

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

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Proposed Runway Safety Area Improvements

Monterey Peninsula Airport
Monterey, Monterey County, California



For further information:

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

July 29, 2010

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

PROPOSED RUNWAY SAFETY AREA IMPROVEMENTS

MONTEREY PENINSULA AIRPORT, MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

1. Introduction

This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the environment as a result of proposed Runway Safety Area (RSA) improvements at the Monterey Peninsula Airport (MRY) in Monterey County, California. The Monterey Peninsula Airport District (MPAD) owns and operates the airport. The improvements consist of building retaining walls, installation of Engineered Materials Arresting System (EMAS) on both ends of Runway 10R/28L, relocation of existing access roads, connector taxiways on the approach end of Runway 10R, shifting both runway end thresholds, and easterly shift of the Medium-intensity Approach Lighting System with Runway Alignment Indicator Lights (MALSR) within the EMAS at MRY.

The Federal Administration Aviation (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before taking the Federal action of processing an application for Federal assistance in funding various airport development and unconditionally approving the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts the proposed construction. Unconditional approval of the ALP is authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (Public Laws 97-248 and 100-223).

2. Proposed Project and Federal Actions

The proposed project, identified as the Proposed Action, consists of building retaining walls, installation of EMAS on both ends of Runway 10R/28L, relocation of existing access roads at both ends of Runway 10R/28L, shifting both runway end thresholds, and shifting the MALSR and connecting taxiways on the approach end of Runway 10R end at MRY.

The proposed federal actions are:

- Unconditional approval of the portion of the ALP that depicts the proposed improvements pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Sections 40103(b), 44718 and 47107(a)(16) and Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 and Part 157.
- Determination of eligibility for federal assistance under the Federal grant-in-aid program authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (49 USC 47101 et. seq.).
- Approval of further processing of an application for federal assistance for eligible projects using federal funds from the Airport Improvement Program, as shown on the ALP.
- Determine under 49 U.S.C. § 44502(b), the proposed improvements at MRY are reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense.
- Continued close coordination with MRY and appropriate FAA program offices, as required, to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 44706.
- Construction of the Airfield improvements to meet FAA Airport Design Standards.
- Approval of an airport certification manual, to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to 14 CFR Part 139 (49 U.S.C. § 44706).

3. Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed airport improvements is to enhance safety at MRY by providing the proposed RSA improvements that will meet FAA Airport Design Standards to the extent practicable. See Section 1.2 and Table 2A of the Final Environmental Assessment (EA).

The proposed action includes the construction of retaining walls at both ends of Runway 10R/28L, the relocation of existing airport access roads to a location outside the limits of the RSA, creation of connecting taxiways on the approach end of Runway 10R, shifting the Runway 10R landing threshold 425 feet to the east to accommodate installation of 390-foot long EMAS on the approach end of Runway 10R, shifting the MALSR lights to the east within the EMAS on the approach end of Runway 10R, shifting the landing threshold for Runway 28L approximately 645 feet to the east. The proposed action also includes installation of 390-foot long EMAS on the approach end of Runway 28L (see Section 1.3 of Final EA).

4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered

As described in Chapter 2 of the Final EA, a total of nine alternatives were considered including the No Action Alternative. Table 2A in the Final EA summarizes the results of the alternatives analysis that eliminated seven of the eight action alternatives as not being reasonable alternatives. The Proposed Action – Construction of retaining walls and EMAS on both ends of Runway 10R/28L, relocation of existing access roads, connector taxiways on the approach end of Runway 10R, shift in the thresholds for both Runway 10R and 28L ends, and the MALSR shift, along with the No Action Alternative were carried forward for further evaluation. The No Action Alternative is required to be reviewed pursuant to Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1502.14(d).

5. Assessment

The potential environmental impacts and possible adverse effects were identified and evaluated in the Final EA prepared July 22, 2010. The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories: Air quality; Compatible land use; Construction impacts; DOT Act Section 4(f); Fish, Wildlife and Plants; Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste; Historical, Architectural, Archeological and Cultural Resources; Light Emissions and Visual Effects; Natural Resources and Energy Supply, Noise, Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks; Water Quality, and Cumulative Impacts.

The following environmental impact categories of Coastal Barriers, Coastal Zone Management, Farmlands, Floodplains, Secondary (induced) Impacts, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Wetlands were not evaluated because the proposed action and no action alternatives will not affect any of these resources.

Section 4.2.1 of the Final EA states that MRY is located in an attainment area for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and there is no current State Implementation Plans for the area. An air quality emissions inventory was completed for construction of the proposed action and the results were well below the de minimis levels (See Final EA Tables 4B and 4C). The Final EA did not evaluate the airport operation emissions because the Proposed Action and No Action would not cause or induce a change in aircraft operations.

