

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

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Proposed Terminal Area Improvements

Long Beach Airport
Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California



For further information

Roberto I. Ramos
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
Southwest Region
Arkansas/Oklahoma Airports District Office
10101 Hillwood Parkway
Fort Worth, TX 76177
(817) 222-5359

December 12, 2019

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

WHAT'S IN THIS DOCUMENT? This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed Terminal Area Improvements Project located at Long Beach Airport (LGB) in Long Beach, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment dated November 2019. 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 Alternative and the No Action Alternative, which are evaluated in detail in this FONSI. This document also identifies the agency-preferred alternative.

BACKGROUND. The City of Long Beach (City), owner and operator of the Long Beach Airport (LGB) proposes to implement planned improvements to the terminal area. In 2006, the City Council approved 97,545 square feet (SF) of terminal improvements as part of a Terminal Development Program. The Terminal Development Program was phased based on service priorities and funding availability. The first phase of improvements included the construction of an additional parking structure with an adjoining surface lot; a new passenger concourse with consolidated passenger screening; and a new aircraft parking ramp. These improvements have been implemented and the concourse opened to the public on December 12, 2012. The proposed improvements evaluated as part of this EA represent the next phase of the Terminal Development Program which are presented as the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action reviewed in this EA is focused on meeting industry standards, improving operational efficiency, and enhancing the passenger experience at LGB. The Draft EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [Public Law 91-190, 42 USC 4321-4347], the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) [40 CFR 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 of Long Beach published the Notice of Availability for the Draft EA on October 1, 2019. No comments were received on the Draft EA during the public comment period between October 1, 2019 and October 30, 2019. FAA signed the Final EA on November 25, 2019.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO? Read the FONSI to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed Terminal Area Improvements Project at Long Beach Airport.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS? The City of Long Beach may begin to implement the Proposed Action Alternative.

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

PROPOSED TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

**LONG BEACH AIRPORT
LONG BEACH, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

1. Introduction. This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) for the proposed Terminal Area Improvements at Long Beach Airport (LGB), Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California. The City of Long Beach is the airport sponsor for LGB. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with NEPA and other applicable statutes before taking any federal actions that are necessary prior to implementation of the project. NEPA requires that after preparing an Environmental Assessment, federal agencies must decide whether to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact and approve the proposed project, or prepare an environmental impact statement prior to rendering a final decision on approval of a proposed project. The FAA has completed the environmental assessment, considered its analysis, and determined that no further environmental review is required. Therefore, the FAA is issuing this FONSI, accompanied and supported by the FAA’s Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) completing environmental review requirements for the project.

2. Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action. The purpose of the proposed action is to improve the Terminal Area at LGB. The proposed action would reinforce the historic Terminal Building’s structural integrity and improve functionality, upgrade, replace or expand facilities, provide integrated and consolidated systems, and better organize the terminal layout for passenger circulation. The proposed action would make LGB more functional and provide a more intuitive user experience, thus providing a higher level of service and better overall experience for travelers using LGB.

Improvements are needed to improve operational efficiency and enhance the passenger experience. Specifically, TSA baggage screening, ticketing facilities, and the outdated Terminal Building and do not meet current standards. Operational inefficiencies result from the placement and segregation of certain operations are not of sufficient size to accommodate required functions. The improvements are needed to streamline and expedite operations in pre-security and post-security areas of LGB to accommodate necessary functions and improve the passenger experience.

3. Proposed Project and Federal Actions. LGB is proposing to implement additional Terminal Area Improvements or “Proposed Action” which would advance the 2006 Terminal Development Program. The Proposed Action, illustrated on Figure 1-3 of the Final EA consists of improvements to enhance the customer travel experience and

improve airport functionality. The Proposed Action would not affect airport capacity or the maximum allowed number of flights. The following Terminal Area Improvements are proposed:

- Redevelop and expand the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Checked Baggage Inspection System (CBIS) to a 6,424 SF enclosed facility to meet current TSA standards;
- Construct a new outbound baggage make-up carousel under a 6,262 SF roof canopy near the new TSA CBIS to facilitate more efficient operations;
- Consolidate baggage claim operations by constructing a new open-air baggage claim area in an 11,491 SF space near the passenger exit with canopies for passenger protection from inclement weather. The baggage claim area would include a new 630 SF enclosed baggage service office (BSO). Additional restrooms totaling 1,367 SF, a replacement airport operations office of 163 SF, and electrical and janitorial support spaces (444 SF and 134 SF, respectively). An additional shell space will be created for potential future concession at 1,113 SF;
- Construct a new standalone, enclosed ticketing building totaling 16,790 SF that consolidates ticketing operations;
- New restrooms (1,249 SF) for public convenience and a collocated Airlines Ticketing/Operations Office (6,199 SF) are also proposed within this building;
- Expand and redevelop the Meeter/Greeter Plaza to incorporate 9,600 SF of area that will become available as a result of relocating the TSA baggage screening building and fencing. Improvements would include hardscaping and landscaping (e.g., palm trees, flowerbeds, benches, signage), as well as new restrooms and a core shell for pre-security concessions;
- Conduct seismic and infrastructure upgrades to the Terminal Building to restore the building's original architecture, make necessary repairs, upgrade and reestablish the building's functionality, and provide improved structural integrity and aesthetics;

Aesthetic improvements including:

- Removal of non-historic architectural elements and added infrastructure to restore original aesthetics and to restore the original viewshed;
- Creation of a new opening and architecturally compatible door which restores the terminal to its original configuration in the north elevation of the building to enhance circulation and provide access to a future proposed rental car lot;

- Restoration of the west elevation of the building due to the removal of the baggage screening building and fencing) to regain access from the back of the building to the Meeter/Greeter Plaza and passenger concourses; and

Restoration of the original tile mosaic floor, including removal of remaining carpet that is covering tile.

- Relocate the Rental Car Counters into the historic Terminal Building from the current modular facilities. Passenger ticketing will be removed from the Terminal Building, however self-service check-in kiosks will remain available for passengers without checked baggage. This function will allow the Airport to preserve the ticketing function of the historic Terminal; and
- Install underground utilities (maximum depth of 4 feet) to connect new buildings to existing

The following additional actions are connected to the Proposed Action:

- Demolish existing Baggage Claims #2 and #3;
- Demolish Baggage Screening Building and fencing, which would restore the west elevation of the Terminal Building; and
- Demolish baggage make-up conveyors

FAA will take the following actions to authorize implementation of the proposed projects:

- Unconditional approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) depicting the proposed improvements pursuant to Title 49 U.S.C. 40103(b), *Sovereignty and Use of Airspace* and 47107(a)(16), *Project Grant Application Approval Conditioned on Assurances about Airport Operations*
- Approval to impose and use Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) funds

4. Reasonable Alternatives Considered.

The Final EA evaluated the Terminal Area Improvements Alternative (Proposed Action) and the No Action Alternative. Analysis of the No Action Alternative is required pursuant to 40 CFR § 1502.14(d). Off-site alternatives were not considered as they would not meet the project purpose and need. Thus, only the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative were retained for analysis in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the Final EA for detailed impact analysis. The Proposed Action is FAA's preferred alternative.

5. **Assessment.** The potential environmental impacts and possible adverse effects were identified and evaluated in the Final EA.

Section 3.1 of the Final EA discloses that the following environmental impact categories were not evaluated further because the Proposed Action would not pose an impact to these environmental resources:

- Biological Resources
- Coastal Resources
- Farmlands
- Wetlands (of Water Resources)
- Floodplains (of Water Resources)
- Wild and Scenic Rivers (of Water Resources)

The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories:

- Air Quality
 - Climate
 - Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f)
 - Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste
 - Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources
 - Land Use
 - Natural Resources and Energy Supply
 - Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use
 - Socioeconomics Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks
 - Visual Effects
 - Water Resources
 - Cumulative Impacts
- **Air Quality.** As shown, the construction emissions are all well below the applicable CAA General Conformity *de minimis* levels for all pollutants/precursors and construction years. Therefore, a Conformity Determination is not required, and the proposed project is presumed to comply with the SIP. Construction-related air emissions would be short-term in nature and associated with air pollutants emitted by construction equipment and construction worker vehicles. The long-term operational air emissions would be associated with utility usage (i.e., heating and cooling requirements) associated with the new facilities. Airport operational emissions sources such as aircraft, auxiliary power units, ground service equipment and motor vehicles were not considered in the analysis as these source emissions would not change as a result of the proposed improvements. Therefore, no significant air quality impacts are expected from the Proposed Action Alternative and no mitigation would be required.

Under the No Action Alternative construction will not occur; no short-term emissions generated; and no significant direct or indirect impacts to air quality.

- **Climate.** The FAA has not established a significance threshold for climate and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. GHG emissions occur during construction but would be short-term. No significant direct impacts related to GHGs will occur as a result of the Proposed Action, and no mitigation measures are necessary. The No Action Alternative will not have construction emissions, change airport operations or aircraft and vehicle traffic patterns and will have no change over local or regional GHGs in the long term. No significant direct or indirect impacts related to GHGs will occur as a result of the No Action Alternative.
- **Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f).** The Proposed Action would not adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes of the terminal and there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative to redevelop the LGB terminal to improve passenger services. Therefore, by design, the Proposed Action causes the least overall harm to LGB historic resources. A physical use of the 4(f) resource would result from the redevelopment; however it will continue to function as a passenger service facility. The redevelopment of the terminal is not anticipated to cause any permanent adverse physical impacts or interference with the activities or purpose of LGB, on either a temporary or permanent basis.

The integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association for the terminal would not be diminished by the proposed action. All alterations and related new construction, including repair and maintenance, would be made consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The FAA has determined that the proposed undertaking would have No Adverse Effect on the historic property as defined in 36 CFR Part 800.5(b). The proposed undertaking would represent a physical use of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would not diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Thus, FAA finds the proposed undertaking will not adversely affect any properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The FAA's determination was circulated for public comment as part of the Draft Environmental Assessment and was coordinated with the California SHPO. The California SHPO was notified of FAA's *de minimis* Section 4(f) determination via correspondence on December 13, 2019.

The Proposed Action includes minimization and mitigation measures described in Section 6 of this FONSI and would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes qualifying the LGB Terminal for protection under Section 4(f). Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would result in a *de minimis* Section 4(f) determination.

The No Action Alternative would not result in either a constructive or physical use of a 4(f) resource.

- **Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste.** The Proposed Action Alternative would have no impact on known hazardous sites. The Proposed Action Alternative includes renovation of the Terminal Building which is known to contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP). An asbestos abatement contractor should be contracted to remove/abate ACM and materials containing asbestos that are damaged or would be disturbed in the renovations. Prior to demolition of buildings, contractors would screen the buildings for the presence of ACM or LBP and demolition activities would comply with established regulations for removal and disposal of these hazardous materials. If any hazardous wastes are encountered during construction, Contractors would be required to store, label and dispose of hazardous substances in accordance with established regulations, and would report any release of hazardous substances.

Under the Proposed Action Alternative there would be no planned uses of any hazardous materials that would not comply with applicable federal, state and local regulations, as well as the LGB storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). Additionally, a construction SWPPP would be developed to minimize potential hazardous material impacts during construction. Therefore, the Proposed Action Alternative would have no significant impacts to hazardous materials.

Solid waste associated with the construction of the Proposed Action Alternative would include demolition debris from the baggage claims, the baggage screening building and fencing, and baggage conveyors. Therefore, the Proposed Action Alternative would have no significant short-term impact to solid waste. Additionally, operation of the Proposed Action Alternative is not expected to result in a change in generation or disposal of solid waste.

The design and use of the Proposed Action Alternative improvements will adhere to federal, state, and local regulations as well as best practices pertaining to the use of hazardous materials, petroleum storage and waste disposal. Construction activities would comply with the requirements in LGB's SWPPP to prevent contamination due to surface water runoff during construction.

Under the No Action alternative use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials or pollution related to accidental spills of hazardous materials will continue to be what currently occurs at the airport. As such, neither the Proposed Action nor the No Action Alternative would result in any impacts related to hazardous materials, solid waste, or pollution prevention.

- **Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources.** The Proposed Action Alternative would restore the exterior and interior of the Terminal Building to its original architectural design and fabrication. The FAA determined that the Proposed Action Alternative would result in no adverse impact to the Terminal and there would result in a no adverse impact to historic resources. The California State Historic Preservation Office concurred with FAA's findings in a letter dated July 29,

2019. No known archaeological or cultural resources are expected to be affected within the Area of Potential Effect

There would be no construction or ground disturbing activities under the No Action Alternative. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not affect any historic, architectural, archaeological or cultural resources.

- **Land Use.** The Proposed Action Alternative would occur entirely on Airport property and would be consistent with the City's existing land use plan and zoning districts and would not alter any existing open spaces. The No Action Alternative would not involve direct nor indirect impacts to adjacent and nearby land use.
- **Natural Resources and Energy Supply.** The Proposed Action Alternative will not result in a significant increase in demand for natural resources and energy during either construction or operations. No significance thresholds for natural resource and energy supply will be exceeded as a result of the Proposed Action or the No Action Alternative.
- **Noise and Compatible Land Use.** The Proposed Action Alternative would not result in any operational noise impacts. No modification to aircraft operational procedures, number of flights or type of aircraft using LGB is anticipated. Noise impacts are anticipated during the construction phase but would be generally localized at the vicinity of the construction site. The closest noise-sensitive receptors to the Terminal Building are residences east of Clark Avenue, 0.5 miles from the Terminal location. The Proposed Action will result in no significant direct impacts from construction and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Under the No Action Alternative, construction activities would not occur. Therefore no impacts related to construction or operational noise would occur.

- **Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks.** The Proposed Action Alternative is located entirely on LGB property and would not require the acquisition or displacement of residents, businesses, or result in the division of communities. Therefore, no impact on minority or low-income populations is expected. A temporary increase in local employment and expenditure due to construction is expected. Temporary indirect impacts to surrounding communities and schools from construction (noise, air, traffic) would be localized at the vicinity of the construction site. The use of best management practices would mitigate temporary impacts to air quality and stormwater runoff.

Under the No Action Alternative, construction would not occur and therefore there would be no impacts to existing socioeconomics or traffic.

- **Visual Effects.** There are no Federal regulations for airport-related light emissions or visual effects. The Proposed Action Alternative would require new lighting, however

light emissions in the area are expected to remain similar to current conditions, as they are all within the existing lighted Terminal Area. The proposed ticketing lobby would be a new building requiring new lighting, however the structure would be enclosed, potentially reducing ambient lighting levels outside of the building. Lighting from all proposed new facilities would not extend beyond the Terminal Area. The Proposed Action Alternative would expose a portion of the Terminal Building on the west elevation screened from view for decades. Temporary views of construction equipment and personnel would be present during the construction phase but would not pose a significant visual impact. Under the No Action Alternative no proposed construction would occur and therefore there would be no changes to light emissions or the visual character of the Terminal Building.

- **Water Resources.** The Proposed Action Alternative would take place on areas that are entirely paved and would not result in a change to impervious surface. The construction phase would include ground disturbance for new building foundations and potential utility trenching, and the use of fuels, oils and greases for construction equipment. Construction activity would increase the potential for sediments and pollutants present in stormwater runoff, however construction activities would comply with the requirements in the City Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System permit, LGB Industrial Permit as well as the LGB SWPPP. Best management practices would be implemented to minimize the introduction of contaminants to the groundwater supply and the discharge of sediments and other pollutants to the storm drain system or surface waters during construction. No increase in total stormwater runoff is anticipated during operations and the existing drainage pattern of the Terminal Area would not change.

The No Action Alternative would not involve any construction activities that would result in impacts to water resources in the Terminal Area.

- **Cumulative Impacts.** There are no anticipated long-term operational impacts associated with the Alternatives, with the exception of the beneficial impacts related to terminal area safety, accessibility and efficiency. Cumulative impacts are generally associated with construction-related impacts from other projects occurring within the Alternatives construction period (early 2020 to 2023) The EA looked at impacts to the following environmental categories:
 - Air Quality
 - Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste
 - Historical, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources
 - Land Use
 - Natural Resources and Energy Supply
 - Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use
 - Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks
 - Visual Effects
 - Water Resources

No cumulative impacts to any of these resources were anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action Alternative and the No Action Alternative. The following projects are planned to occur in a timeframe that may overlap with the Proposed Action Alternative and No Action Alternative, including:

- Taxiway D Rehabilitation (2020)
- Ramp Remain Overnight Parking Improvements (2020)
- Taxiway L Improvements (2021)
- Runway 16R-34L Conversion to Taxiway B (2021)
- Terminal Curbfront and Sidewalk Improvements (2021-2022)
- Rental Car Ready/Return Lot (2021-2022)
- Ground Transportation Center (2021-2022)
- Taxiway F Realignment and Reconstruction (2023)

The No Action Alternative would not contribute to cumulative impacts resulting from these planned projects. The Proposed Action Alternative would not contribute to cumulative impacts from these planned projects.

6. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures for the Proposed Action Alternative are defined in Section 4.6.5, *Mitigation*, of the Final EA. The Terminal Building improvements would be governed by conditions set forth in the Certificates of Appropriateness (COAs) issued April 9, 2018 and March 11, 2019 by the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services. These COAs are included in Appendix A, Attachment 4. A summary of the mitigation measures includes the following requirements:

- The Proposed Action Alternative will not adversely affect any significant historical, cultural, architectural, or aesthetic feature of the Terminal Building;
- The Proposed Action Alternative will remedy any condition determined to be immediately dangerous or unsafe by the Fire Marshal and/or Building Official;
- Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for Preservation, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings;

7. Public Participation.

The public comment period for the Draft EA went from October 1, 2019 to October 31, 2019. No public comments were received. A list of agencies contacted, copy of the information sent, and responses received are in Appendix E, *Agency and Public Involvement* of the Final EA. The City published a notice of availability of the Draft EA in the following local newspaper in the vicinity of the airport: *Long Beach Press-*

Telegram. The City made the Draft EA available on the LGB website, two local libraries, Long Beach City Hall, LGB and the FAA Los Angeles Airports District Office.

8. Inter-Agency Coordination.

In accordance with 49 USC § 47101(h), the FAA has determined that no further coordination with the U.S. Department of Interior or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is necessary because the Proposed 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.

9. Reasons for the Determination that the Proposed Action 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 proposed Terminal Area Improvements Project at Long Beach Airport would not involve any environmental impacts which would exceed a threshold of significance as defined by FAA Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B. Based on the information contained in the Final EA, the FAA has determined the Proposed Action preferred alternative, is most feasible and prudent alternative. FAA has decided to implement the proposed project as described in the attached Final EA.

10. 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) and other applicable requirements. I also find the proposed Federal Action, with the required mitigation referenced above will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or otherwise include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to section 102 (2)(C) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an EIS for this action.

APPROVED:



JOHN E. MICHENER
Acting Manager, Los Angeles Airports District Office

12/12/19
Date