

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

---

***FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT***

---

**Proposed Northeast Hangar Development**

Camarillo Airport  
Camarillo, Ventura County, California



For further information

Gail Campos  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Aviation Administration  
P.O. Box 92007  
Los Angeles, CA 90009-2007  
(310) 725-3614

**July 6, 2017**

## GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

**WHAT IS IN THIS DOCUMENT?** This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Proposed Northeast Hangar Development at Camarillo Airport located in Camarillo, Ventura County, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment dated June 2017. This document discusses all alternatives considered by FAA in reaching its decision, summarizes the analysis used to evaluate the alternatives, and briefly summarizes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and the No Action alternative, which are evaluated in detail in this FONSI. This document also identifies the agency preferred alternative. This document identifies applicable and required mitigation.

**BACKGROUND.** In March 2017, the County of Ventura Department of Airports prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA). The Draft EA addressed the potential environmental effects of the proposed Northeast Hangar Development including various reasonable alternatives to that proposal. The Draft EA was prepared as required by federal laws and regulations, and pursuant to the requirements and standards of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500-1508). This EA was initiated in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and follows the guidelines and organizational structure recommended by FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. Ventura County published the Notice of Availability of the Draft EA on March 29, 2017, and received comments on the document through April 28, 2017. Two public comments were received on the Draft EA. FAA approved the Final EA on June 22, 2017.

**WHAT SHOULD YOU DO?** Read the FONSI to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed Northeast Hangar Development at Camarillo Airport.

**WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS?** Ventura County may begin to implement the Proposed Action.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION  
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

Camarillo Airport  
Camarillo, Ventura County, California

Northeast Hangar Development

- 1. Introduction.** This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact on the environment as a result of a proposed hangar development by the County of Ventura Department of Airports (County) owner and operator of Camarillo Airport. The County's proposed action consists of the development of approximately twenty (20) acres of open land on the northeast quadrant of the airport. The project includes the development of 105 nested T-hangars, thirteen (13) executive box hangars and approximately two (2) or four (4) private hangars, taxilanes, utility extensions, and drainage collection system. The proposed hangar development at Camarillo Airport is needed to meet existing demand for hangar space at the airport and to accommodate the expansion of existing businesses.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before taking the federal action for approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts the proposed airport development projects. Approval of the ALP is authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (Public Laws 97-248 and 100-223). A Final Environmental Assessment (EA) dated June 2017 was prepared pursuant to FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*, and is used to support the findings in this document.

- 2. Project Purpose and Need.** The purpose of the Proposed Action is to develop approximately 20-acres of land for County-owned hangars and supporting infrastructure, to meet the existing demand for hangar space at the airport and to accommodate the expansion of existing businesses. Currently, the County has a wait list of 130 people, and the approximate wait time is five to six years to get a hangar. Chapter 1 of the Final EA provides a detailed discussion on the purpose and need for the proposed project.

The FAA's statutory mission is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. The FAA must insure that the proposed action does not derogate the safety of aircraft and airport operations at the Camarillo Airport.

- 3. Proposed Project and Federal Actions.** The following is a listing of the various components of the proposed project as discussed in Chapter 1 of the Final EA:

- The Proposed Action is to develop approximately twenty (20)-acres of open land and supporting infrastructure in the northeast quadrant of the airport. This action would provide County-owned hangars to individuals on the existing wait list and to accommodate business expansion.

The proposed federal actions are:

- Unconditional approval of that portion of the airport layout plan (ALP) that depicts the Proposed Action pursuant to Title 49 United States Code (USC) Sections 40103(b), 44718, and 47107(a)(16) and 14 C.F.R. Part 77.
- Review of project design and approval of the Construction Safety and Phasing Plan (CSPP) to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to FAA AC 150/5370-2F.
- Determinations under 49 U.S.C. Sections 47106 and 47107 related to eligibility of the Proposed Action for Federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP).

**4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered:** As described in Chapter 2 of the Final EA, the alternatives evaluated include:

- 1 - No Action Alternative
- 2 - Northeast Hanger Development of 118 nested T-hangars and executive box hangars, connected taxiways, utility extensions, and drainage collection system (Proposed Action Alternative)
- 3 - Alternative Project Design of 98 nested T-hangars and executive box hangars
- 4 – Alternative Project Locations

Paragraph 6-2.1 of FAA Order 1050.1F states, in part: *“The alternatives discussed in an EA must include those that the approving official will consider. 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.”* FAA need not examine other alternatives because the project does not involve any unresolved conflict of resources (FAA Order 5050.4B, paragraph 706.d(5)).

