

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

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

**Proposed Runway 12/30 Safety Area Improvement Project
at Bishop Airport**

Bishop Airport
Bishop, Inyo County, California



For further information

Camille Garibaldi
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
Western-Pacific Region
Los Angeles Airports District Office
777 S. Aviation Blvd., Suite 150
El Segundo, CA 902457
(424) 405-7287

November 14, 2024

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

WHAT'S IN THIS DOCUMENT? This document is the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Record of Decision (ROD) for the proposed Runway 12/30 Runway Safety Area (RSA) Improvements at Bishop Airport (BIH or Airport), Inyo County, California. This document includes the agency determinations and approvals for those proposed Federal actions described in the Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) dated November 2024. 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 Project and the No Action alternative, which are evaluated in detail in the Final EA attached to this FONSI-ROD.

BACKGROUND. On April 11, 2024, the County of Inyo (County) released the *Draft Environmental Assessment for Runway 12/30 Safety Area Improvement Project at Bishop Airport* (Draft EA) for public review. The Draft EA addressed the potential environmental effects of constructing a RSA for Runway 12/30 by cutting, filling, and grading areas within the RSA to bring the area up to current FAA Airport Design standards. The Draft EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [42 USC Secs 4321-4335], the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) [40 Code of Federal Regulations (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*. Inyo County published the Notices of Availability for the Draft EA on April 11, 2024, in the *Inyo Register* and on the County's website. Inyo County held a review and comment period on the Draft EA from April 11, 2024, to May 21, 2024. On May 14, 2024, the County held a public workshop at the Airport from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. No members of the public attended the workshop. No public comments were received on the Draft EA. FAA accepted the Final EA on November 13, 2024.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO? Read the Finding of No Significant Impact and Record of Decision to understand the actions that FAA intends to take relative to the proposed Runway 12/30 RSA Improvement Project at BIH.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THIS? The County may begin to implement the Proposed Project.

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

PROPOSED RUNWAY 12/30 SAFETY AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AT BISHOP AIRPORT

**BISHOP AIRPORT
BISHOP, INYO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

- 1. Introduction.** This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the environment and Record of Decision (ROD) (FONSI/ROD) for the proposed Runway 12/30 Safety Area Improvement Project at Bishop Airport (BIH/Airport), Inyo County, California. Inyo County is the sponsor for BIH, a Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 139 certificated commercial service airport. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before being able to take the proposed federal actions. Inyo County, as the airport sponsor, prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) pursuant to requirements of Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) implementing regulations at 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508¹, and FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, and Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*.
- 2. Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project.** As described in Section 1.3 of the Final EA, the overall purpose and need for the Proposed Project is to enhance airfield safety and efficiency by achieving a Runway Safety Area (RSA) for Runway 12/30 that meets FAA *Airport Design* standards, identified in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13B, *Airport Design*, for an Airport Reference Code (ARC) C-III designated runway. The existing Runway 12/30 RSA includes non-standard conditions and requires the use of declared distances which limits the full use of the Runway by C-III aircraft during certain conditions consistent with FAA Order 5200.8, *Runway Safety Area Program*. Under 14 CFR § 139.309, Part 139 certificated airports must provide and maintain RSAs that are compliant with FAA airport design standards.

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 BIH meets all safety standards required for its 14 CFR Part 139 Operating Certificate and that aviation operations are conducted in a manner that will not compromise the safety of air commerce.

Proposed Project and Federal Actions. The Proposed Project, identified in Section 1.4, and depicted in Figures 2-2, 2-3, and 2-4, of the Final EA, includes the following elements:

Runway 12

- Approximately 7.8 acres of land within the RSA beyond the Runway 12 end would be cut, filled, graded, and compacted. This would provide a standard RSA.

¹ CEQ NEPA Implementing Regulations issued May 20, 2022

- The existing Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) unpaved patrol road would be relocated outside the runway's Object Free Area (OFA). The portion of relocated road would be approximately 15 feet wide and 1/4 mile long.
- Approximately 1,635 linear feet (LF) of existing perimeter fence would be removed and approximately 2,175 LF of new perimeter fence would be installed beyond the OFA boundary.

Runway 30

- Approximately 6.5 acres of land within the RSA beyond the Runway 30 end would be cleared of vegetation, cut, filled, and graded. This would provide a standard RSA.
- Approximately 2,000 LF of existing perimeter fence would be removed and approximately 3,125 LF of new perimeter fence would be installed outside the OFA.

Runway Sides

- The RSA alongside the runway is generally in compliance with FAA regulations but would be graded to ensure an adequate, flat surface throughout.

Any necessary fill material for the RSAs will be taken from the cut material in the RSAs. In the event more material is required, a borrow area has been identified immediately adjacent to the RSA beyond the Runway 12 end.

The portions of the RSA beyond the existing Airport perimeter fence that occupy land outside the current leasehold with the LADWP are within the Airport's easement.

The FAA federal actions necessary to carry out the proposed project are:

- Unconditional approval of the portion of the Bishop Airport - Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts the components of the Proposed Project pursuant to 49 United States Code (U.S.C.) §§ 40103(b), 44718, 47107(a)(16).
- Determinations under 49 U.S.C. §§ 47016 and 47107 that are associated with the eligibility of the Proposed Project for federal funding assistance under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP); 49 U.S.C. § 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR § 158.25 to use passenger facility charges (PFCs) collected at the Airport to assist with construction of eligible elements of the Proposed Project as shown of the ALP; and potential funding through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021, (Public Law 117-58).

4. **Reasonable Alternatives Considered.** Figure 2-1, *Alternatives Screening Process*, in Chapter 2 of the Final EA, detailed a three-step alternatives analysis screening used to evaluate each alternative's ability to meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Project. The three step screening criteria includes:

- Step 1** the ability to provide a standard RSA without modifications;
- Step 2** technical and economic feasibility; and
- Step 3** operational effectiveness.

Analysis of the No Action alternative is required pursuant to 40 CFR § 1502.14(c). Paragraph 6-2.1(d) of FAA Order 1050.1F states in part: “An EA may limit the range of alternatives to the proposed action and no action when there are no unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. Alternatives are to be considered to the degree commensurate with the nature of the proposed action and agency experience with the environmental issues involved.”

Section 2.3, *Range of Alternatives Considered*, of the Final EA describes and evaluates the alternatives considered: Alternative A – Proposed Project – Fully Compliant RSA; Alternative B – Use of Declared Distances; Alternative C – Modify Runway 12/30; Alternative E – Improve Other Runways at the Airport; and Alternative F – No Action Alternative.

Table 2-3 summarizes the ability of the alternatives to meet the established screening criteria. The No Action Alternative has fewer environmental effects than the Proposed Project. However, the No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project and the No Action alternative passed the screening criteria and were retained for detailed analysis in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the Final EA.

- 5. Environmental Consequences.** The potential environmental impacts were identified and evaluated in the Final EA prepared in November 2024. The Final EA has been reviewed by the FAA and FAA determined that the Final EA adequately describes the potential impacts of the Proposed Project.

The Final EA examined the following environmental impact categories: Air Quality; Biological Resources; Climate; Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; Historical, Architectural, and Cultural Resources; 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 (Wetlands, Floodplains, Groundwater, and Surface Water); and Cumulative Impacts.

Section 3.1.2 discloses that the environmental impact categories Coastal Resources; Farmlands; Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f); and Water Resources (Wild and Scenic Rivers) were eliminated from consideration because the Proposed Project and No Action alternatives would **not affect** environmental resource in these impact categories.

Section 4.1.2, Study Years, identifies the environmental consequences impact analysis considered operations in 2024 and 2029. The Final EA notes that the Proposed Project initial proposal projected implementation in 2024, however, unavoidable delays pushed this estimate to Spring of 2025. Changing the study years was considered, though it was determined unwarranted since effects of the Proposed Project are primarily related to the proposed construction activities and the forecast aircraft operations are anticipated to remain constant. Study year 2029 represents the fifth year after implementation of the Proposed Project.

- A. Air Quality.** Section 4.2 of the Final EA provides the air quality analysis that was prepared using FAA *1050.1F Desk Reference* and the *FAA Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook* (Version 3, Update 1) as guidance. The emission inventory for aircraft and ground support equipment (GSE), detailed in Appendix G-1, was developed using the most recent version of FAA’s Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT), Version 3e. Emission factors for employee and visitor roadway emissions were calculated for each

scenario using the California Air Resources Board's Emission Factor 2021 (EMFAC2021) web database.

Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1 provides the existing conditions for the General Study Area (GSA) of the Proposed Project as being within the Great Basin Valleys – Air Basin (Air Basin) which is monitored by the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District (GBUAPCD). The GBUAPCD has not prepared air quality plans for the GSA area, therefore, the GSA is not designated as nonattainment or maintenance for any of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) criteria pollutants. Thus, the Air Basin is in attainment of the NAAQS, therefore there is no State Implementation Plan applicable to the GSA.

Section 4.2.3 presents the construction emission contributions, and Section 4.2.4 addresses the operational emissions for the No Action and Proposed Project alternatives. Tables 4-2 and 4-3 disclose the construction emissions for the No Action and Proposed Project alternatives, respectively. Table 4-4 provides the Proposed Project and No Action alternative operational emission inventories.

During construction of the Proposed Project emission of criteria pollutants would not result in a significant air quality impact because there would be no exceedance of the NAAQS or increase in frequency or severity of any air quality exceedances of the NAAQS in the Air Basin. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not induce an increase in operations at BIH or associated emissions from aircraft, GSE, or off-airport vehicular traffic. Thus, there is no increase in emission of criteria pollutants when comparing operation of the Proposed Project to the No Action alternative in either 2024 or 2029. Approval of the Proposed Project would not result in a significant air quality impact.

B. Biological Resources. Section 4.3 of the Final EA describes the potential impacts to biological resources (including fish, wildlife, and plants). Biological resources within the GSA were identified using an official United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) list of federally listed threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species (federally listed species) and designated critical habitat, as well as information collected during an Action Area field survey conducted on November 1, 2022. The USFWS IPaC list and the Action Area field survey were used to prepare the Biological Assessment (BA) contained in Appendix H of the Final EA.

Section 4.3.3.2 reports that USFWS IPaC list identified six federally listed threatened or endangered species with the potential to occur, and one candidate species within the Action Area². No federally designated critical habitat is located within one mile of the Action Area or GSA. Under the Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the FAA evaluated the information in the BA and determined the Proposed Project will have **no effect** on federally listed species or designated critical habitat.

The BA also addressed migratory birds of concern that were identified in the USFWS IPaC list. Sixteen bird species that are protected under the *Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918* (16 U.S.C. §§ 703-711) were evaluated in the BA. The FAA considered the information in context of the Proposed Project and the operations at BIH and determined that no bird populations or migratory patterns would be affected by the Proposed Project.

² USFWS defines Action Area as “all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action: see <https://www.fws.gov/media/section-7-consultation-technical-assistance-glossary-terms#:~:text=Action%20area%20means%20all%20areas,area%20involved%20in%20the%20action.>

Section 4.3.4 of the Final EA further summarizes that no state-listed species or associated habitat would be affected by the Proposed Project.

No significant impacts to biological resources would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project.

- C. Climate.** Section 4.4.2 of the Final EA states that there are no established significance thresholds for climate and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. FAA Order 1050.1F has not identified specific factors to consider in making a significance determination for GHG emissions, especially as it may be applied to a particular project. The detailed Climate analysis is provided in Appendix G of the Final EA.

Table 4-7 of the Final EA, *Proposed Project – Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, discloses the estimated GHG emissions would result in a temporary increase of 1,067 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}). Tables 4-6 and 4-8 disclose the MTCO_{2e} for operational years 2024 and 2029 for the No Action and Proposed Project alternatives, respectively. Since there is no change in the number of aircraft operations between the No Action and Proposed Project alternatives, the estimates emissions for 2024 and 2029 are the same for both alternatives.

Section 4.4.4 of the Final EA indicates that the social cost of the GHGs emitted during the Proposed Project construction would total \$122,425.42 when quantified using 2020 United States government rates for individual GHGs. It was estimated that the No Action alternative would result in \$45.53 of social costs. Therefore, it was estimated that the Proposed Project would result in an extra \$122,379.89 in social costs compared to the No Action alternative. The minimal GHGs emissions resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project alternative are not projected to disproportionately affect the State of California's GHG emissions targets. Therefore, the Proposed Project alternative would not result in a significant climate impact.

- D. Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste.** Section 3.5 of the Final EA provides the existing conditions within the GSA. There is one Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) site within the GSA, south of Poleta Road, and no National Priority List sites within the GSA.

Chapter 4, Section 4.5.3, *2024 and 2029 Impacts*, of the Final EA, identifies that the No Action alternative would continue to accommodate aircraft activity with a displaced threshold therefore no ground disturbance activities, such as cut and fill, would occur.

The evaluation of the Proposed Project alternative in Section 4.5.3.2, indicates that the identified RCRA site is not within the area to be cut, filled, or graded with the Proposed Project. The Proposed project would not result in expansion of the operations at BIH, therefore a direct increase in fuel use, maintenance activity, or increase in the volume of solid waste generated at the Airport. Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in some construction waste such as vegetation debris, and old fencing materials. Sufficient capacity exists, 3.3 million cubic yards, at the Bishop-Sunland Landfill for disposal of suitable material. During construction all materials will be handled in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to hazardous materials, pollution prevention, and solid waste.

E. Historic, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources. As documented in Section 3.6.3 of the Final EA, under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the FAA established an Area of Potential Effect (APE) pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(a). The APE depicted in Figure 3-4, includes Runway 12/30 with a 500-foot buffer. A records search was performed at the Eastern Information Center of the California Historic Resources Information System and a site survey was conducted and a cultural resource report was prepared. Final EA Section 4.6.2 identifies that the FAA initiated government-to-government Tribal consultations in January 2024 and that no responses were received. Based upon the results of the records search and survey of the APE, the FAA determined that the Proposed Project would not alter, directly or indirectly, any of the resources within or intersected by the APE. The FAA submitted its finding of *no adverse effect on historic properties* to the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on May 20, 2024. On July 25, 2024, the California SHPO indicated that the APE was sufficient to account for the direct and indirect effects to historic properties and concurred with FAA's finding that the proposed undertaking would not adversely affect historic properties. Copies of the NHPA Section 106 consultation letters and California SHPO response are included in Appendix E of the Final EA.

The No Action alternative would result in no ground disturbing activity therefore, no impacts to cultural resources would occur.

Section 4.6.4.2 of the Final EA is based upon the results of the NHPA, Section 106 consultation with the FAA, and California SHPO concurrence that the Proposed Project would result in *no adverse effect to historic properties*. Although there is a low potential for occurrences of cultural resources within the APE, a cultural resource monitoring plan will be developed, and cultural awareness training will be conducted for all personnel involved in construction of the Proposed Project. Inclusion of tribal monitoring during ground disturbing activities is encouraged as an avoidance – conservation measure. Section 4.6.5, of the Final EA concludes that no significant impact to Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project alternative.

F. Land Use. Chapter 3, Section 3.7 identifies the applicable general plans and zoning ordinance of Inyo County and the LADWP, *Owens Valley Land Management Plan* (OVLMP). The Airport occupies land owned by LADWP, Inyo County leases the land and was granted easements in 1929 and 2010 protecting the land for airport use. A prior 34-acre open pit aggregate mine is located immediately north of the airfield. In December 2021 a portion of the area was redesignated to Public Facilities and rezoned to Public (P). Section 3.7.3 of the Final EA identifies that the reclamation plan is satisfied, and the lease associated with the property terminated with the closure of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 permit.

Section 4.7.3.2 details the consistency of the Proposed Project with the surrounding land uses designations as a Public Service Facilities (PF) and Light Industrial (LI) as well as the OVLMP. Much of the clearing and grading required and the relocation of the fence, would occur on lands designated as Agriculture (A) or Natural Resources (NR). The Inyo County General Plan allows for public and quasi-public use on lands with the A designation. Land with the NR designation is intended to remain open in character the clearing, grading and installation of the proposed fence in a 9-4 acre portion of the land was determined consistent as it would otherwise be left open and unimproved. Relocation of the patrol road is consistent with the existing dirt roads in the area surrounding BIH.

Section 4.7.4 of the Final EA references the Inyo County commitment to maintain land use consistency for airport operations as required by 49 U.S.C. § 47106(a)(10), a copy of the letter is provided in Appendix E-5. Further, Section 4.7.4 of the Final EA identifies that the Proposed Project presents no conflict with existing zoning and is permissible with the Inyo County Code with planning commission approval. No significant land use impact would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project alternative.

G. Natural Resources and Energy Supply. Section 4.8 of the Final EA addresses Natural Resources and Energy Supply. Section 4.8.3.1 indicates that the No Action alternative would continue operations of Runway 12/30 with declared distances. It is anticipated that relocation of the sponsor owned Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) would be necessary which would require minor ground disturbance and minimal use of energy and natural resources. Section 4.8.3.2 estimates that the Proposed Project result in creating RSAs at the ends of Runway 12/30 that meet current FAA Airport Design standards. The primary resources that would be utilized during construction of the RSAs are water and fill material (clean dirt or rock). Water requirements during construction activities will be imported from the City of Bishop. Approximately 11,300 cubic yards of clean fill material will be necessary and expected to be supplied by on-site material. Section 4.8.4 of the Final EA summarizes that the increase in energy demand would be temporary and would not exceed existing or future energy supply. Water, to be purchased from the City of Bishop, is of sufficient quantity to meet the temporary need. Fill material for construction of the RSA would be taken from on-site and is within regional supply. No significant impact to natural resources or energy supplies are anticipated with construction of the Proposed Project.

H. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use. Section 4.9 of the Final EA describes anticipated noise impacts resulting from the Proposed Project and the No Action alternatives. The noise analysis was conducted using FAA's AEDT 3e and considered FAA approved Aviation Activity Forecasts provided in Appendix D. The methodology for the noise analysis is discussed in Section 4.9.1. and the *Noise Analysis Technical Report* is provided in Appendix J. The Proposed Project alternative is intended to enhance the safety of Runway 12/30 and would not increase aviation operations, therefore the forecast activity levels for the Proposed Project and No Action alternatives are the same. Table 4-9 provides the *Aircraft Operations Summary* for the years 2022, 2024, and 2029.

Section 4.9.3 of the Final EA discusses the potential impacts associated with the No Action alternative and Proposed Project alternatives in 2024 and 2029. Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)³ contours were prepared. The No Action alternative CNEL contour is depicted in Figure 4-2. The Proposed Project CNEL contour is depicted in Figure 4-4. The CNEL contours primarily remain within Airport property. Table 4-10, *Noise Sensitive Uses and Population within the CNEL 65 dB and Higher Contours Proposed Project and No Action Alternatives - 2024 and 2029*, indicates that there are no sensitive land uses or populations within the CNEL 65 decibel (dB) contour. No noise and noise-compatible land use impacts would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project.

³ The use of CNEL instead of the Day Night Level (DNL) for airport noise in California is described in paragraph 9(n) of FAA Order 5050.4B.

I. Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risk are discussed in Section 4.10 of the Final EA.

The Socioeconomic Impacts analysis is presented in Section 4.10.1 of the Final EA. The No Action alternative would continue to provide direct and indirect economic benefit to the community. The Proposed Project would include physical development in uninhabited areas that would result in no disruption or division of any local community. Temporary growth in employment could occur during construction of the RSA for Runway 12/30. No community relocation or disruption would occur with the Proposed Project. A temporary increase in vehicle traffic on the surrounding surface roads is anticipated during the construction period which is estimated to take approximately three-months. Haul routes will be established to avoid populated areas and local roads to the extent feasible.

There are no established thresholds of significance for Socioeconomic Impacts. When considering the factors identified in Exhibit 4-1 of FAA Order 1050.1F, the temporary conditions that would occur during a short-term construction period would not result in a significant Socioeconomic Impact.

The Environmental Justice analysis is in Section 4.10.2. Two Census block groups have been identified as communities with environmental justice concerns. Census block group 60270001001 and 60270004003 include low-income population percentages of 19% and 17% which exceed that of Inyo County at 11%. Census block 60270001001 also includes a 52% minority population which exceeds Inyo County’s 40%. No migrant housing was identified in the GSA.

No Environmental Justice impacts would occur with the No Action alternative. Although there are two Census block communities with environmental justice concerns no disproportionate and adverse human health or environmental effects to the identified communities would occur. The Proposed Project would not alter the physical environment in a manner that would uniquely affect any members of the identified communities with environmental justice concerns.

Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks is addressed in Section 4.10.3 of the Final EA. Chapter 3, Section 3.10.3.3, no children’s schools, child daycare facilities, or other facilities, such as public parks, where children congregate are located within the GSA. The Air Quality analysis in Section 4.2 and the Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use analysis in Section 4.9 identified no impacts that might affect the health of children. The Proposed Project would not result in hazards that would lead to a disproportionate health or safety risk to children.

The Final EA, Section 4.10, identified no significant Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks impacts.

J. Visual Effects. Analysis of the Visual Effect environmental consequences in Section 4.11.3.1 of the Final EA identifies that Runway 12/30 would remain non-standard, the sponsor owned Runway 12 PAPI location would be shifted to account for the displaced threshold, and no alteration to the visual character of the surrounding area of the GSA or Airport would occur under the No Action alternative. Section 4.11.3.2 of the Final EA identifies that the Proposed Project would include cutting, filling, and grading portions of the Runway 12/30 RSA. The existing patrol road and airport perimeter fence would be relocated outside of the RSA. No new light sources would be added. Temporary light

during construction activities may be necessary. Due to the distance of the nearest residential development, and surrounding land uses the temporary construction lights would be unlikely to cause excessive light to the surrounding viewshed. No visual effect impacts would occur with approval of the Proposed Project alternative.

- K. