

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

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

Proposed Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center

Sacramento International Airport
Sacramento, Sacramento County, California



For further information

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

April 08, 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 Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center 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 April 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 January 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 Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center 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 with a notice of Floodplain Encroachment on January 15, 2025. The SCDA received in total, 3 comment documents comprising 12 bracketed comments during the public comment period held between January 15, 2025 and February 21, 2025. The Final EA became a Federal document when the Responsible FAA Official signed the document on April 08, 2025.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO? Read the FONSI and ROD to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center 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 SACRAMENTO COUNTY/WATT EV COMMERCIAL CHARGING CENTER

**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 Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center at Sacramento International Airport (SMF), 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.

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. Therefore, FAA approval of the Airport Layout Plan depicting the proposed Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center is limited to approval of those portions of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depict the proposed projects within FAA's authority to approve. FAA approval of the ALP is authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (Public Laws 97-248, 100-223, and 118-63). There are no funds from the FAA for this proposed non-aeronautical project.

- 2. Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project.** Section 1.3 of the Final EA states in 2023, Watt EV, a private company and Project Proponent, entered into an agreement with the SCDA to develop facilities on airport property to accommodate the unmet demand for electric vehicle charging facilities in Sacramento County. This includes the development of the proposed project and supporting infrastructure at SMF. The proposed project would be operated by Watt EV. Section 1.5 of the Final EA describes the *purpose* of the Proposed Project is to develop a charging facility for electric vehicles in Sacramento County that is accessible and convenient to major freight and transportation corridors that meets the objectives and evaluation criteria of the California Transportation Commission's Trade Corridor Enhancement Program and supports the goals of the National Highway Freight Program, the California Freight Mobility Program, and the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan. SMF is a commercial service airport that accommodates both air carrier aircraft as well as general aviation activity. Section 1.4.2 states the proposal, as a non-aeronautical use would not induce additional aircraft operations.

Section 1.5, of the Final EA, also states the *need* for the Proposed Project is to reduce vehicle generated air pollutant emissions and to support a large portion of the EV charging demand in Sacramento County adjacent to the major freight and travel corridors that traverse the area. Sacramento County applied for and was awarded a grant from the California Transportation Commission along with private funding to design, construct, and operate a facility that meets the CTC's grant requirements. Section 1.5 of the Final EA also identifies the following minimum operational requirements for an electric vehicle charging facility at SMF:

- A site in Sacramento County large enough (>100 acres) to provide sufficient EV charging stations for freight trucks and passenger vehicles, onsite amenities, and administrative functions as well as a solar field of the size needed to provide for a net-zero facility.
- A site directly adjacent to the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) as well as industrial development. The goal of the NHFP is to improve efficient movement of freight along the NHFN. The location must be strategically located to serve multiple high-capacity freight corridors including I-5, I-80, SR-99, and US-50, as well as in proximity to established interchanges on I-5 and SR-99 to provide for efficient and safe movements to and from the project site.
- A site in proximity to SMUD 69 kV distribution lines which are necessary to transmit power to and from the existing electrical grid. The site's proximity to these existing distribution facilities negates the need to construct lengthy generation tie-lines.
- A site that is feasible without unreasonably high costs that would limit the ability to be a net-zero facility.

Section 1.5 of the Final EA states FAA's purpose and need is to FAA's purpose and need is to ensure that SMF is in compliance with all FAA grant-in-aid assurances and obligations.

3. Proposed Project and Federal Action. The Proposed Project includes site preparation, grading, as needed, installation of drainage structures, paving, marking and lighting of various non-airfield pavements, and installation of photovoltaic panels. the following component listing in Section 1.4.1.1 of the Final EA. The Proposed Project evaluated in this FONSI/ROD includes the following major project components:

- Construction of a 15.3-acre charging area/rest area configured with two truck charging areas separated by a publicly accessible central plaza. The facility would include a two-story 14,000-square-foot (sf) convenience store and visitor center, a 3,000-sf single story operations and maintenance facility, and a 3,000-sf single story office building.

- Construction of two truck charging areas providing a total of 18 Megawatt Charging Standard (MCS) chargers and 90 240 kW Combined Charging Standard (CCS) chargers designed for heavy and medium duty trucks. Eighty truck parking stalls would also be provided.
- Construction of 30 CCS chargers dedicated to passenger vehicle use and an automobile parking lot with 200 automobile parking spaces.
- Construction of access improvements along Bayou Way, which borders the site to the north and is directly south and parallel to I-5. Direct access to the Proposed Project site would be provided through the construction of three sets of ingress and egress points (six total access points) along Bayou Way.
- Installation of drought tolerant landscaping in the northern portion of the Proposed Project site where the vehicle charging/rest area would be located. Installation of an illuminated pylon sign that would be visible from I-5. Onsite lighting would also be provided.
- Construction of an 88.9-acre Photovoltaic (PV) solar array, with solar modules mounted on tracker arrays. Each rack would hold up to 90 panels (72 Cell Modules). Five 3.6 Megavolt Ampere (MVA) inverters and transformers would be installed on concrete pads located within the solar field. The solar array would also be developed according to FAA's policy, *Review of Solar Energy System Projects on Federally Obligated Airports*, to ensure that there would be no adverse glare impacts to Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) personnel or pilots.ⁱ
- Installation of a substation and associated substation equipment. The proposed powerline intertie would connect from the substation switchgear to the Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District's (SMUD) existing facilities located along Power Line Road. Due to the distance between the proposed substation and point of interconnection, which could be up to 650 feet, a new 69 kV power line would be required to connect the substation to SMUD facilities. The substation would be located within a fenced 200-foot by 200-foot pad in which the electrical gears would occupy an approximately 12,000-square-foot area.
- Installation of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). The enclosure would be placed outdoors on a concrete pad near the substation and main switch gear.
- A fence would be installed around the perimeter of the solar facilities. Controlled access would be provided at secured gates intersecting the new interior access roads. Security lighting would be installed.
- Installation of two access gates and construction of internal road network. One access gate would be located to the south of the east truck charging and storage lot and one to the south of the west truck charging and storage lot. Internal access roads would be unpaved with an aggregate base.

ⁱ 86 FR 25801

- Project Commitment 1: Offsite improvements including paving and widening at the intersections of Bayou Way and Airport Boulevard and Bayou Way and Power Line Road as well as widening Bayou Way to facilitate truck turns and movement; in total, all of the off-site improvements would encompass 3.36 acres of land.
- Project Commitment 2: Although this land is no longer used for agriculture due to its location near SMF within the 10,000' critical zone, its historical use as farmland is sufficient to be designated as "Farmland of Local Importance" by the County of Sacramento. This parcel is maintained consistent with SMF's approved Wildlife Hazard Management Plan. Regardless, in order to ensure no net loss of land with this designation, the County has committed to setting aside an equal amount of identified airport land of like classification.
- Project Commitment 3: Conduct a construction ozone precursor screening, and analysis if applicable. Mitigation for construction impacts could include fleet emissions reduction, best management practices to reduce dust and emissions, and mitigation fees if impacts can't be fully offset.

Site Preparation and Utilities:

- Site preparation would include land clearing, excavation, embankment, and grading. The northern 15.3-acre portion of the parcel, which includes the public plaza and the trucks charging stations, would be graded with an average of 3 feet of fill to increase the elevation of the current grade. Utilities would be extended to the Proposed Project site including electrical, water, communications, and other related infrastructure. An onsite septic system would be constructed approximately 150-feet east of the parking area of the convenience store/visitor center. The septic tank and a pump would be located on a 500-sf pad.
- Surface water drainage conveyance to vegetative swales which would flow to underground storm drain culverts that would convey the water under Bayou Way and into an existing drainage channel that lies between Bayou Way and I-5. The conveyance work would be limited to the Proposed Project site. The ground beneath the solar panels and adjoining disturbed areas would be hydroseeded with native seed mix.

The federal actions necessary to carry out the proposed project:

- Approval of a change in land use from aeronautical to non-aeronautical use pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 47107.
- Unconditional approval of the Airport Layout Plan for the Airport depicting the proposed improvements pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 47107(a)(16), (x).

4. **Reasonable Alternatives Considered.** Figure 2-1, *Alternatives Screening Process* in Chapter 2 of the Final EA, used a detailed two-step alternatives analysis screening process for the proposed Commercial Charging Center. This FONSI/ROD summarizes the screening used below:

Step 1 – Does the Alternative Meet the Purpose and Need?

- Would the alternative meet the unmet demand for EV vehicle charging?
- Does the alternative meet the purpose and need by providing 100+acres of land in Sacramento County for development to accommodate a large-scale EV truck and automobile charging facility supported by green energy?
- Is the alternative located adjacent to the NHFN, interchanges and industrial development?

Step 2 - Constructability and Operational Considerations

- Is the alternative located near SMUD 69 kV transmission lines?
- Is the alternative technologically and economically feasible?

Section 2.4 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. Paragraph 6-2.1 of FAA Order 1050.1F states in part: *“There is no requirement for a specific number of alternatives or a specific range of alternatives to be included in an EA. An EA may limit the range of alternatives to the proposed action and no action when there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. Alternatives are to be considered to the degree commensurate with the nature of the proposed action and agency experience with the environmental issues involved.”*

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

Table 2-1, Alternatives Evaluation Summary, in the Final EA summarizes the results of the alternatives screening process. The use of the No Solar Array Alternative would not fully meet the purpose and need. The North Airport Alternative does not have direct access to the I-5 corridor. The Metro Air Park Off-Airport Alternative does not meet the purpose and need. The Airport South Industrial Park Off-Airport alternative passes Step 1 but fails to pass Step 2. The alternative would not be economically feasible and would require omitting the solar array which would not meet the purpose and need.

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 April 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) and Land and Water Conservation Act, Section 6(f) Resources; Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use; 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. FAA evaluation of the proposed project's air quality impacts is under General Conformity pursuant to the Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended. Section 4.2.1.2 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project is assumed to not affect the number or types of aircraft operating at SMF. There are no components of the proposed project that would require approval or funding by either the Federal Highway Administration or the Federal Transit Administration. Thus, Transportation Conformity does not apply to this project.

Table 4-2, of the Final EA, shows that for the anticipated 13-month construction period, the emissions in the two construction years would **not** exceed the *de minimis* thresholds for the various criteria pollutants. Table 4-3 of the Final EA provides the 2026 and 2031 Proposed Project Operational emissions inventory. This table shows that the *de minimis* thresholds are **not** exceeded for the various criteria pollutants for the year 2026 and 2032. 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. Table 4-3 states that total **net** emissions for the year 2026 for Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG) Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂), Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x), Particulate matter (PM₁₀), and PM_{2.5} result in **a reduction of emissions** compared to the No Action Alternative. For the year 2031, similar reductions are predicted, with the exception of SO₂ and PM_{2.5} where the values are equal to the No Action alternative.

B. Biological Resources. Section 4.3.3.1 of the Final EA states the No Action Alternative would not involve construction of any of the new facilities or planned improvements. Current airport operations have the potential to impact migratory

birds and active nests protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This section of the Final EA also states there is limited habitat available for state listed species potentially occurring within the General Study Area.

Section 4.3.3.2 of the Final EA states under the Proposed Project, there is no suitable aquatic habitat for either the giant garter snake or the northwestern pond turtle would be impacted by the Proposed Project. Further, Table 4-5 of the Final EA states there is marginal existing Giant Garter Snake habitat in the DSA. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to state of California or federally listed species, migratory birds, or designated critical habitat.

On October 4, 2024, FAA reinitiated formal Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) on the effects of the Proposed Project on federally listed species – specifically the Giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*). The FAA determined the proposed project would affect, likely to adversely affect the Giant garter snake. In 2008 the USFWS issued a Biological Opinion that concurred with FAA’s determination and included various terms and conditions. Under the terms and conditions of the 2008 Biological Opinion, a total of 59 acres of mitigation land was required to offset impacts at a 1:10 ratio for a parking lot north of I-5 and the Transportation Surface Parking Lot south of I-5 (the site of the current Proposed Project). While the current Proposed Project has smaller impacts than the Transportation Surface Parking lot, there is a surplus of 14.63 acres of compensatory mitigation. USFWS issued a new Biological Opinion (see Appendix D to the Final EA) to the FAA on February 25, 2025. This Biological Opinion noted that the previous mitigation measures have been completed, and no additional new terms and conditions apply. Thus, the mitigation for the Proposed Project is considered by the FAA and the USFWS as being completed.

- C. Climate.** Section 4.4.2 of the Final EA states there are no established significance thresholds for climate and Green House Gas (GHG) emissions. FAA Order 1050.1F has not identified specific factors to consider in making a significance determination for GHG emissions, especially as it may be applied to a particular project. Table 4-7 of the Final EA discloses the construction GHG emissions that are anticipated to occur during the 13 months of construction would be 685 Metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) for the Proposed Project. Table 4-8 of the Final EA discloses Operational GHG emissions for the Proposed Project for the years 2026 and 2031. Table 4-8 shows there is an annual net **decrease** in GHG emissions with the Proposed Project. Section 4.4.4 of the Final EA notes due to minimal emissions within the GSA, there would be little, if any increase in vulnerability to future climate impacts from the proposed projects. No mitigation measures are proposed.
- D. Farmlands.** As noted in Section 3.5.3.1 of the Final EA, the site for the Proposed Project has been withdrawn from active agricultural use since the early 2000s and is currently covered in non-native annual grasses. Irrigation water is not available to the site. Historic agricultural production consisted of dryland crops. Section 4.5.3 of

the Final EA states under the No Action Alternative, the land for the Proposed Project would continue to be mowed for the purposes of weed abatement and reduce attractants to wildlife that could pose a hazard to aircraft. Section 4.5.3.2 of the Final EA states that the Proposed Project would be on land that has been designated “Farmlands” as defined in FAA Order 1050.1F. FAA consulted with the National Resources Conservation Service using U.S. Department of Agriculture from AD-1006. FAA determined the Proposed Project Site would have an agricultural resources value score of 130.7 points which is below the threshold of significance of 200 points. Consultation with the NRCS is included in Appendix E to the Final EA.

Section 4.5.4 of the Final EA notes that due to the site’s historic use as farmland it is designated as “Farmland of Local Importance” by Sacramento County. While not needed for federal purposes, the Project applicant has committed to setting aside an equal amount of agricultural land of like classification. SCDA intends to use contiguous and/or adjacent land they currently own including appropriate deed restrictions to retain as agricultural land.

E. Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste. Section 4.6.3.1 of the Final EA states under the No Action Alternative, no construction of any of the new facilities or improvements planned under the proposed Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center would occur. Thus, no significant impacts to hazardous materials or solid waste would occur. Section 4.6.3.2 of the Final EA states construction activities of the Proposed Project would involve use of fuels, oils, and lubricants, solvents, cleaners and adhesives, paints and thinners, degreasers, concrete and asphalt mixtures which are all commonly used during construction. This section also states the construction contractor would be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities that would list the hazardous materials proposed for use during construction; describe spill prevention measures, equipment inspections, protocols for responding immediately to spills and describe best management practices for controlling site runoff. Section 4.6.4 of the Final EA states since no significant impacts under the Proposed Project, no mitigation is required.

F. Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources. As documented in Section 3.7.3 of the Final EA, the FAA delineated an Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed undertaking and coordinated the APE with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The California SHPO concurred with the FAA’s delineation of the Proposed Project’s APE by letter dated September 9, 2024 (see Appendix F to the Final EA).

Section 4.7.3.1 of the Final EA states that under the No Action Alternative, no construction of any of the new facilities or planned improvements 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 4.7.3.2 of the Final EA discloses the FAA’s determination of eligibility for five age eligible architectural resources within the APE. FAA found the Proposed Project would not adversely affect the following sites: Ditch A – a half mile long earthen drainage ditch (P-35-005241); Ditch B – a 0.71 mile long earthen drainage ditch long the north side of Bayou Way (P-35-005251); Ditch C – a 0.77 mile long earth ditch along the south side of Bayou Way (P-35-005251); The Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District (SMUD) electrical transmission line (P-34-005789); and a home at 5250 Power Line Road (P-34-005788). FAA determined that these five properties are **not** eligible for inclusion into the NRHP.

The California Native American Heritage Commission provided FAA with a listing of contacts for four tribes listed in Appendix F of the Final EA. The United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC) asked for a walk through of the Proposed Project site. A walk through was held on November 13, 2024. In the event any cultural resources are uncovered during construction, the UAIC would be notified.

Section 4.7.4 of the Final EA describes what would occur in the event of an unanticipated discovery of previously unidentified archaeological resources. The following measures are to be implemented in the event archaeological resources are discovered:

- *If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during the undertaking, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find and the Sacramento County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5.*
- *If any Native American cultural resources are discovered, all work shall cease within a 60-foot buffer so that a qualified archaeologist can be retained to assess the find, and the UAIC shall be contacted.*
- *If significant Native American cultural resources are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, a treatment plan shall be developed by a qualified archaeologist, followed by further consultation with the UAIC.*

Appendix F of the Final EA, also includes a copy of FAA’s determination and findings of effect letter to the California SHPO prepared under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. The California SHPO concurred with FAA’s determination of eligibility and findings of effect by letter dated December 09, 2024 (See Appendix F to the Final EA).

G. Land Use. Section 3.8.3.2 of the Final EA identifies the airport boundaries are within Sacramento County General Plan. The site of the proposed project is zoned as Agricultural on parcels within the boundaries of SMF.

Section 4.8.3.1 of the Final EA states under the No-Action Alternative, construction of the proposed new facilities or improvements would not occur. Therefore, no

changes to the Airport Layout Plan and local zoning would occur. The parcel would not be used for agricultural purposes and the land would continue to be maintained to reduce the hazardous movements of wildlife at SMF.

Section 4.8.3.2 of the Final EA states that FAA approval is required to revise the Airport Layout Plan changing the parcel designation from aeronautical to non-aeronautical land use. This section of the Final EA also states Proposed Project is consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan. This section of the Final EA also states that if the Proposed Project is constructed, the local zoning ordinance would redesignate the site for commercial use.

- H. Natural Resources and Energy Supply.** Section 4.9.3.1 of the Final EA states that under the No Action Alternative the Proposed Project would not be constructed. Only negligible amounts of energy and natural resources would be consumed to continue to mow the site for the purposes of weed abatement and reduce the attractants to hazardous movements of wildlife.

Section 4.9.3.2 of the Final EA states *“Construction of the Proposed Project would require the use of fuels (primarily gasoline and diesel), or potentially electricity for some equipment, for construction equipment and vehicles that would perform a variety of activities, including excavation, hauling, paving, assembly, and general vehicle travel.”*

For operations in 2026 and 2031, this section of the Final EA states: *“Once operational, the Proposed Project would include a solar facility that would create a new renewable source of energy in Sacramento County. The specific existing sources of energy that would be replaced by the Proposed Project would be related to combustion of gasoline and diesel fuels for traditional combustion-fueled trucks, buses, and passenger vehicles. The proposed solar facilities would power the Proposed Project’s electric vehicle charging stations and appurtenant uses except during nighttime and cloudy weather, which much of the site’s electric energy needs produced on site. Any surplus electricity generation not stored in the proposed onsite Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) would be exported to the Sacramento Municipal Utility District’s (SMUD) system. This would provide a net positive energy impact attributable to the project and be a benefit to the County, as excess energy generation stored on-site could then be exported to SMUD’s grid during off-peak times, thereby assisting SMUD in achieving its goal to reach zero carbon emissions in its power supply by 2030 and in meeting its obligations under State energy storage targets.”*

- I. Construction Noise.** The Proposed Project has no aeronautical components and would not change the number of existing or forecasted aircraft operations at SMF. Therefore, there would be no change to the approach and departure paths to and from the airport under the Proposed Project. Aircraft noise impacts would be the same under the No Action and Proposed Project Alternatives. Section 4.10.2 of the

Final EA states that FAA has not adopted a significant threshold for construction equipment noise.