Based on the evaluation of the alternatives, two alternatives were retained for evaluation in the Final EA: the Proposed Action Alternative (Northeast Hangar Development) and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action. However, analysis of the No Action Alternative is required under 40 CFR § 1502.14(d) and used for comparison.

5. **Assessment.** The potential environmental impacts and possible adverse effects were identified and evaluated in a Final Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared in June 2017. The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories: Air Quality, Biological Resources Climate, Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste and Pollution Prevention, Natural Resources and Energy Supply, Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks, Visual Effects, Water Resources, and Cumulative Impacts.

The environmental impact categories: Coastal Resources, Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f), Farmlands, Historical, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources<sup>1</sup>, Land Use, Noise<sup>2</sup>, and Compatible Land Uses were not evaluated further because these resources are not affected by the proposed hangar development project or do not occur in the study area.

**A) Air Quality.** Section 4.3.1 of the Final EA states that the Proposed Action Alternative will not increase the capacity of the airport or substantially change overall airport operations or aircraft traffic patterns. The Proposed Action construction emissions are estimated at 2 pounds per day (lbs/day) of reactive organic gases (ROGs) (also known as VOCs) and 4.7 lbs/day of oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The project would generate less than one ton/year of VOC or NOx. The General Conformity *de minimis* thresholds for the precursors of ozone (NOx and VOC), for which Ventura County is a Federal nonattainment area, are 50 tons per year. The Proposed Action does not exceed the General Conformity *de minimis* levels. Therefore, there would be no significant air quality impacts from the Proposed Action when compared to the No Action alternative.

The hangar and detention basin development would cause specific temporary fugitive dust, particulate matter, and emissions during construction. These impacts are temporary and the following mitigation measures would be used to reduce the impacts due to the construction work.

#### 1. Prevention of Fugitive Dust

The applicant shall comply with the provisions of applicable Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) Rules and Regulations, which include but are not limited to, Rule 50 (Opacity), Rule 51 (Nuisance), and Rule 55 (Fugitive Dust) as follows:

- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations shall be minimized to prevent excessive amounts of dust;
- Pre-grading/excavation activities shall include watering the area to be graded or excavated before commencement of grading or excavation

---

<sup>1</sup> On December 13, 2016, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred that the project, as described, will not affect historic properties.

<sup>2</sup> Not evaluated further because noise-sensitive receptors are 0.25 miles or more away and outside the 65 decibel (dB) level.  
Camarillo Airport  
Northeast Hangar Development FONSI

operations. Application of water should penetrate sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust during grading activities;

- All trucks shall cover their loads as required by California Vehicle Code, Section 23114.
- Fugitive dust throughout the construction site shall be controlled by the use of a watering truck or equivalent means (except during and immediately after rainfall). Water shall be applied to all unpaved roads, unpaved parking areas or staging areas, and active portions of the construction site. Environmentally safe dust control agents may be used in lieu of watering.
- Signs shall be posted onsite limiting traffic to 15 miles per hour or less.
- During periods of high winds (i.e., wind speed sufficient to cause fugitive dust to impact adjacent properties), all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations shall be curtailed to the degree necessary to prevent fugitive dust created by onsite activities and operations from being a nuisance or hazard, either offsite or onsite.

## 2. Construction Equipment

The Permittee shall comply with the provisions of applicable APCD ROG and NOx construction mitigation measures, which include but are not limited to, provisions of Section 7.4.3 of the Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines (County of Ventura 2003).

- Construction equipment shall not have visible emissions, except when under load.
- Construction equipment shall not idle for more than five (5) consecutive minutes. The idling limit does not apply to: (1) idling when queuing; (2) idling to verify that the vehicle is in safe operating condition; (3) idling for testing, servicing, repairing or diagnostic purposes; (4) idling necessary to accomplish work for which the vehicle was designed (such as operating a crane); (5) idling required to bring the machine system to operating temperature, and (6) idling necessary to ensure safe operation of the vehicle.

**B) Biological Resources.** As discussed in Section 4.3.2 of the Final EA, no adverse impacts to federal or state listed plants or wildlife are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action Alternative due to a lack of suitable conditions and habitat within the project area. However, several bird species or signs of species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) were observed within the Proposed Action Alternative area.

