

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

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

Proposed Concourse B Expansion

Sacramento International Airport
Sacramento, Sacramento County, California



For further information

David M. Wickens
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
Western-Pacific Region - Airports Division
San Francisco Airports District Office
2999 Oak Road, Suite 200
Walnut Creek, California 94597-7776
925-546-6445

May 22, 2025

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 Concourse B Expansion Project at Sacramento International Airport located in Sacramento, Sacramento County, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment dated May 2025. 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 December 2025, Sacramento County Department of Airports (SCDA), prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) under the supervision of the FAA. The Draft EA addressed the potential environmental effects of the proposed Concourse B Expansion Project 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], and FAA Orders 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. The SCDA published the Notice of Availability for the Draft EA on December 19, 2025. Executive Orders issued following publication of the Draft EA have resulted in potential changes to environmental reviews. In the spirit of NEPA timelines and efficiency, the subjects of various Executive Orders that have been revoked have not been removed from the EA, and the FAA's review of the conclusions would not change the significance findings or FAA determinations and decisions contained within this decision document. The SCDA received in total, one comment letter comprising 5 bracketed comments during the public comment period held between December 19, 2025, and January 24, 2025. The Final EA became a Federal document when the Responsible FAA Official signed the document on May 20, 2025.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO? Read the FONSI and ROD to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed Concourse B Expansion project at Sacramento International Airport.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS? The SCDA 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 CONCOURSE B EXPANSION PROJECT

**SACRAMENTO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
SACRAMENTO, SACRAMENTO 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 Concourse B Expansion Project (Proposed Project) at Sacramento International Airport (SMF)(Airport), Sacramento County, California. The Sacramento County Department of Airports, through its Aviation Department, is the sponsor for SMF. 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.

Executive Orders issued following publication of the Draft EA have resulted in potential changes to environmental reviews. In the spirit of NEPA timelines and efficiency, the subjects of various Executive Orders that have been revoked have not been removed from the EA, and the FAA's review of the conclusions would not change the significance findings or FAA determinations and decisions contained within this decision document.

Pursuant to Section 743 of the *Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2024* (Public Law 118-63), 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. Based on FAA's interpretation and implementation of the law, approval of the Airport Layout Plan depicting the proposed SCDA's Proposed Project is 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 118-63).

- 2. Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project.** Section 1.3.1 of the Final EA states the Airport is forecast to experience continued growth. To meet existing and future needs of the Sacramento region and to ensure SMF functions at industry standard levels of service (LOS), Sacramento County Department of Airports (SCDA) is proposing improvements at SMF that would provide terminal facilities sized to efficiently accommodate the market-based passenger demand at industry standard levels of service through Planning Activity Level (PAL) PAL 2, which is estimated to be reached by 2030. Improvements to the fuel hydrant system would also increase safety via reduced potential for taxiway/taxilane surface incidents by alleviating the need for fuel trucks to cross the airfield to get between the fuel farm and Concourse B. Section 1.3.2 of the Final EA states the SCDA's need for the Proposed Project is because SMF will have a

capacity need of six additional aircraft gates once PAL 2 is reached, which is anticipated to be 2030. The Proposed Project also identifies a safety need. Development of the Proposed Project will enable activation of a fueling system that can allow fueling of airplanes stationed at aircraft gates that will reduce fueling truck trips across Taxiway W and Taxilane Y, thus reducing opportunities for surface incidents. Section 1.3.3 of the Final EA states FAA's purpose of the Proposed Project is to: provide facilities that are sized to efficiently accommodate the market-based demand at industry standard levels of service; and reduce the potential for surface incidents of fueling trucks or other vehicles into the path of aircraft on taxiways and taxilanes.

Section 1.3.3 the Final EA identifies the following minimum operational requirements to meet existing and future needs at SMF:

- Provide facilities that are sized to efficiently accommodate the market-based demand at industry standard levels of service; and
- Reduce the potential for surface incidents of fueling trucks or other vehicles into the path of aircraft on taxiways and taxilanes.

Section 1.3.4 of the Final EA identifies the FAA Purpose and Need which is to ensure that the Proposed Project does not derogate the safety of aircraft and airport operations at SMF and that it meets FAA airport design standards and for airport development projects provide for the protection and enhancement of natural resources and the quality of the environment of the United States.

3. Proposed Project and Federal Action. Section 1.4 of the Final EA provides a description of the Proposed Project. Proposed Project includes expanding Concourse B to accommodate six additional aircraft gates and associated holdrooms at the west end, constructing additional concessions facilities, modifying the Concourse B security checkpoint to add two new lanes, adding two new baggage carousels at Terminal B baggage claim, and extending the hydrant fuel line system around the expanded concourse and connecting the hydrant fuel line system to the fuel farm. Proposed Project elements fall into three broad categories: Passenger Concourse Improvements; Airfield Improvements; and Utility Improvements.

Passenger Concourse Improvements discussed in the Final EA at Section 1.4.1 and evaluated in this FONSI/ROD include the following major components:

- Temporary relocation of operations from existing gates B22 and B23 to gates B02 and B03 for the duration of construction of the Proposed Project.
- Removal of the existing west wall of Concourse B and construction of an expansion of approximately 70,000 square feet (sf) to accommodate six new aircraft gates and associated holdrooms. The key elements of this component would include:
 - Six new aircraft gates (gates B24, B25, B26, B27, B28, and B29)
 - Approximately 24,000 sf of holdroom space

- Approximately 39,000 sf of additional concessions facilities
- Two new restroom banks
- Two new lanes at the Concourse B security checkpoint
- Two new baggage carousels at the Terminal B baggage claim.
- Existing gates B14, B15, B16, B17, B18, B19, and B20 would be realigned to better accommodate the six additional gates at Concourse B

Airfield Improvements discussed in the Final EA at Section 1.4.2 and evaluated in this FONSI/ROD include the following components:

- Airfield pavement west of Concourse B would be expanded further west by approximately 308 feet toward Taxiway A for a total of 230,100 square-feet of new impervious surface area.
- Portions of Taxiways A, Y, and B1 would be reconstructed so that the connections between Taxiway A and Taxiways Y and B1 would conform to existing FAA design standards.
- Taxilane Y4, located west of Concourse B, would be realigned onto the new airfield pavement.

Utility Improvements discussed in the Final EA at Section 1.4.3 and evaluated in this FONSI/ROD include the following components:

- The existing hydrant fuel line would be extended to encompass the expanded concourse.
- The existing fuel pits along the western half of Concourse B would be relocated at the locations in which gates would be realigned.
- The hydrant fuel line would be extended from its current terminus west of Earhart Road and south of Cy Homer Road to reach the existing fuel farm. The hydrant fuel line would then be connected to the fuel farm.

Section 1.5 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project would be implemented in the following five stages, between the years 2025 and 2029ⁱ:

- Taxiway and Taxilane improvements
- West Apron, New Concourse, and North Fuel and Fiber Extension
- South Apron Fuel Pits Reconfiguration, Striping, and Passenger Boarding Bridge Adjustments
- North Apron Fuel Pits Reconfiguration, Striping, and Passenger Boarding Bridge Adjustments
- Fuel and Fiberoptics Tie-ins.

ⁱ Full implementation of the Proposed Project was updated from 2028 to 2029 prior to the Final EA.
 Sacramento International Airport
 Concourse B Expansion FONSI/ROD
 May 2025

The federal action necessary to carry out the proposed project:

- Unconditional approval of portions of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depict those components of the Proposed Project subject to FAA review and approval pursuant to 49 USC § 47107(a)(16)(B), (x);
- Determinations under 49 USC §§ 47106 and 47107 that are associated with the eligibility of the Proposed Project for federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program; and
- Determinations under 49 USC § 40117, as implemented by Title 14 CFR § 158.25, to impose and use passenger facility charges (PFCs) collected at the Airport to assist with construction of potentially eligible development items shown on the ALP.

4. **Reasonable Alternatives Considered.** Section 2-2, *Screening Process* in Chapter 2 of the Final EA, used a detailed two-step alternatives analysis screening process for the proposed Concourse Expansion Project. This FONSI/ROD summarizes the screening used below:

Step 1 – Does the Alternative Achieve the Objectives of the Purpose and Need?

Would the alternative accommodate the forecast increase in passengers by meeting the requirements for the number of aircraft gates?

Does the alternative meet the purpose and need by providing the space for passenger security screening, the space and facilities for baggage handling, the space for holdrooms, the space for concessions and the space for restrooms?

Does the alternative reduce the potential for surface incidents of fueling trucks or other vehicles into the path of aircraft on taxiways and taxilanes?

Step 2 Constructability and Operational Considerations

Is the alternative technologically and economically feasible? Alternatives that would not introduce potential conflicts, hazards, redundancies, or operational inefficiencies are considered more viable than those that would. Also, an alternative that was more “reasonable to construct,” based on construction costs, complexity, or regulatory or compliance costs was considered more viable.

Section 2.3 of the Final EA describes the alternatives retained for further analysis. Analysis of the No Action Alternative is required pursuant Paragraph 6-1(a)(1) of FAA Order 1050.1F. At Paragraph 6-2.1 of FAA Order 1050.1F the Final EA 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.

Table 2-3, *Summary of Step 1 Screening Process*, in the Final EA provides a summary of the Step 1 screening process considered for all the alternatives evaluated. All the proposed alternatives achieved the objectives of the Purpose and Need. Therefore, all the alternatives were considered in Step 2 of the screening process. At Table 2-4, *Summary of Step 2 Screening Process*, the Final EA provides a summary of the Step 2 screening process.

- Alternative 2: Expanding Concourse B to the southwest would not have minimal effects on airfield operations and would not be reasonable to construct.
- Alternative 3: Construction of a new concourse parallel to Concourse B would not have a minimal effect on landside operations, and would not be reasonable to construct.
- Alternative 4: Construction of a new concourse parallel to Lindbergh Drive would not have minimal effects on landside operations, and would not be reasonable to construct.
- Alternative 5: Expansion of Concourse B to the east would not have minimal effects on airfield operations.
- Alternative 6: Expansion of Concourse A to the north would not have minimal effects on airfield operations.
- Alternative 7: Construction of a new concourse north of Concourse B would not have minimal effects on airfield operations, would not have minimal effects on landside operations, and would not be reasonable to construct.

Only the Proposed Project and No Action Alternative passed Step 1 and Step 2 for analysis in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the Final EA for detailed impact analysis.

5. **Environmental Consequences.** The potential environmental impacts were identified and evaluated in a Final EA prepared in May 2025. 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; Biological Resources; Climate; Farmlands; Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste and Pollution Prevention; Historic, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources, Land Use; Natural Resources and Energy Supply, Noise (Construction), Socio-Economic Impacts, and Children's Health and Safety Risks, Visual Effects, Water Resources, and Cumulative Impacts.

Table 3-1 of the Final EA discloses that the environmental impact categories of Coastal Resources; Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f); Farmlands; Land Use;

Wetlands; and Wild and Scenic Rivers were not evaluated further because the proposed project at SMF would **not affect** these environmental resources.

A. Air Quality. Section 4.2 of the Final EA provides the analysis of air quality for the Proposed Project. The FAA evaluation of the proposed project's air quality impacts is under General Conformity pursuant to the Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended, Table 4.3 at Section 4.2.2.2 presents the construction emissions associated with demolition and construction of the Proposed Project for each year (2025-2029) would be below established *de minimis* thresholds for all pollutants. Therefore, a General Conformity determination is not required for the construction and demolition activities of the Proposed Project. Additionally, in accordance with the FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, the Proposed Project can be determined to "not cause a significant air quality impact, because it is unlikely the pollutant concentration analyzed would exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)." No significant adverse air quality impacts would be expected to result from construction of the Proposed Project.

