed Project.

Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks: As discussed in the Final EA Section 5.4, the Proposed Project will not require disruption or relocation of any residents or businesses, and therefore not result in socioeconomic impacts. No development would occur outside of CEC property. Implementation of the Proposed Project alternative would not create a disproportionately high and adverse impact on human

health or environmental effects on any minority or low income populations in the vicinity of CEC, nor would it would result in a disproportionate health or safety risk to children.

Air Quality: Del Norte County is located within the North Coast Air Basin (NCAB). The NCAB is in "Attainment" or "Unclassified" of all federal National Ambient Air Quality Standards. As discussed in the Final EA Section 5.5, air quality emissions are expected to increase slightly with implementation of the Proposed Project alternative due an increase in aircraft taxi-time and a longer airport access road. However, as shown in Table 5.5-1 and discussed in Section 5.5.4.2 construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not exceed *de minimis* thresholds and no significant impact to air quality would occur.

Water Resources: As discussed in Final EA Section 5.6, the Proposed Project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces at CEC from 66 acres under the No Action alternative to approximately 70.5 acres under the Proposed Project alternative. Sufficient capacity exists in the stormwater drainage ditches to accommodate the associated increase in stormwater runoff and no additional stormwater detention is required. An existing open earth channel would be slightly reconfigured to accommodate the new parking lot. Construction of the Proposed Project could impact water quality during ground disturbance and site clearing activities. The Sponsor will implement the measures identified in Section 5.6.4.3 of the EA to minimize any potential impact to water resources. These include an erosion and runoff control plan that will be submitted to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) as required by the Notice of Intent to Issue Permit (NOIIP) No. A-1-DNC-09-048.BCRAA. Plans and specifications will be submitted to the County of Del Norte for approval prior to commencement of construction activities along with a BCRAA Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that includes site-specific structural and operational Best Management Practices (BMP) to prevent and control impacts to water quality. No significant impact to Water Resources will occur from implementation of the Proposed Project alternative.

Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste: As discussed in the Final EA Section 5.7, the Proposed Project alternative would include demolition of the existing terminal originally constructed in 1950. Given the age of the building it is known to contain asbestos and lead based paint. Section 5.7.4.3 of the EA, states that prior to demolishing the terminal building, BCRAA will require preparation and implementation of an asbestos and lead-based paint control plan to ensure proper removal and disposal of these materials.

Construction debris generated during implementation of the Proposed Project would be taken to a licensed landfill facility. Sufficient capacity exists within the identified landfill to accept the construction debris. The quantity of material generated is not expected to impact the capacity of landfill. Therefore no significant impacts from hazardous materials, solid waste or pollution prevention would occur from implementing the Proposed Project.

Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources: As discussed in Final EA Section 5.8 and Appendix G, FAA determined that no cultural resources or historic properties listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are within the Area of Potential Effect for the Proposed Project. The FAA determined that no historic properties would be affected by implementation of the Proposed Project. FAA consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was conducted for the Proposed Project. The California SHPO concurred with the FAA's determinations regarding the Proposed Project in letters dated August 6, 2008, October 27, 2010 and February 24, 2011. The SHPO's concurrence on October 27, 2010 considered the configuration modifications to the Proposed Project Alternative, and the February 24, 2011 concurrence addressed site clearance for the hangar relocation. Section 5.8.4.3 of the Final EA describes the procedures which will be implemented in the event that previously unidentified resources are discovered during construction activities.

No significant impact to Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, or Cultural Resources would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project alternative.

Department of Transportation (DOT) Act Section 4(f) Properties: As discussed in Final EA Section 5.9, no Section 4(f) properties would be subject to direct or constructive use from implementation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, no significant environmental impacts would occur to DOT Section 4(f) properties.

Fish, Wildlife, and Plants: As discussed in the Final EA Section 5.10, construction of the Proposed Project could result in a disturbance of potential habitat for the federally endangered western lily (*Lilium occidentale*) plant within the Proposed Project access road alignment. The FAA determined that the Proposed Project may but is not likely to adversely affect the western lily. This United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) concurred with the FAA determination during the Endangered Species Act Section 7 informal consultation, in a letter dated October 12, 2010, which is documented in Appendix H of the Final EA. Between 1 and 3 acres of habitat improvement will be undertaken as mitigation for the access road western lily habitat disturbance, as discussed in Section 5.10.4.3 of the Final EA.

Final EA Section 5.10.4.3 also discusses avoidance and minimization measures during construction in order to protect migratory and protected bird species. If feasible, vegetation clearing activities will be conducted outside of the nesting season between July 15 and October 15. If work occurs during the nesting season, February 15 through August 31, a preconstruction survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify if any migratory or protected birds are nesting in the vicinity of the Proposed Action alternative. The California Coastal Development Permit incorporates compensation for potential habitat impact to the northern red-legged frog (*Rana aurora*), a California species of concern. This requires incorporation of sub-grade passageways in the eastern portion of the access road for the Proposed Project alternative and monitoring. BCRAA will prepare a plan that documents the underpass design features and establishes the annual monitoring requirements for a period of 5 years. The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to listed species or critical habitat.

Wetlands: As discussed in the Final EA Section 5.11, the Proposed Project would impact a total of approximately 0.182 acres of wetlands and other waters of the United States, that are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Approximately 0.134 acres are wetlands and 0.048 acres are "other waters." The Proposed Project qualifies for a Nationwide Permit #39, Commercial and Institutional Development.

The 0.182 acres is also considered coastal wetlands under the jurisdiction of the CCC. The CCC has established a mitigation ratio of 4:1 for wetlands under its jurisdiction. As discussed in Section 5.11.4.3 of the Final EA, coastal wetland mitigation will be implemented at the 4:1 ratio, include a 5-year monitoring program and will meet criteria established by the CCC as well as meet USACE requirements, therefore, there would be no significant impact to wetlands.

Coastal Resources: CEC is located within the California coastal zone. As described in Section 5.12 of the Final EA the Proposed Project will be implemented in a manner consistent with the California Coastal Management Program and the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). The Proposed Project alternative will be designed to enhance the visual quality of CEC. The terminal building will be designed with naturally occurring earth tones to blend with the surrounding landforms and vegetation and will use non-reflective exterior materials to the extent practical. On August 19, 2010 the CCC agreed that with implementation of all conditions required by the NOIIP No. A-1-DNC-09-048 that the Proposed Project would not adversely affect coastal resources and is consistent with the California Coastal Management Program and CZMA. The permit conditions include protective or mitigation measures and monitoring of the coastal resources to include: Wetlands; Fish, Wildlife and Plants; Water Resources; Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste; and Visual Resources. Therefore, no significant impact to Coastal Resources will occur with implementation of the Proposed Project.

Energy Supply and Natural Resources: The Proposed Project alternative would generate a need for additional electrical power to the new terminal building, aircraft apron and parking facilities. It is estimated that the Proposed Project would result in a 10 percent increase from the No Action alternative in 2016. As discussed in the Final EA Sections 4.4.10 and 5.13, sufficient

electrical power is available to meet the projected increase. The Proposed Project design will incorporate energy-saving design features. The Proposed Project will not impact any mineral resources. Thus implementing the Proposed Project alternative would not result in a significant impact to energy supply or natural resources.

Visual/Aesthetics and Light Emissions: As discussed in the Final EA Section 5.14, implementation of the Proposed Project would not adversely affect any scenic vistas in the coastal environment. It is anticipated that the new terminal building will become the central focal point and would improve the visual character of CEC for its patrons and the community. The Proposed Project will have limited visual or aesthetic effect on the offsite land uses. Future light emission levels are not expected to dramatically change, exterior lighting will include directional shielding when possible to reduce glare and comply with County policies regarding outdoor lighting. No impacts are anticipated from the Proposed Project alternative.

Construction Impacts: Environmental impacts during construction would be temporary in nature and ultimately cease as components of the Proposed Project were completed. As discussed in the Final EA Section 5.15, preventative measures and BMPs in accordance with federal, state, and local requirements, and additional BMPs identified by the Sponsor, would be implemented to keep potential environmental impacts during construction below a significant level.

Secondary (Induced) Impacts: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a temporary increase of approximately 20 to 30 persons employed beyond the CEC employment levels during construction of the Proposed Project. As discussed in the Final EA Section 5.16, implementation of the Proposed Project is designed to accommodate existing aviation demand and the Proposed Project would not result in changes in the regional population, public services demands, or business or economic activity or result in permanent changes in employment. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any secondary or induced impacts.

Cumulative Impacts: The Final EA considered the possible cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project and other developments (off-airport) that are related in terms of time and proximity. Section 5.17 of the Final EA, identifies past, present and future on and off airport projects in the Del Norte County area. The cumulative impact analysis considered the potential impact interaction of the projects identified. No significant cumulative impacts are identified for any of the environmental resource categories.

6. Public Participation:

The Sponsor encouraged public participation through the public involvement process as documented in Appendix A of the Final EA. The Sponsor solicited public scoping comments during a November 25 to December 22, 2006 public scoping period, including two public and agency scoping meetings held on December 12, 2006. A Draft EAVEIR was provided for public review and comment from September 2, 2008 to October 17, 2008, including a public hearing on October 2, 2008. The BCRAA published a Notice of Availability of the Draft EAVEIR in The Triplicate, the local newspaper, on August 30, 2008. In response to public and agency comments received during the review and through the CCC consultation and permitting evaluation process, the Proposed Project alternative was modified to further avoid potential wetland and biological resource impacts. This is discussed in Appendix J of the Final EA. Public comment letters and the responses to those comments are included in Appendix L of the Final EA.

7. Inter-Agency Coordination

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. § 47101(h), FAA has determined that no further coordination with the U.S. Department of Interior or the EPA 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 deemed present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action. The Proposed Project is implementation of a Terminal Replacement Project that includes airside and landside components at CEC to meet the existing and projected aviation demand. The Proposed Project would not involve any environmental impacts that would exceed the threshold of environmental significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1E and 5050.4B, with the implementation of the mitigation measures and BMP's as discussed in the Final EA. The FAA has decided to implement the eligible components of the Proposed Project as described in Section 3 of this FONSI.

9. Finding of No Significant Impact

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 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this action.

APPROVED:



Mark A. McClardy
Manager, Airports Division, AWP-600

8/9/11
Date

DISAPPROVED:

Mark A. McClardy
Manager, Airports Division, AWP-600

Date