Section 4.10.3 of the Final EA describes the methods of evaluation of noise from construction equipment of the Proposed Project. Section 4.10.3.1 of the Final EA states, under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center would not be constructed. Thus, there would be no construction related noise impacts under the No Action Alternative.

Section 4.10.3.2 of the Final EA states construction of the Proposed Project would generate increased noise (unwanted sound) during construction activities such as demolition, site preparation, grading, paving and building construction. Noise would also be generated during driving of the vertical support structures for the solar arrays. This section of the Final EA states the nearest residential noise receptor is 400 feet from the Proposed Project site. The Final EA states that no construction traffic would occur in the vicinity of that receptor. All construction traffic would enter the site from Bayou Way, approximately 2,900 feet from the receptor.

Construction-related noise would vary based on the type of equipment used and proximity to the construction site, and it is likely that multiple activities would be occurring at one time, involving multiple types of construction equipment. This section of the Draft EA estimated construction equipment usage noise exposure at the nearest receptor to be 64 dBA. which is below the 65 dB threshold used by the FAA to determine land use compatibility.

Section 4.10.4 of the Final EA states Sacramento County's Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 6.68.090(e)) offers an exemption for construction noise provided that the activities only occur between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. Maintenance of construction equipment with approved mufflers and engine coverings are standard conditions imposed during the grading and building permit processes. The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts; therefore, no additional mitigation is required.

- J. Socioeconomic Impacts, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risk** are discussed in Section 4.11 of the Final EA. Section 3.11.3.1 of the Final EA states the Proposed Project is located within a semi-rural portion of unincorporated Sacramento County. While the Census Tract 71.07 covers a relatively large, area the site of the Proposed Project is substantially removed from populated areas within the Census Tract. Figure 3-6 of the Final EA shows there is one U.S. Census tract (Tract 71.07) with known residential population wholly or partially within the General Study Area for the proposed Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center. While the Proposed Project would be constructed on existing airport property. Table 3.11 of the Final EA provides the income and housing data of the State of California, Sacramento County, and Census Tract 71.07.

Section 4.11.3.2 of the Final EA states there are no schools or established communities within the General Study Area (GSA) for the Proposed Project. There is only one residential home within the GSA, and it would not be relocated. There are no businesses within the GSA and there would be no relocation of businesses or other impacts. This section of the Final EA states that the Proposed Project is anticipated to create approximately 20 permanent jobs that local residents would be able to apply for.

- K. Visual Effects.** Section 4.12.2 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 4.12.3.1 states under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Project would not be constructed. There would be no development or alteration of the land in the GSA. Thus, there would be no new light sources or changes to the visual character of the surrounding area.

Section 4.12.3.2 of the Final EA states under the Proposed Project, new light sources would include streetlights to illuminate the Charging Center and associated access roads. This section of the Final EA also discloses that the FAA completed Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis for the Proposed Project and issued an airspace determination on December 13, 2024. This section notes that after completion of construction, substantial visual changes would occur including changes from ruderal grassland to paved parking areas, buildings and a Photovoltaic solar array with an electrical power substation. However, the GSA is of low visual quality and sparsely populated. None of the elements of the Proposed Project would occur in residential or other light sensitive areas.

- L. Water Resources – Floodplains.** Sections 3.13.3.2 and 4.13 of the Final EA describe the floodplain conditions of the DSA and Indirect Effects Study Area at SMF. The 100-year floodplain at SMF is defined as a Zone A “*Approximate: floodplain where base flood elevations have not been established.*” Further, a portion of the site is within Zone A99 which corresponds to areas of the one percent annual chance of the floodplain will be protected by a federal flood protection system when construction has reached specified statutory milestones. Figure 3-7 of the Final EA shows the current Federal Emergency Management Agency flood mapping for the site of the Proposed Project. Supplemental floodplain analysis for this Proposed Project is included in Appendix I to the Final EA.

As discussed in Section 4.13.3.2, and documented in Appendix I, the Proposed Project would encroach into the 100-year floodplain for the Sacramento River. Modeling conducted for the Proposed project, described in Appendix I to the Final EA, determined that the Proposed project and subsequent change in surface elevation would not create a rise in the 100-year floodplain elevations. Section 4.13.3.2 states the Proposed Project would not create a “significant encroachment.” A significant encroachment is described in DOT Order 5650.2, *Floodplain Management and*

Protection: that increase the likelihood of loss of human life, adversely impact transportation facilities, or impact the floodplain’s natural and beneficial values such as values associated with adjacent agricultural activities, flood control activities, groundwater recharge, or water quality. Based upon these considerations, implementation of the Proposed Project would not cause “*notable adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values*” and would not create a significant encroachment to the existing 100-year floodplain or the associated beneficial uses.

Therefore, the FAA has determined that the floodplain encroachment is not significant, and no significant direct or indirect floodplain impact would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project.

M. Cumulative Impacts. The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative actions included in the cumulative impact analysis are presented in Section 4.14 of the Final EA, Cumulative Impacts. Table 3-14 in the Final EA identifies the various past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of SMF. Table 4-11, Potential Cumulative Impacts identifies the various environmental impact categories and potential impacts of various project including the Proposed Project at SMF. This table of the Final EA states there are a number of projects at SMF in various stages of planning and/or construction. The evaluation of cumulative impacts from these cumulative actions is discussed in Section 4.13 of the Final EA. Since the Proposed Project has no aviation component, the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative would not result in aircraft operational changes to the airport or would increase the type or amount of aircraft operations at the airport. No significant cumulative impacts were identified in the Final EA.

N. 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 Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center improvements 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. The Proposed Project would also reduce emissions from vehicles by supporting the use of non-air pollutant emitting electric vehicles in the vicinity of SMF.

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 with a Notice of Floodplain Encroachment, which was released for public review on January 15, 2025. The SCDA published a notice of availability with a Notice of Floodplain Encroachment 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-wattev, 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 J of the Final EA. The public comment period ended on February 21, 2025, with a total of 37 days for public review of the Draft EA. The SCDA received a total of three written comment documents comprising 12 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 Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging 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. Independent and Objective Evaluation: 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.

b. 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 Sacramento County/Watt EV Commercial Charging Center project along with the various other on-going projects in the area of SMF will not have a significant cumulative impact on air pollutants. This project is intended to reduce emissions from on-road Internal Combustion Engine powered vehicles by encouraging a supporting the use of electric powered vehicles.

c. 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. FAA conducted the required consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Officer pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

d. Executive Order 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*: The FAA has determined there would be no change in risk to health or safety for children caused by the Proposed Project.

e. Executive Order 11988, *Floodplain Management*: As discussed in Section 5.L of this FONSI/ROD and Sections 3.13.3.2 and 4.13.3.2, and Appendix I of the Final EA, the Proposed Project would occur within the 100-year floodplain approximately 1 mile north of the Sacramento River. 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. *The FAA finds that the Proposed would not result in a significant floodplain encroachment.*

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. The FAA must select one of the following choices:

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

Approval signifies that applicable federal requirements relating to the proposed airport development and planning have been met. Approval permits the Sacramento County Department of Airports to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Project and associated mitigation measures. 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.

- Approval of a change in land use from aeronautical to non-aeronautical use pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 47107.
- 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	Date
Manager, San Francisco Airports District Office	
Western-Pacific Region, SFO-600	

DISAPPROVED:

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

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.