Operational emissions of the Proposed Project are also examined in the Final EA. The Proposed Project would not increase the number of aircraft or change the fleet mix or taxi times compared to the No Action Alternative; therefore, additional aircraft operations are not anticipated with the Proposed Project. However, an additional 1,500-kilowatt emergency generator and cooling tower are planned as part of the concourse expansion component of the Proposed Project. At Table 4-4 the Final EA presents the net operational emissions associated with aircraft operation for the Proposed Project for the opening (2029) and forecast year (2034) conditions compared with the appropriate USEPA *de minimis* thresholds. The net operational emissions would be below the *de minimis* thresholds for all pollutants. Therefore, a General Conformity determination is not required for the operational emissions of the Proposed Project. No significant adverse air quality impacts would be expected to result from operation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no significant effect on air quality. At Table 4-4 the Final EA provides the 2029 and 2034 Proposed Project Operational emissions inventory. This table shows that the *de minimis* thresholds are **not** exceeded for the various criteria pollutants for the year 2029 and 2034. Thus, the Proposed Project emissions would **not** cause or contribute to an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS. Since the Proposed Project for both construction and operations do not exceed *de minimis* thresholds, the project is presumed to conform to the State Implementation Plan. Thus, no General Conformity Determination was required for this Proposed Project.

Section 4.2.3 of the Final EA states that even though air quality mitigation measures are not required, SCDA is committed to implementing air quality best management practices (BMPs).

- B. Biological Resources.** Section 4.3.2.1 of the Final EA states the No Action Alternative would not involve any physical changes to Airport configuration, buildings, or infrastructure. Thus, the No Action Alternative would have no effect on biological resources.

Section 4.3.2.2 of the Final EA states under the Proposed Project, there is no suitable habitat for any of the federally-listed species potentially occurring within the Project Study Area. Further, Table 4-6 of the Final EA states none of the federally listed species are known or likely to occur in the Project Study Area. The Final EA also states there would be no impact to Migratory Bird Treaty Act species. This is because suitable habitat does not exist within the proposed areas of disturbance because the area is predominantly paved and developed, has high levels of human activity, and lacks habitat such as shrubs, trees, and water resources necessary for breeding, foraging, perching, or sheltering.

- C. Climate.** Section 4.4.2.1 of the Final EA states that under the No Action Alternative construction of the Proposed Project would not occur and would not generate emissions that could affect the local and global climate. The SCDA would continue to operate the Airport and serve forecast aviation demands. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would have no effect on climate.

Table 4-7 at Section 4.4.2.2 identifies GHG emissions associated with Proposed Project construction/demolition and operations compared to the No Action Alternative. The Final EA explains aircraft operations in the Proposed Project and the No Action Alternative scenario would be the same. Additionally, runway configuration and taxi times would be the same. The Final EA also discloses that while there are no significance thresholds established for climate impacts, GHGs associated with the Proposed Project have been calculated in accordance with the latest FAA guidelines (1050.1F) for climate impacts in a NEPA. Emissions spreadsheets in the Air Quality Technical Report are disclosed in Appendix D of the Final EA.

- D. Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention.** Section 4.5.2.1 of the Final EA states under the No Action Alternative, no construction would occur that could generate hazardous materials or solid waste. Fuel would continue to be trucked from the fuel farm to the concourse via trucks crossing active taxiways and taxilanes, maintaining the potential for surface incidents between fueling trucks and aircraft that could result in a hazardous materials release. Absent surface incidents between fueling trucks and aircraft, no significant impacts to hazardous materials or solid waste would occur. Section 4.5.2.2 of the Final EA states construction activities of the Proposed Project would involve use of fuels, oils, and lubricants, and solvents that may contain hazardous substances. This section also states the construction contractor would be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction activities that would contain BMPs for spill prevention, response, and pollution prevention measures to minimize or prevent the release of

hazardous substances into the environment during construction. Overall, the Proposed Project would have no significant impact on hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention.

- E. Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources.** As documented in Section 4.6.2.2 of the Final EA, a Cultural Resources Constraints Analysis was prepared in August 2024. The analysis determined that the nearest known eligible or listed resource is the Sacramento River, approximately 1.8 miles northwest of the Area of Potential Effect (APE), (the APE boundaries are the same as the Project Study Area), at its nearest point, which is a Tribal Cultural Landscape. Further, the Native American Heritage Commission responded that the results were negative for sacred sites within their search radius of the APE. The APE was included in the Terminal Modernization Project at SMF (County of Sacramento, 2008) which also determined that there were no eligible resources.

Section 4.6.2.1 of the Final EA states that under the No Action Alternative no physical changes to Airport configuration, buildings or infrastructure would occur. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not adversely affect any properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Section 4.6.2.2 of the Final EA discloses the Proposed Project would be within an area of the Airport that has been previously developed with Airport infrastructure and facilities. Construction of the Proposed Project would require a minor amount of grading and ground-disturbing activities within the developed airport facility, which is predominantly paved and previously disturbed (e.g., mass graded). The proposed project components would be consistent with the existing Airport facility landscape and would not result in any changes to viewsheds off of the Airport property. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant effects from noise or changes to visual setting that could directly or indirectly affect the NRHP-listed resource located more than a mile away from the APE. The project would not affect criteria associated with a cultural landscape, visual setting, or the understanding of historical and landscape features that may define perspectives, lifestyles, or settlement patterns associated with the Sacramento River.

The Proposed Project would result in No Historic Properties Affected. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would have no effect on historic, architectural, archeological, or cultural resources. Thus, based on the results of the Cultural Resources Constraints Analysis and SHPO concurrence on the “no adverse effect” determination under the Terminal Modernization Project (County of Sacramento, 2008), the FAA determined that the Proposed Project would not affect any properties listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP.

The Final EA states because the Proposed Project would have no effect on historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural resources, no mitigation measures are required. However, in the unlikely event during construction any archaeological

resources are inadvertently discovered, work would be halted and SCDA, FAA, and SHPO would be notified.

F. Natural Resources and Energy Supply. Section 4.7.2.1 of the Final EA states that under the No Action Alternative the Proposed Project would not be constructed. Electricity usage for the Airport would increase as a result of the forecast growth in aircraft operations and passenger enplanements. Current energy supplies could accommodate the increased demand for electricity at the Airport. However, fuel consumption would increase over time as a result of forecast growth in aircraft operations and passenger enplanements at the Airport. Section 4.7.2.2 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project would temporarily increase the use of natural resources and energy supplies over the 5-year construction period. However, these natural resources are ample in supply and the increase in fuel demand would be minimal. Following construction, operations associated with the Proposed Project would not place undue strain on existing natural and energy resources. Compared to the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Project would have no significant effect on natural resources and energy supplies.

G. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use. The year 2029 represents the opening year for the Proposed Project. There would be no changes in operating conditions as a result of the Proposed Project when compared to the No Action Alternative. As such, the population exposure, housing unit count, and noise contour areas for the 2029 Proposed Project would be the same as those shown for the 2029 No Action Alternative in Table 4-9 of the Final EA. The year 2034 in Table 4-10 represents five years after the opening year for the Proposed Project. This scenario again represents the same conditions as the No Action Alternative. Again, there would be no changes to operating conditions as a result of the Proposed Project. As such, the population exposure, housing unit count, and noise contour areas for the 2034 Proposed Project would be the same as those shown for the 2034.

Because there would be no change in aircraft operations when comparing the No Action Alternative to the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would have no effect on noise and noise-compatible land use.

H. Socioeconomics, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risk. A total of 6,199 people live within the General Study Area. Whereas 523,600 live within the City of Sacramento and 1,579,211 live in Sacramento County. While the Census Tracts cover a relatively large area, the site of the Proposed Project is substantially removed from populated areas within the Census Tracts because it is located within the near-center of the existing developed airport facility.

Section 4.9.1.2 of the Final EA states there are no residents or housing units within the Project Study Area, and the Proposed Project would not relocate residents or housing units. This section of the Final EA states that the Proposed Project is anticipated to positively affect employment by creating a temporary increase in

demand for construction-related employees. However, the Proposed Project would not require any additional employees to serve the forecast increase in passengers at the Airport beyond the No Action Alternative. Both temporary and permanent employment positions would likely be filled by existing residents in the greater Sacramento area and can be considered a positive impact. Operation of the Proposed Project would result in a minor increase in the number of vehicle trips to and from the Airport. However, the increase in passenger trips would not go beyond what is projected under the No Action Alternative.

The Proposed Project would not result in the relocation, acquisition, or alteration of schools, residences, daycares, parks, or any other establishments associated with children or childcare. None of the locations where children may be likely to congregate within the General Study Area would have a significant noise impact, which means no disproportionate effect on children's environmental health and safety risks would occur. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no effect on children's environmental health and safety risks when compared to the No Action Alternative.

- I. Visual Effects.** Section 4.10.1.1 of the Final EA states that the FAA has not established thresholds to determine the significance of light emissions and visual resources in FAA Order 1050.1F. Section 4.10.1.2 of the Final EA explains under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Project would not be constructed. There would be no development or alteration of the existing Airport configuration or infrastructure that could produce new light emissions. Thus, there would be no new light sources or changes to the visual character of the surrounding area.

The Final EA states under the Proposed Project, temporary light emissions would occur during nighttime-related construction. However, the temporary light source would not be visible to the nearest residence. This section of the Final EA also discloses the Proposed Project would increase light emissions. However, new lighting additions would be consistent with existing lighting at the Airport. The nearest light-sensitive land use is a residential property approximately one mile west of the Project Study Area and is unlikely to be affected by light emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Project should not cause any interference with normal activities, cause an annoyance to the community, or affect the visual character of the area due to light emissions. The Proposed Project would have no effect on light emissions.

- J. Visual Resources and Visual Character.** Section 4.10.2.2 explains the affected environment of the Proposed Project is not expected to affect the nature of the visual character of the area, contrast with the visual resources and/or visual character in the Detailed Study Area, or block or obstruct the views of visual resources. The No Action Alternative would have no effect on visual resources or character.

The Proposed Project's internal and external character would be in a similar design to existing Airport facilities and would have no significant effect on the visual resources or visual character of the Airport.

- K. Water Resources – Floodplains.** Section 4.11.1.2 of the Final EA discloses the Project Study Area is located within the Natomas Basin in an area that was historically part of the Sacramento River floodplain. Currently the land within the Project Study area and General Study Area is enclosed and protected by levees. During a storm event, water developed at the Airport is conveyed from the Airport property and pumped to the Sacramento River.

The Proposed Project is located within the developed Airport facility. The developed Airport (i.e., runways, taxiways, aprons, terminal, concourses, parking lots, etc.) is located entirely within a Federal Emergency Management Area (FEMA) special flood hazard area, Zone A99. The Zone A99 designation allows new development to proceed without an elevation certificate (EC) while improvements to the Natomas Basin Levee System are being completed. Once the levee improvements are complete the Urban Level of Flood Protection (ULOP) would be for a 200-year flood protection standard.

The No Action Alternative would have no effect on floodplains. The Proposed Project would be required to implement construction controls as outlined in the Construction Stormwater General Permit (CGP) and a SWPPP to avoid and/or minimize impacts to natural and beneficial floodplain values, including surface water quality as discussed in the Section 4.11.1.2 of the Final EA. Therefore, compliance with the CGP and SWPPP while constructing the Proposed Project would not result in direct or indirect adverse significant impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values.

- L. Surface Waters.** Section 4.11.2.2 discloses how stormwater developed at the Airport is conveyed through ditches and an underground storm drain system, detained in detention basins and subsequently discharged (pumped) to the Sacramento River. The No Action Alternative would have no effect on surface water. The Proposed Project would increase the amount of impervious surface by approximately 230,100 square feet. The increase in the amount and rate of stormwater runoff can be accommodated by the Airport's existing stormwater management system. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed water quality standards established by federal, state, or local regulatory agencies, nor contaminate public drinking water supply such that public health would be adversely affected. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no significant effect on surface waters.

- M. Groundwater.** Section 4.11.3.2 of the Final EA discloses the No Action Alternative would have no effect on groundwater. The depth to groundwater is estimated to be approximately 15 feet. The depth of the Proposed Project would be 45 feet for the expanded concourse foundations. Thus, there is potential that construction of the

Proposed Project would encounter groundwater during construction. In case of the need for dewatering during construction, a SWPPP would be implemented to comply with the CGP, which includes erosion and sediment control BMPs, spill prevention and response measures, and other pollution prevention measures to protect water resources, including groundwater. Because the location of the foundations would be outside of the groundwater protection area, the Proposed Project does not involve any groundwater withdrawals or construction activities associated with new or existing wells, and through compliance with the CGP that includes implementation of a SWPPP during construction, the Proposed Project would have no significant effect on groundwater.

N. Reasonably Foreseeable Action Impacts. The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions included in the impact analysis are presented in Section 4.12.2 of the Final EA. Section 4.12.3 of the Final EA concludes the Proposed Project, when added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, would have no significant effect on any of the environmental resource categories. This conclusion was reached because: the Proposed Project results in no effects or de minimis effects (i.e., so small as to be negligible or insignificant); the effects associated with the construction of the Proposed Project are temporary in nature; and mitigation measures, implementation of BMPs, and compliance with applicable regulations and permits for the Proposed Project, when implemented, would result in no significant environmental effects.

O. 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 Concourse B Expansion Project at SMF 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 December 19, 2024. The SCDA published a notice of availability for the Draft EA in the *Sacramento Bee*, the local newspaper in the vicinity of the airport.

The SCDA also sent out the Notice of Availability of the Draft EA via email to everyone included on the mailing list the County had for the proposed project. The County made the Draft EA available on its web site:

https://sacramento.aero/scas/about/planning_design#draft-ea, the local library, and at the FAA's Airports District Office in Walnut Creek, California, and the FAA's Western-Pacific Region Office in El Segundo, California. The newspaper Affidavit of Publications of the Draft EA are included in Appendix G of the Final EA. The public comment period ended on January 24, 2025, with a total of 35 days for public review of the Draft EA. The SCDA received a total of 1 written comment document comprising 5 bracketed comments

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 Concourse B Expansion at SMF would not cause any environmental impacts which, after mitigation, would 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 Sacramento County General 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)[2020] 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. Air Quality.** SMF is located in Sacramento County, California. This air basin is classified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as a non-attainment area for Ozone, and moderate non-attainment for Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}). Implementation of the Proposed Concourse B Expansion project along with the various other on-going projects in the area of SMF will not have a significant cumulative impact on air pollutants.
- e. National Historic Preservation Act:** FAA finds the proposed project will not adversely affect any historic properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Based on the results of the Cultural Resources Constraints Analysis, the FAA determined the Proposed Project would result in No Historic Properties Affected. The Proposed Project would have no effect on historic, architectural, archeological, or cultural resources.
- f. Executive Order 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*:** The FAA has determined there would be no change in risk to health or safety for children caused by the Proposed Action.
- g. Executive Order 11988, *Floodplain Management*:** As discussed in Section 5. *Environmental Consequences* of this FONSI/ROD and Section 3.13.1.1 of the Final EA, the Airport facility, and the Proposed Project, is within a special flood hazard area. No prudent or feasible alternative which would avoid the floodplain was identified. The FAA finds the Proposed Project will be designed to maintain natural and beneficial floodplain values, minimize risks for flood-related property loss, impacts on human safety, health, and welfare. Additionally, operation of the Proposed Project would have no significant effect on floodplains.

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 Project as the FAA's Preferred Alternative. As such, 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. An approval permits the Sacramento County Department of Airports to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Project and associated mitigation measures. A disapproval would prevent the Sacramento County Department of Airports from implementing the Proposed Project within SMF.

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).

As a condition of approval of this Finding of No Significant Impact and Record of Decision, the Sacramento County Department of Airports shall implement all the mitigation measures identified in 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:

Amy L. Choi
 Manager, San Francisco Airports District Manager
 Western-Pacific Region, SFO-600

Date

DISAPPROVED:

Amy L. Choi
Manager, San Francisco Airports District Manager
Western-Pacific Region, SFO-600

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.