The following mitigation measures would be taken to reduce potential impacts to these species:

- Prior to grading and/or construction activities, all personnel associated with the project shall attend a worker education training program, conducted by a qualified biologist, to avoid or reduce impacts on sensitive biological resources including nesting birds.
- To the maximum extent possible, site preparation, ground disturbing, and construction activities shall be conducted outside of the avian nesting season. If such activities are required during this period, a qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction nesting bird surveys to verify that migratory birds are not actively nesting within the site or within areas that could be impacted by construction activities (typically 50 feet for passerines or 250 feet for raptors). If nesting activity is detected, the following measures shall be implemented:
  - o The project shall be modified as necessary to avoid direct take of identified nests, eggs, and/or young protected under the MBTA; and/or,
  - o The biologist shall establish an avoidance buffer around active nest sites (typically 50 feet to 250 feet). Construction activities within the established buffer zone shall be prohibited until the young have fledged the nest and achieved independence.
- All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur at least 100 feet from drainage features, and not in a location from where a spill would drain directly toward drainage features. If staging of equipment is required within 100 feet of a drainage feature, appropriate best management practices (BMPs) (e.g., straw wattles, silt fencing) shall be installed between the stage equipment and the drainage and maintained until construction is complete and staging areas are restored. Appropriate spill prevention and cleanup kits shall be readily available on site and any accidental spills shall be promptly cleaned up.

Therefore, the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives would have no effect on federal or state listed threatened or endangered species.

**C) Climate.** Section 4.3.3 of the Final EA states that the Proposed Action Alternative will not increase the capacity of the airport or substantially change overall airport operations or aircraft traffic patterns. The Proposed Action Alternative construction greenhouse gases (GHG) impacts are estimated at 4,018 lbs/day of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions (CO<sub>2e</sub>). These impacts are temporary and minimization measures (listed in Air Quality Section above) would be used to reduce the construction impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Action Alternative would have no significant impacts to climate when compared to the No Action Alternative.

**D) Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste.** Section 4.3.4 of the Final EA states there are no known contaminations present in the area; however, the area has been used in the past to store automobiles. Therefore, it is possible that minor fossil fuel leaks have occurred in the area recently and that soil contamination could be encountered during construction activities. The lessee storing the automobiles at the Proposed Action site will be responsible to clean up any contaminated soil before construction of the Proposed Action is initiated. Therefore, the possible leak would not impact the Proposed Action or No Action Alternatives.

Construction equipment and vehicles utilize fossil fuels and other potential hazardous materials. All construction activity will be subject to existing permit procedures for the handling, transporting, and disposal of such materials.

No additional fuel storage or dispersal facilities (i.e., fuel farms) are planned at the airport as part of the Proposed Action Alternative. The County-owned hangars will not allow aircraft maintenance or storage of liquid waste, petroleum products, or other hazardous materials. The types of maintenance activity or storage material in the future commercial hangar development is unknown at this time, however this development will be subject to the same programs and compliance regulations as the County hangars.

Some solid waste is anticipated to be generated as a result of the construction phase of the proposed project. Materials that are reusable will be recycled and unusable materials will be disposed of in a landfill as stated in section 4.3.4. Long term, ongoing solid waste generation will have an incremental increase in the airport's overall solid waste disposal needs. Solid waste impacts would be increased with the Proposed Action Alternative implementation compared to the No Action alternative.

Mitigation Measures to minimize hazardous materials, pollution prevention, and solid waste include:

- If previously unknown contaminants are discovered during construction or a spill occurs, work shall be halted and the National Response Center notified. The contractor shall follow standard hazardous materials containment procedures and BMPs, as required by FAA AC 150/5370-10G, *Standard for Specifying Construction of Airports* (FAA 2014).
- All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur at least 100 feet from drainage features, and not in a location from where a spill would drain directly toward drainage features. If staging of equipment is required within 100 feet of a drainage feature, appropriate best management plans (BMP) (e.g., straw wattles, silt fencing) shall be installed between the stage equipment and the drainage and maintained until construction is complete and staging areas are restored. Appropriate spill



prevention and cleanup kits shall be readily available on site and any accidental spills shall be promptly cleaned up.

- The contractor shall implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) for all construction actions involving more than one acre of ground disturbance in compliance with the Clean Water Act and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) State General Construction Stormwater Permit (No. CAS000002). The airport will be required to prepare and submit a current Notice of Intent (NOI) and SWPPP to the Ventura County Department Watershed Protection District (VCWPD) for review (see Section 4.3.8.3, Mitigation Measures).
- The County shall meet all State, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and VCWPD requirements related to implementation of the Los Angeles RWQCB NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (No. CAS004002) and the State NPDES General Industrial Stormwater Permit (No. CAS000001).
- The Proposed Action Alternative and all future tenants of the project shall be required to comply with all local permits and policies regarding the handling of hazardous materials and waste. This includes General Plan Hazardous Materials and Waste Policies 2.15.2 as implemented by the County at the time that lease agreements are approved.

Through compliance with existing programs and regulations, as well as implementation of the mitigation measures listed in section 4.3.4 and above, hazardous materials and solid waste generation will be minimized and no significance thresholds will be exceeded during the construction or operation phases of the Proposed Action Alternative.

**F) Natural Resources and Energy Supply.** Section 4.3.5, of the Final EA states the Proposed Action Alternative will use fossil fuels, aggregate material, and water during construction. This short-term demand for natural resources and energy supplies will be met using local suppliers to the extent feasible, based on market demand. No significant impact to natural resources and energy supply will occur in the short term.

The Proposed Action long term natural resources and energy supplies will be provided by the airports existing fuel farms, Southern California Edison and the City's water system. No issues regarding the supply of energy and fossil fuel to the Proposed Action Alternative are expected. The Proposed Action Alternative would increase natural resources and energy supply usage compared to the No Action Alternative. Water use must comply with the City's Water Conservation Ordinance. To comply with the City's ordinance the following water offsets will be provided as part of the project

- The Proposed Action Alternative shall install low flow water use fixtures. The resulting water use for these facilities shall be offset by replacing existing

water use fixtures (normal water flow volume urinals, toilets, and faucets) with low flow water use fixtures within other existing airport-maintained facilities. A City-required water impact study shall be prepared to identify the amount of offsets needed so that the Proposed Action Alternative will not create new demand on the City's water system.

- Any future development of the project site by a private developer shall provide similar studies and offsets, as required by the City.

**G) Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks.** Section 4.3.6, of the Final EA states that access to the proposed hangar development for construction workers, equipment, and future tenants will use existing roads. Onsite storage of heavy construction equipment will be limited to one trip in and one trip out. A Construction Safety and Phasing Plan will be submitted to the County. The County may, based on their review, require construction related trips to avoid peak traffic periods.

Long term access of the Proposed Action Alternative is expected to have 44 vehicular trips during peak hours. Some of these trips are associated with aircraft already based at the airport and use these same streets for access. Long term access to existing roads is not anticipated to exceed current level of service thresholds. The future commercial development impacts are unknown at this time. These impacts would be analyzed during the approval process for this development.

The Proposed Action Alternative does not result in the relocation of residences or businesses, division of communities, disruption of planned development, or appreciable changes in employment due to this development. Therefore, the Proposed Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to socioeconomics or environmental justice impacts nor increase children's environmental health and safety risks when compared to the No Action Alternative.

**H) Visual Effects.** Section 4.3.7, of the Final EA states that there are scenic corridors in proximity to the airport that include Las Posas Road and Pleasant Valley Road. However, the County's Resource Protection Map does not contain any Scenic Resource Protection areas in proximity to the airport. Construction of the proposed hangars will introduce building security lighting within the northeast part of the airport; no other changes to lighting will occur. No light sensitive land uses are located in the proximity of the Proposed Action area. The airport's visual appearance when viewed from Las Posas Road will not significantly change. The Proposed Action Alternative will not be visible from Pleasant Valley Road or other areas within the unincorporated County. Therefore, there would be no significant visual impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative when compared to the No Action Alternative.

**I) Water Resources.** As discussed in Section 3.7.9 of the Final EA, the Proposed Action Alternative is not within a floodplain and the nearest wild and

scenic river is over 25 miles away. Therefore, the Proposed Action Alternative and the No Action Alternative would not affect floodplains or wild and scenic rivers. The Proposed Action may indirectly affect wetlands, would have minimal impacts to surface waters, and ground water resources compared to the No Action alternative.

### Wetlands

The nearest wetland or water feature is more than 100 feet from the project site. The Proposed Action Alternative would not directly impact wetlands or water features. However, Section 4.3.8.1 of the Final EA states that accidental spills of hazardous materials, such as fuel, could result in indirect impacts to surface waters, and ground water resources compared to the No Action Alternative.

As a result, the following mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize these impacts:

- All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur at least 100 feet from drainage features and not in a location from where a spill would drain directly toward drainage features. If staging of equipment is required within 100 feet of a drainage feature, appropriate BMPs (e.g., straw wattles, silt fencing) shall be installed between the stage equipment and the drainage and maintained until construction is complete and staging areas are restored.
- Appropriate spill prevention and cleanup kits shall be readily available on site and any accidental spills shall be promptly cleaned up.