Section 4.2.3 of the Final EA states that the proposed action would not result in any compatible land use changes within the vicinity of MRY. There are some noise sensitive developments located within the 65dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour for MRY and these properties have been subject to the airport's sound insulation program.

Section 4.2.4 of the Final EA states that construction operations would cause specific impacts to the eastern and western most portions of MRY. These impacts are distinct and temporary in duration and decrease as work is finished. The impacts will be limited to air quality, noise, and water quality. With the implementation of mitigation measures, the construction impacts would be reduced.

Section 4.2.5 of the Final EA states that the implementation of the proposed action on the U. S. Navy's Pines Golf Course would result in changes to the MRY MALSRS system. The golf course's westernmost MALSRS light would be removed from service and replaced with two new lights constructed within the EMAS on airport property. The shifted MALSRS would occur in areas in which an easement has been issued to MRY. No changes to the easement is required and no mitigation is needed as the project does not involve more than minimal physical use of a section 4(f) property nor is it deemed constructive use substantially impairing the section 4(f) property.

Section 4.2.6 of the Final EA states the FAA determined the proposed action is likely to adversely effect the Monterey spineflower and the Yadon's piperia, two federally listed species. FAA conducted formal Section 7 consultation with the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The USFWS issued a Biological Opinion (BO) dated, May 13, 2010, that concurred with FAA's determination and included various mitigation measures for the proposed project's effects on these two species. (See BO in Appendix D of Final EA).

Section 4.2.8 of the Final EA documents that the California State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with the FAA finding of no effect on historic properties (See SHPO concurrence letter dated February 23, 2010 in Appendix E of Final EA).

Section 4.2.9 of the Final EA states visual impacts resulting from the proposed action will be most apparent on the east end of the runway due to retaining wall construction and relocated airport access road. The text of the Final EA states the retaining wall for the east RSA, as well as the retaining walls for the relocated access road, will be visible from Highway 68. Highway 68 is a scenic route. Mitigation to reduce the visibility of the retaining wall will be made by using a tiered retaining wall. The walls will also be revegetated and constructed of natural appearing surfaces.

Section 4.2.11 of the Final EA states that the landing and departure thresholds for Runways 28L and 10R shift to the east, resulting in a slight change to the noise exposure at the airport. Implementation of the proposed action results in a slightly shorter runway in both directions, which compacts the noise exposure. The 65 CNEL noise contour for the proposed action is shorter, but wider (See Exhibits 4J and 4K in the Final EA). Results of this analysis indicates a 1.5 CNEL increase is not experienced; therefore, implementation of the proposed action does not result in impacts which exceed the threshold of significance.

Section 4.2.12 of the Final EA states that the proposed action would occur entirely on MRY property. No communities will be disrupted, interference with planned development will not occur, nor will an appreciable change in employment. With mitigation, implementation of the proposed action would not exceed the significant impact threshold for socioeconomic impacts.

Section 4.2.13 of the Final EA indicates implementation of the proposed action would result in changes to the drainage patterns at MRY as well as an increase of impermeable surfaces. Additionally, construction of the proposed improvements may have limited, short-term effects on surface water quality, particularly an increase in suspended sediments during and shortly after precipitation events in the construction phase. The MRY's existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) operating permit will need to be modified to include the additional impervious surfaces at MRY and changes in drainage patterns.

6. Public Participation

The public was encouraged to review and comment on the Draft EA. The MPAD published a notice of availability of the Draft EA on June 3, 2010 in the *Monterey Herald*, the local newspaper for the City of Monterey for a 30-day public review period. Two written comments were received pertaining to the proposed action (See comment letters in Appendix I of Final EA). The commenter's concerns have been addressed in Appendix I of 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 resources that were deemed present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the proposed action. The proposal to construct retaining walls, install EMAS on both ends of Runway 10R/28L, relocate existing access roads, and connector taxiways, shift both runway end thresholds, and shift the MALSR system to the east at MRY, would not involve any environmental impacts that would exceed the threshold of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1E and 5050.4B. Based on the information contained in the Final EA, the FAA has determined that the Proposed Action Alternative, is the most feasible and prudent alternative. The FAA has decided to implement the proposed action as described in the attached Final EA.

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 of Section 101(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and other applicable environmental 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 EIS for this action.

APPROVED:



Debbie Roth
Acting Manager, Airports Division, AWP-600

7-29-10

Date

DISAPPROVED:

Debbie Roth
Acting Manager, Airports Division, AWP-600

Date