

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION  
WESTERN-PACIFIC REGION  
SAN FRANCISCO AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE

---

***FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT***

---

**SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT  
RENTAL CAR CENTER AND AIRTRAIN EXTENSION PROJECT**

City and County of San Francisco  
San Francisco Airport Commission  
San Francisco, San Mateo County, California



For further information:

Camille Garibaldi  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Aviation Administration  
San Francisco Airports District Office  
1000 Marina Blvd., Suite 220  
Brisbane, CA 94005  
(650) 827-7613

October 26, 2017

## GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

**WHAT'S IN THIS DOCUMENT?** This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact for the City and County of San Francisco, Airport Commission's (the City) proposed construction of a new Rental Car Center and AirTrain Extension at San Francisco International Airport (SFO) San Francisco, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) dated October 2017. This document summarizes the 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 alternatives, which are evaluated in detail in the Final EA attached to this Finding of No Significant impact.

**BACKGROUND.** On July 31, 2017, the City released the Proposed Rental Car Center and AirTrain Extension Draft EA and Notice of Floodplain Encroachment for public review. The Draft EA addressed the potential environmental effects of construction and operation of a new Rental Car Center and AirTrain Extension, including associated elements, at SFO. The Draft EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [Public Law 91-190, 42 United States Code 4321-4347], the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) [40 Code of Federal Regulations Parts 1500-1508], and FAA Orders 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. The City published the Notice of Availability for the Draft EA including Notice of Floodplain Encroachment (Notice) on July 31, 2017. Pursuant to Executive Order 11988 and Department of Transportation (DOT) Order 5650.2, the City held a public hearing on the proposed project on August 30, 2017. The Draft EA was available for review and comment period between July 31, 2017 and September 5, 2017. No comments were received

**WHAT SHOULD YOU DO?** Read the Finding of No Significant Impact to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed Rental Car Center and AirTrain Extension at SFO.

**WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS?** The City may begin to implement the Proposed Action.

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

**SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT  
RENTAL CAR CENTER AND AIRTRAIN EXTENSION PROJECT**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
AIRPORT COMMISSION  
SAN FRANCISCO, SAN MATEO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

**1. Introduction**

This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the environment as a result of the proposed development and operation of a new Rental Car Center and AirTrain Extension at San Francisco International Airport (SFO or Airport). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before being able to take the Federal action of unconditional approval of the proposed development within the SFO Airport Layout Plan (ALP). The City and County of San Francisco, Airport Commission (the City), as the airport sponsor, issued the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Notice of Floodplain Encroachment on July 31, 2017 for a 36-day public review period. A Final EA dated October 2017 was prepared to document the results of the environmental analysis. The Final EA is attached to this FONSI.

**2. Project Purpose and Need**

SFO is owned and operated by the City and is part of the Federal National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems. SFO is a commercial service airport that accommodates both air carrier aircraft as well as general aviation. The City applies for and accepts Federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant funding to construct and maintain airport facilities. The City is thereby obligated to maintain, operate, and improve their facilities in compliance with airport grant assurances. Chapter 1 of the Final EA identifies the purpose of the Proposed Action, which is to provide: efficient and modern rental car center facilities to meet the future demand with convenient access to and from the passenger terminals, with safe and efficient vehicular access to the regional roadway network through efficient entrances, exits, roadways, and intersections; additional space for on-airport rental car storage, reducing the need for rental cars to be stored offsite and shuttled back and forth; reuse of existing facilities; and elimination of trips to the terminal curbsides, thereby improving management of congestion along the terminal roadways and at the terminal curbsides.

The FAA's statutory mission is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. The FAA must ensure that the Proposed Action does not derogate the safety of aircraft and Airport operations at SFO. Moreover, it is the policy of the FAA under 49 United States Code (USC) Sections 47101(a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7) to encourage development of intermodal connections on airport property between aeronautical and other transportation modes and systems to serve air transportation passengers and cargo efficiently and effectively and promote economic development; that airport development projects provide for the protection and enhancement of natural resources and the quality of the environment of the United States; and that airport construction and improvement projects that increase the capacity of facilities to accommodate passenger and cargo traffic be undertaken to the maximum feasible extent such that safety and efficiency increase and delays decrease.

**3. Proposed Action and Federal Actions**

As described in the Final EA in Section 1.3, the Proposed Action includes construction of a new Rental Car Center (RCC) and extension of the existing AirTrain to Lot DD at SFO. The RCC

includes a five-level Ready/Return Garage with ready-return spaces, a customer service lobby, and rental car offices. Each level of the Ready/Return Garage is proposed to be approximately 160,000 square feet. A multi-level Quick Turnaround Facility (QTA) with storage/stacking spaces would also be constructed. The SFO AirTrain would be extended approximately 1,750 feet from the existing terminus in Lot D to Lot DD. A new AirTrain station approximately 240 feet long and 70 feet wide would be constructed near the north end of the RCC. A new curbside for passenger pickup and drop-off at the Lot DD AirTrain station would also be provided.

Connected and associated elements of the Proposed Action include:

- Closing and abandoning 14 underground storage tanks (UST), that provide 177,000 gallons of fuel storage, at the existing QTA and replacing in-kind USTs within the footprint of the new QTA.
- Constructing roadway, access, and intersection improvements in the vicinity of the new RCC:
  - Reconfigure the intersection of South Airport Boulevard, North McDonnell Road, and San Bruno Avenue.
  - Construct a public vehicle access road serving Lot DD from South Airport Boulevard to accommodate public access to the Ready/Return Garage.
  - Construct a service vehicle access road serving the Ready/Return Garage and the QTA facility.
- Construction of a fire lane along the north and west sides of the Ready/Return Garage, following the on-Airport alignment of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's San Francisco Bay Trail (Bay Trail) along the west side of the proposed garage.
- Construction of utility improvements:
  - Improve the utility corridor serving Lot DD, including expansion of the substation in Lot D.
    - Locate the utility corridor under a portion of the existing Bay Trail alignment adjacent to Lot DD.
  - Construct utility links to existing utility nodes in Lot DD.
  - Construct pump stations along utility corridor improvements between Lots D and DD.
- Conversion of the existing RCC facilities to public parking and rental car vehicle storage:
  - Restripe the existing Ready/Return Garage and install entrance and exit booths to provide 3,700 long-term public parking spaces.
  - Remove the existing QTA structure and repave, as needed, to provide approximately 2,200 short-term rental car storage spaces in a surface lot. No new structure would be constructed to replace the demolished QTA structure.

The City needs FAA's:

- Unconditional approval of the portion of the ALP for the Airport depicting the proposed improvements pursuant to 49 USC §§ 40103(b), and 47107(a)(16).
- Determination of the effects of the Proposed Action upon the safe and efficient utilization of navigable airspace pursuant to 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 77 and 157. The FAA performed an airspace review (Airspace Case No. 2016-AWP-1066-NRA) of the proposed development at SFO.
- Determination under 49 USC §44502(b) and 49 USC §§ 47101 *et seq.* that the Airport development is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense.
- Approval of a Construction Safety and Phasing Plan to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-2F, *Operational Safety on Airports During Construction*, [14 CFR Part 139 (49 USC § 44706)].

- Determinations under 49 USC §§ 47106 and 47107 relating to eligibility of the Proposed Action for Federal funding assistance under the AIP and under 49 USC § 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR Part 158.25 to impose and use Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) for the Proposed Action.
- Determination of eligibility for Federal assistance for the near-term development projects under the Federal grant-in-aid program authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (49 USC §47101 *et seq.*).
- Determination of the Proposed Action's effect on the safe and efficient use of airspace.

#### 4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered

As described in Chapter 2 of the Final EA, the alternatives evaluated include:

- Alternative 1 – Expand Existing RCC Facilities in Lot D and Extend AirTrain to Lot DD: The existing Ready/Return Garage would be expanded to the south and Level 5 would be converted from a staging area to ready/return spaces shaded by service canopies. The rental car companies would be reallocated between Levels 1 and 4 Customer Service Lobbies, and expansion of the QTA facility with construction of a second structure adjacent to and south of the newly expanded Ready/Return Garage in Lot D. The alternative would provide 4,500 ready/return spaces and 3,300 stacking/staging spaces. Space for additional on-Airport vehicle storage was not identified as part of this alternative.

The AirTrain would be extended to Lot DD and a new station would be constructed in the lot to provide AirTrain access to customers parking in the long-term parking garage. A remote curbside would present a new entry point to the terminals. Rental car patrons would continue to use the Lot D AirTrain station. Existing access routes between the regional roadway network and the expanded RCC would be maintained. Bus trips from the Lot DD long-term parking garage to the passenger terminals would be eliminated.

Construction of new facilities would comply with FAA design standards.

- Alternative 2 – Proposed Action – Construct New RCC Facilities in Lot DD, Extend AirTrain to Lot DD and Retain QTA Storage in Lot D: Alternative 2, the Proposed Action, includes construction of a new five-level Ready/Return Garage with a Customer Service Lobby provided on a portion of the sixth floor (positioned to avoid being an airspace obstruction) and a three-level QTA facility in Lot DD. The Proposed Action provides 4,400 ready/return spaces and 2,880 stacking/storage spaces.

The AirTrain would be extended to Lot DD with a new station to serve the new RCC and provide AirTrain access to customers parking in the long-term parking garage in Lot DD along with a remote curbside, which would present a new entry point to the terminals. Existing access routes between the regional roadway network and the point at which rental car patrons access the Airport roadway system would be maintained, however, intersection improvements would be made to accommodate changes in turning movements for the on-Airport segment of the trip. Bus trips from the Lot DD long-term parking garage to the passenger terminals would be eliminated. In addition, the relocation of rental car and Kiss & Fly activities to Lot DD would remove off-Airport rental car busses and private vehicles from the curbside at the existing RCC and therefore allow Lot D shuttle busses to access that curbside. Bus trips from Lot D to the terminal curbsides would be eliminated.

The existing Ready/Return Garage would be converted to a long-term public parking garage. The existing QTA facility would be demolished, and the site would be converted to a surface-level lot that provides 2,200 spaces for the short-term storage of rental cars.

An additional area in the southeast portion of Lot D would provide an additional 2,340 spaces for on-site rental car storage.

This alternative is consistent with the planned land use of ground access and parking for Lots D and DD.

- Alternative 3 – Construct New RCC Facilities in New Airport Location: Alternative 3 considers construction of the new RCC facilities in another location on SFO property. It is assumed that this alternative would be designed to support the facility requirements defined for Ready/Return spaces, stacking spaces, and general need for on-Airport spaces.

No undeveloped parcels exist along the AirTrain alignment (as demonstrated on the ALP provided in Appendix C of the Final EA), and no other area on the Airport, aside from Lots D and DD, and the terminal, have been designated to support ground access and parking land uses. Assuming a parcel of land on Airport property but not located along the AirTrain alignment was identified, this alternative would not include a new AirTrain station to serve the new RCC facilities and would require shuttle buses to transport passengers directly to the terminals or to the Lot D AirTrain for transport to the terminals. Because a specific site has not been identified on Airport property, evaluation of whether this alternative would provide safe and convenient access to the regional roadway system is unknown. Furthermore, without a new AirTrain station serving the new RCC facilities, this alternative would not provide a new remote curbside and entry point to the terminals.

Under this alternative, the existing Ready/Return Garage would be converted to a long-term parking garage to meet the need for additional parking supply, and the existing QTA facility would be demolished.

- Alternative 4 – New RCC Facilities Located Off-Airport: Consideration of the construction of new RCC facilities at an off-Airport location is the subject of Alternative 4. It is assumed that this alternative would be designed to support the facility requirements defined for Ready/Return spaces and stacking spaces; however, under this alternative, it is assumed that nearby storage spaces may also be provided to minimize the transporting of rentals cars between the off-Airport site and remote rental car company sites.

Given the alternative's off-Airport location, the alternative does not include a new AirTrain station to serve the new RCC facilities. This alternative would involve the use of shuttle buses to transport passengers between the off-Airport rental car facility and the passenger terminals or an AirTrain station and would not provide a new remote curbside and entry point to the terminals. Because a specific site has not been identified, evaluation of whether this alternative would provide safe and convenient access to the regional roadway system is unknown.

Under this alternative, the existing Ready/Return Garage could be converted to a long-term parking garage to meet the need for additional parking supply, and the existing QTA facility would be demolished.

- Alternative 5 – No Action Alternative: Under the No Action alternative, rental car activity would continue to be accommodated in existing RCC facilities in Lot D and the AirTrain would not be extended to provide a new curbside and entry point to the terminals or AirTrain access to passengers using the Lot DD parking garage. The No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need, but it is retained for consideration pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.14(d), which defines the types of alternatives to be considered in a NEPA evaluation.

The alternatives were evaluated with the screening criteria described in Section 2.3 , Table 2-1, of Chapter 2. The screening results are provided in Exhibit 2-2, Alternatives Comparison Summary. Alternatives that failed to pass the criteria analysis were eliminated from further consideration. The alternatives eliminated from further consideration are Alternatives 1, 3, and 4. Section 2.4.1 provides an explanation of why these alternatives failed to meet the established criteria. Alternative 2 – the Proposed Action and 5 - the No Action were carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA.

## 5. Assessment

The potential environmental impacts and possible adverse effects were identified and evaluated in the Environmental Consequences Chapter, Chapter 4 of the Final EA. The Final EA was reviewed by the FAA and found to be adequate for the purpose of the proposed Federal action. The FAA determined that the Final EA adequately describes the potential impacts of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives. No new issues surfaced as a result of the public review process.

Final EA, Chapter 3 – Affected Environment, Section 3.2 identified that the environmental resource categories, Farmlands and Water Resources – Wild and Scenic Rivers, were not present in the defined study area shown in Exhibit 3-1.

Final EA, Chapter 4 – Environmental Consequences, Section 4 identified environmental resource categories that were eliminated from consideration because the environmental resource would not be affected by either the Proposed Action or No Action Alternatives. Those environmental resource categories are: Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Uses; Environmental Justice; Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks; and Water Resource – Wetlands.

The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories in detail: Air Quality; Biological Resources; Climate; Coastal Resources; Department of Transportation (DOT) Act, Section 4(f); Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources; Land Use; Natural Resources and Energy Supply; Socioeconomics; Visual Effects; Water Resources – Floodplains, Surface Waters, and Groundwater; and Cumulative Impacts.

**Air Quality:** The National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) designation for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (Air Basin) is classified as marginal nonattainment for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>); moderate nonattainment for Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>); attainment/maintenance for the 8-hour Carbon Monoxide (CO)<sup>i</sup>. The Air Basin is classified as in attainment for Nitrogen Dioxide, and Sulfur Dioxide; and is unclassified for Lead and PM<sub>10</sub>.

The air quality assessment considered the potential for the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives to result in direct and indirect impacts to air quality. No change to existing or forecast aviation operations would result from either No Action or the Proposed Action Alternatives and would not influence the projected level of passenger enplanements.

The Air Quality assessment located in Chapter 4, Section 4.1, considered emission estimates for air pollutants (or their precursor compounds) for which the Air Basin is not in attainment or is unclassified. Emission estimates were prepared for CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) which are primary precursor compounds that lead to the formation of O<sub>3</sub>. The California Emission Estimator Model was used to conduct the construction emission analysis associated with the Proposed Action. Construction emission sources include exhaust from off-road construction equipment, haul trucks, and construction worker vehicles; fugitive VOC emissions from paving; and fugitive dust emissions from grading, materials handling, and vehicles traveling on paved and unpaved roads. Table 4-1 summarizes the annual emissions estimated for construction of the Proposed Action Alternative, which would

---

<sup>i</sup> Designation as a maintenance area will continue until 2018.

occur beginning in 2017 and continue through 2024, and compares the annual emissions with the applicable General Conformity *de minimis* levels. The changes in emissions attributed to construction of the Proposed Action would be less than the *de minimis* threshold for each year of construction. Additionally, the City will implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to further minimize fugitive dust during construction activities.

The Final EA indicates that no significant Air Quality impacts would occur from operation and construction of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

**Biological Resources:** The Proposed Project Area, Exhibit 3-1, is developed Airport property comprising of paved surface and structured parking areas, roadways, and structures or facilities supporting rental car operations. Natural habitat areas and vegetation communities are not present, although, maintained landscaped areas consisting of ornamental trees and shrubs are present along surrounding roadways. Although not within the Proposed Project Area, a constructed stormwater drainage channel, the North Channel, is present approximately 200 feet northwest of the Proposed Project Area.

The potential presence of Federally listed threatened or endangered species, and species proposed for listing (Federally listed) were evaluated. As documented in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.2, an official species list was obtained from the United States (US) Fish and Wildlife Service. The list identifies 22 known species (17 wildlife and 5 plant species) with the potential to occur in the vicinity of the Proposed Project Area; no designated critical habitats were identified. As summarized in Tables 3-2 and 3-3, based upon a review of the habitat requirements, distribution of the species, and existing site conditions, none of the listed species are considered present due to the absence of suitable habitat.

Similarly, the potential presence of state-listed threatened or endangered species, and species proposed for listing were considered. Of the species identified through a search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's California Natural Diversity Database, 20 species (7 wildlife and 13 plant species) with the potential to occur in the area were identified. Tables 3-4 and 3-5 provides the species list and evaluation of habitat requirements, distribution, and existing site conditions. None of the species are considered to be present in the Proposed Project Area due to the absence of suitable habitat.

Given the proximity to the Proposed Project Area, the analysis also considered species potentially present in the North Channel. The Federally listed California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, Salt marsh harvest mouse, Tidewater goby, Steelhead, and Ridgeway's Rail were evaluated and are not considered to be present based on an evaluation of the habitat requirements and existing environmental conditions.

No permanent biological communities exist within the Proposed Project Area, and no Federal or state listed species or critical habitat are present. The City will conduct a pre-construction survey to ensure the continued absence of biological resources in the Proposed Project Area.

As a result of the analysis provided, the FAA has determined that completion of the Proposed Action will have no effect on biological resources including Federal listed threatened or endangered species and designated critical habitat. No impact to Biological Resource would occur with implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative.

**Climate:** Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions would temporarily increase during construction of the Proposed Action. Annual GHG emissions were calculated and presented in Table 4-3. Minimization of GHG emissions during construction will occur by recycling concrete to the extent possible, proper maintenance of construction equipment, and reduction of equipment idling times. Operation of the Proposed Action Alternative would provide for relocation or elimination of several types of ground access and parking activities. As shown in Table 4-2, changes in vehicle trip types under the Proposed Action Alternative are estimated to have a neutral to positive effect on air emission and elimination of some trip types as passengers are shifted to the AirTrain and

shuttle bus trips are eliminated. Operationally, fuel use is expected to be lower under the Proposed Action Alternative, which would result in lower GHG emissions when compared to the No Action Alternative. No impact to Climate resource is expected.

**Coastal Resources:** As described in Section 3.6 of the Final EA, the coastal zone is protected by the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) and California Coastal Management Program, which is administered by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). Along with areas subject to regular tidal action, the coastal zone extends 100 feet inland from the mean high-tide line. This area is referred to as the 100-foot shoreline band and is shown on Exhibit 3-2. The Proposed Project Area is approximately one-quarter mile west of the shoreline and is not within the coastal zone. However, a portion of the proposed east construction staging area and the associated proposed truck route, would utilize an existing equipment staging site and an existing access road that is within the 100-foot shoreline band. These uses were authorized by permit within the shoreline band originally issued in 1996 by BCDC. As described in Section 4.4.3.2, construction of the Proposed Action Alternative would not change the site use, therefore, the areas remain consistent with the BCDC San Francisco Bay Plan. Operation of the Proposed Action Alternative is outside, and would not have indirect effect to the shoreline band; therefore, it is not subject to CZMA consistency review. No CZMA impact would occur with implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative.

**Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f):** As shown on Exhibit 3-3, a Department of Transportation, Section 4(f) [Section 4(f)] resource is within the Proposed Project Area. A segment of the BCDC Bay Trail is within the Airport property along the western boundary of the Proposed Project Area. This portion of the Bay Trail provides a walking trail and bikeway, within a Right-of-Way (ROW) within a transportation facility (the Airport). Section 4.5.3.2, describes the temporary closure of 1,150 linear feet of the on-Airport segment of the Bay Trail to accommodate burial of a utility corridor and reconstruction to include a fire lane within the trail alignment. To maintain Bay Trail connectivity during construction an alternate route will be provided during construction. After construction of the utility corridor and fire lane is complete, the Bay Trail will reopen functionally and aesthetically consistent with the current trail. Procedural requirements for complying with Section 4(f) are set forth in DOT Order 5610.1C. Although not binding on the FAA, the FAA may use applicable Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration regulations as guidance to the extent relevant to aviation projects. The FAA determined that Federal Highway Administration regulation 23 CFR Part 774.13(f)(3) is an applicable exception to Section 4(f). The exception applies to “certain trails, paths, bikeways, and sidewalks that occupy a transportation facility ROW without limitation to any specific locations within that ROW, so long as the continuity of trail, path, bikeway, or sidewalk is maintained.” The FAA requested BCDC concurrence with its determination on April 5, 2017. On June 1, 2017, BCDC responded with a “concurrence for the Transportation Act Section 4(f) Exception” and a determination “that the project would not have an adverse impact on the public access, as required, and generally confirms to the requirements of the BCDC permit.” Copies of the correspondence are provided in Appendix I of the Final EA. There are no Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, Section 6(f) resources within the Proposed Project Area. No Section 4(f) impacts would occur with implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative.

**Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention:** Hazardous Materials: Section 3.8 of the Final EA describes the existing conditions within the Proposed Project Area. There are 14 Underground Storage Tanks (UST) within the existing QTA facility in Lot D. A capacity of 177,000 gallons of gasoline is available and distributed via 60 above-ground fuel dispensers. The USTs and fuel dispensing system were installed when the existing Ready/Return Garage and QTA facility were constructed in 1997. San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issued Order 99-045, which defines a framework to implement an Airport-wide cleanup and management strategy and streamline the regulatory oversight allow for consistent cleanup decisions for similar sites. Review of the hazardous material cleanup-site records found no active cleanup sites within the Proposed Project Area. The closest active cleanup site is located north of the North Access Road approximately 1,100 feet northeast of the Proposed Project Area and 600 feet to the east of the west equipment staging area.

Construction of the Proposed Action Alternative includes the closure and abandonment of the 14 USTs at the existing QTA and replacement of the 177,000-gallon fuel storage capacity at the proposed QTA in Lot DD. The San Mateo County Environmental Health Division oversees the UST Program for San Mateo County which includes the Airport. The City will obtain permits for the closure of the USTs and construction of the new USTs.

Prior to the start of construction and demolition activities of the soil and groundwater in the project area will be tested to determine what material is acceptable for reuse. Any contaminated material considered to be hazardous waste will be handled in accordance with Federal, state, and local regulations. Hazardous waste will be disposed of at a suitable landfill such as Ox Mountain Landfill or Keller Canyon Landfill.

Operation of the Proposed Action Alternative would involve the same types and quantities of hazardous substances typically associated with the operation of the rental car facilities and AirTrain as the No Action Alternative. With implementation of the testing protocols and proper use and disposal a hazardous materials impact would not occur during construction or operation of the Proposed Action Alternative.

**Solid Waste:** The City's Green Building Ordinance calls for recycling a minimum of 75 percent of non-hazardous construction and demolition solid waste generated by City-sponsored projects; with the rate increasing to 85 percent in 2018. In practice the Airport construction projects achieve an approximate 90 percent recycling rate. Generation of solid waste from operation of the Proposed Action Alternative is expected to increase proportionately with the projected increase in passenger enplanements at the Airport and use of the RCC. The recycling programs will continue and sufficient regional disposal capacity exists for municipal solid wastes.

**Pollution Prevention:** The City will need to obtain a Construction General Permit for construction of the Proposed Action Alternative, since the permit is required for discharges of stormwater associated with construction activity for any project disturbing one or more acres. Construction of the Proposed Action Alternative will also require preparation of a site specific Storm Water Pollution Prevent Plan (SWPPP) which will incorporate BMPs to ensure no impact to stormwater would occur. Conformance with the Airport-wide SWPPP measures will also be required during construction and operation of the Proposed Action Alternative. Additionally, the City will update the Airport's Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan to reflect the changes associated with the fuel storage and disposal conditions under the Proposed Action Alternative.

No significant impact due to Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste would result with implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative in compliance with storage, use and permitting requirements.

**Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources:** The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the evaluation of Historic, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources (cultural resources) is shown on Exhibit 3-4. The depth of the vertical APE was established at 135 feet below the existing ground surface to account for the maximum depth of pilings, although the majority of the ground disturbance associated with the Proposed Action Alternative will be less than 25 feet below the ground surface. As describes within Section 3.9.2, the APE is within the boundaries of prior evaluations in 1991 and 1997. The evaluations identified no cultural resources in the APE. An updated Cultural Resource Inventory evaluation was conducted in 2017 that confirmed that no cultural resources are present within the APE. The FAA submitted its No Historic Properties Affected determination to the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on June 20, 2017. In July 2017, the FAA also conducted consultation with Native American tribes that were identified by the Native American Heritage Commission as potentially having knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. No resources of concern were identified. The SHPO responded on August 22, 2017, with its concurrence. Copies of the

National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 consultation are provided in Appendix F of the Final EA. No cultural resource impact would occur with implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative.

**Land Use:** The City and County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAD) serves as the Airport Land Use Commission for San Mateo County. The Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for SFO was adopted by C/CAG on November 8, 2012. The Land Use evaluation in Section 4.8 of the Final EA considered the compatibility of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives. The C/CAG determined that the General Plans of San Mateo County and the cities adjacent to SFO are consistent with the ALUCP. On October 11, 2016, the City provided its assurance for existing and planned land uses pursuant to 49 USC Section 47107(a)(10), formerly Section 511(a)(5) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended. A copy of the City's letter is located in G of the Final EA.

The proposed RCC facilities are not located within an RPZ or of such a height to be an obstruction to air navigation. The City will complete coordination with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to secure an encroachment ROW permit for the AirTrain extension foundations. No land use impacts would result from implementing the Proposed Action Alternative.

**Natural Resources and Energy Supply:** Chapter 3, Section 3.11 and Table 3-7 provide historic energy use information for the Airport. Facilities within the Proposed Project Area rely on electricity by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. Rental car vehicles and shuttle bus operations consume fuel energy.

Construction of the Proposed Action Alternative will require commonly available consumable natural resources and will incorporate use of recycled materials to the extent practicable. During construction water used to BMP dust suppression will be sourced from the Airport's recycled water facilities. The Hazardous Material, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention resource evaluation discusses the City's ongoing program to minimize waste and objective to increase its program. The temporary increase in utility demand for construction activities would not be significant.

Operation of the Proposed Action Alternative will result in an increase in electricity and natural gas when compared to the No Action Alternative. The proposed RCC and AirTrain facilities will include energy and water efficiency measures, consistent with the City's pursuit of the US Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design's Gold rating. The increase is expected to be minor in comparison with the total energy demand at the Airport and would not appreciable increase energy use. Relocation of the existing fuel dispensing system to the new QTA facility will not change the fuel storage capacity or use when compared to the No Action Alternative. No significant natural resource or energy supply impact is expected from operation of the Proposed Action Alternative.

**Socioeconomics:** The Proposed Project Area includes no residential communities or areas of low-income or minority populations. Ground access is connected to the surrounding community by vehicle trips between the Proposed Project Area and the local roadway network. Table 3-8 summarizes the vehicle trip types occurring in the area. The evaluation of potential socioeconomic impacts considered the extent to which the levels of service on roadway segments would be affected. As discussed in Section 4.10, no residential or business relocations; or disruption or division of established communities would occur. The Proposed Action Alternative would result in minor changes to local traffic patterns in comparison to the No Action Alternative. Construction of the Proposed Action Alternative includes roadway improvements shown in Exhibit 1-4. A temporary effect on traffic patterns are expected during construction activities and a Transportation Management Plan was submitted to Caltrans which addresses temporary traffic restrictions and detours anticipated during construction. The effects on traffic during construction are temporary and not considered a significant impact.

Operation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not induce substantial economic growth in comparison to the No Action Alternative. Rental car trips and parking activities in the Proposed Project Area and their use of the local roadway network, including the terminal area roadways, are expected to increase commensurate with the forecast increase under the No Action Alternative. The Proposed Action Alternative shifts the RCC ingress and egress from North McDonnell Road to South Airport Boulevard. San Bruno Avenue will serve in the same capacity under both the Proposed Action Alternative and No Action Alternative, as the link between the surrounding transportation network and the RCC. The Proposed Action Alternative includes roadway improvements to support a turning movement change associated with the proposed relocated ingress and egress to the RCC as well as to improve traffic flow in the area. Additionally, the AirTrain extension to Lot DD with a new remote curbside provides the ability to eliminate or reduce several trip types that current access the congested terminal roadways and curbsides. Operation of the Proposed Action Alternative is expected to result in a beneficial socioeconomic impact by contributing to improvement of the level of service of the terminal and regional roadway network between Lots D and DD, and the terminal curbsides.

**Visual Effects:** The Visual Effects analysis, in Section 4.11, determined that the Proposed Action Alternative would not create a significant effect related to light emissions, visual resources, or the visual character of the area when compared with the No Action Alternative. The Proposed Project Area, described in Section 3.14, is a high ambient light paved environment comprised of surface and structured parking and roadways. The visual character of the Proposed Project Area and its vicinity is defined by transportation-related structures (airfield, terminal, and freeway facilities) and partial views of San Bruno Mountain to the north and east. For both the Proposed Action and No Action Alternatives, the nearest residences are located 1,000 feet to the west and are further separated from the Proposed Project Area lighting sources by U.S. Highway 101.

During construction of the Proposed Action Alternative equipment may temporarily block or obstruct the partial views of San Bruno Mountain, but given the visual character of the area, this would not constitute a significant impact. Additional lighting will be installed to support the RCC and AirTrain in the Proposed Action Alternative. The lighting will conform to aviation standards and would be shielded and directed downward. The new RCC facilities and AirTrain in Lot DD, of the Proposed Action Alternative, would change the view of the area but not alter the visual character of the Proposed Project Area. Additionally, implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not affect the views of San Bruno Mountain from the Bay Trail. For these reasons it was determined that the Proposed Action Alternative would not result in a significant visual change or visual effects impact.

#### **Water Resources:**

**Floodplains:** As described in Section 3.15.2.2, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) includes the Airport on the 1984 San Mateo County Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). A portion of the southern end of the Proposed Project Area is located within the 100-year floodplain and the northern end of the area within the 500-year floodplain. See Exhibit 3-6. On November 12, 2015, FEMA issued a Preliminary FIRM for the City of San Francisco which includes the Airport Property. If and when FEMA makes this FIRM final, the majority of the Proposed Project Area, shown on Exhibit 3-7, would be within the 100-year floodplain. Copies of the FIRMs are provided in Appendix H. The Proposed Project Area is fully developed and paved, creating an impermeable surface, with the exception of landscaped areas along the roadways and the Bay Trail. The area has limited natural and beneficial floodplain values (natural moderation of floods, water quality maintenance, groundwater recharge, fish, wildlife, plants, open space, natural beauty, scientific study, outdoor recreation, agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry). The City implements a variety of flood protection measures and is also developing a Shoreline Protection Program (SPP) to improve the Airport-wide shoreline protection system. The SPP will provide flood protection against 100-year floods and sea level rise through shoreline protection improvements such as seawalls, flood/tidal gates, pump stations, and levee and embankment stabilization.

Chapter 4, Section 4.12, identified that both the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives represent a floodplain encroachment. The Proposed Action Alternative would increase activity within the Proposed Project Area when compared to No Action Alternative; although within the entire Airport, the Proposed Action Alternative is a redistribution of the projected No Action Alternative activity levels within the floodplain. Applicable to both the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives, the City's flood control measures and other methods to minimize harm to human life and transportation facilities from events within the 100-year floodplain include the SPP, compliance with controls for hazardous material use and storage, and use of the stormwater drainage system. The City's Floodplain Management Ordinance requires the design of all new construction and substantial improvements in designated floodplain prone areas to include mitigation against flood damage and employ materials and equipment resistant to flood damage, consistent with the criteria set forth in 44 CFR § 60.3. The City's Building Inspection and Code Enforcement Division enforces the provision of the Floodplain Management Ordinance on Airport property and does so by following California Building code that incorporates American Society of Civil Engineers 24-14, which contains design and construction standards above the minimum requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program.

The existing developed, impervious surface, of the Proposed Project Area and surrounding Airport property have eliminated the natural and beneficial values of the floodplain. The lack of the natural and beneficial values is consistent with the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives. To offset this condition, the City maintains an Airport wide stormwater management system to manage, direct and pre-treat stormwater flows that occur. Flood Control and Groundwater Recharge would continue at the Airport.

The Proposed Action Alternative is consistent with the established planned ground access and parking uses and would not provide direct or indirect support for new development in the base floodplain.

Based upon the summary provided herein and the Final EA, the floodplain encroachment associated with the Proposed Action Alternative does not represent a significant encroachment because it would not result in a considerable probability of loss of human life, likely future damage that could be substantial in cost or extent or a notable adverse impact on natural and beneficial floodplain values. The City is taking action and is planning additional measures in its SPP to minimize potential floodplain harm. On July 31, 2017, the City provided Notice of Availability for the Draft EA and Notice of Floodplain Encroachment for public review. A public hearing was held on August 30, 2017; no written or verbal comments were provided during the hearing or public review period.

Surface Water: Section 4.12.3.2 addresses the potential for the Proposed Action Alternative to affect surface water. During construction of the Proposed Action Alternative, potential temporary water quality impacts could occur, however those impacts will be minimized through compliance with the Airport's National Pollution Discharge Elimination Permit and the Construction General Permit, which require development of a site-specific SWPPP. The site specific SWPPP will include BMPs for construction activity to prevent the discharge of sediments and other pollutants into the storm-drain system or surface waters. Operation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not result in additional storm water runoff entering surface water resources. By employing pollution-prevention measures (i.e. SPCC, NPDES permit, and SWPPP) identified in Section 4.6.3 and maintain compliance with all appropriate Federal, state, and local permits, effects on surface water would be minimized or avoided. Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative is not expected to result in an exceedance of water quality standards nor result in a significant impact to surface water.

Groundwater: The developed and paved surface conditions of the Proposed Project Area is consistent with the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives. The groundwater conditions at the Airport is described in Section 3.15.4. The Airport is located within the Westside Groundwater Basin which is designated by Department of Water Resources as a very-low priority basin. The Environmental Protection Agency has not designated a sole source aquifer, one that would

supply at least 50 percent of drinking water to its service area, in the vicinity of the Proposed Project Area. In the vicinity of the Airport, the top elevation of the aquifer zone is approximately 200 feet below mean sea level underneath a thick layer of fine-grained clays, sandy clay, and sand beds. A common depth of groundwater near the surface is estimated to be between 3 and 10 feet below the surface.

Construction of the Proposed Action Alternative includes ground disturbance to depths ranging from 80 to 135 feet below ground surface. Groundwater near the surface of the Proposed Project Area is likely to be encountered during construction and will be managed through the SWPPP. As stated in Section 4.12.3.3, groundwater that is encountered will be tested to determine if it can be discharged into a storm drain or industrial sewer system. If the testing results exceed acceptable levels the groundwater will be treated prior to disposal. No groundwater impact is anticipated with implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Chapter 4, Section 4.13 presents the Cumulative Impact analysis; past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are identified in Section 3.16. No significant cumulative impacts to Air Quality; Biological Resources; Climate; Coastal Resource; DOT Section 4(f); Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste; Historic, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources; Land Use; Natural Resources and Energy Supply; Socioeconomics; Visual Effects; or Water Resources would occur.

## **6. Public Participation**

As discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EA, the public was encouraged to review and comment on the Draft EA. The City published a Notice of Availability and Notice of Floodplain Encroachment for public review and comment on the Draft EA with the announcement of a public workshop and public hearing on July 31, 2017. The Draft EA was made available for review for 36 days from July 31, 2017 to September 5, 2017. A public workshop followed by a public hearing occurred on August 30, 2017. Publication of the document availability occurred in the San Francisco Chronicle, San Mateo County Times, and San Jose Mercury; as well as the SFO website. Copies of the Draft EA were available for review at the locations listed in Table 5-1 which included local libraries, the Airport and FAA, San Francisco Airports District Office. The Notice of Availability including Notice of Floodplain Encroachment and affidavit of publication are presented in Appendix K of the Final EA. No comments were received during the public hearing or comment period.

## **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 Action 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 environmental resource categories that were deemed present at the project location, or had the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action. The proposal to construct and operate an RCC and AirTrain extension would not result in any environmental impacts that would exceed the thresholds of significance as defined by 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, described in Chapter 1, Section 1.3 as the FAA's Preferred Alternative. The FAA has decided to unconditionally approve the proposed development within the SFO ALP 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 Final 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 Environmental Impact Statement for this action.

**APPROVED:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James W. Lomen  
Manager, San Francisco Airports District Office, SFO-600

10/26/2017  
Date

**DISAPPROVED:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
James W. Lomen  
Manager, San Francisco Airports District Office, SFO-600

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date