### Surface Waters

The Proposed Action Alternative will result in the creation of approximately 10.1 acres of new impervious surfaces in the northeast corner of the airport. This will result in increased stormwater runoff and associated pollutants. Sections 1.3 and 4.3.8.2 of the Final EA discusses the Proposed Action Alternative collection of the site's stormwater runoff in the infiltration/detention basins. The proposed drainage design includes BMPs to improve water quality and mitigate potential water quality impacts caused by the land development.

Mitigation measures include the following.

- The mitigation measures identified in the Wetlands discussion above.
- The County Department of Airports shall meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act (per the NPDES permitting program) and VCWPD, by submitting the documentation requested in the VCWPD letter, dated August 31, 2015 (**Appendix A**):

- The proposed project shall meet performance criteria defined in Section III, Part 4.E of the Los Angeles RWQCB NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (No. CAS004002) and the *Ventura County Technical Guidance Manual (TGM) for Stormwater Quality control Measures* (2011);
- The County Department of Airports shall provide a Maintenance Plan and annual verification of ongoing maintenance provisions for the required Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan (PCSMP) controls in accordance with the Los Angeles RWQCB NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (No. CAS004002) Part 4.E and the County TGM;
- The construction of the proposed project shall meet requirements contained in Part 4.F, “Development Construction Program” of the Los Angeles RWQCB NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (No. CAS004002) through the inclusion of effective implementation of the construction BMPs during all ground disturbance activities;
- The County shall properly file all compliance documents required under the State’s General Construction Stormwater Permit (No. CAS000002);
- The County Department of Airports shall properly file all compliance documents required under the State’s NPDES General Industrial Stormwater Permit (No. CAS000001).

### Groundwater

As discussed in Sections 3.7.7 and 4.3.5 of the Final EA, water for the proposed project will be obtained from the City of Camarillo, which gets part of its water from groundwater resources (i.e., the Fox Canyon Aquifer System). No significance thresholds for impacts to groundwater resources will be exceeded as a result of the Proposed Action Alternative’s water use, with the mitigation measures listed under the Natural Resources and Energy Supply section and surface water discussion above in this FONSI.

The Proposed Action Alternative would have the same water resources impacts and will be subject to the same programs, regulations, and mitigation measures listed with each water resource above.

With the implementation of mitigation and minimization measures, there would be no significant impacts to wetlands, surface water, or ground water resources of the proposed action when compared to the no action alternative.

**J) Cumulative Impacts.** Section 4.4 of the Final EA evaluates the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative actions within the general vicinity of the airport. With the implementation of the minimization and mitigation measures, neither the Proposed Action Alternative nor No Action Alternative would result in cumulative impacts on the environment.

The EA has been independently reviewed by the FAA and found to be adequate for the purpose of the proposed Federal action. The FAA has determined that the EA for the proposed project adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed actions. As discussed in Section 2.3.1 and 3.2., the Proposed Action is consistent with the alternatives considered in the 2011 Airport Master Plan, the County General Plan, and revalidated by the FAA on the 2015 Airport Layout Plan.

6. **Public Participation.** Efforts were made to encourage public participation through announcing the availability of the Draft EA and the 30-day public review and comment period for the Draft EA. Notices announcing the County's public review of the Draft EA were published on March 29, 2017, in *The Ventura County Star*, the local newspaper for the City of Camarillo, in Ventura County. Two comments were received and responses to those comments are included in Appendix B of the Final EA. The Notice of Availability and affidavit of publication are presented in Appendix B of the Final EA.
7. **Inter-Agency Coordination.** In accordance with 49 USC 47101(h), 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 impact categories. The proposal for the Northeast Hangar Development would not cause significant environmental impacts in any of the resource categories provided for in FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B.

Based on the information contained in this FONSI and supported by detailed discussion in the Final EA, the FAA has selected the Proposed Action (Alternative 2), Northeast Hangar Development as the FAA's Preferred Alternative. The FAA has decided to implement the Proposed Action as described in Section 3 of this FONSI.

## 9. Finding of No Significant Impact

I have carefully and thoroughly considered the facts contained in the attached EA. Based on that information I find that the proposed Federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). I also find the proposed Federal Action, will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to Section 102 (2)(C) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this action.

**APPROVED:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David F. Cushing  
Manager, Los Angeles Airports District, LAX-600

July 6, 2017  
Date

**DISAPPROVED:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
David F. Cushing  
Manager, Los Angeles Airports District, LAX-600

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date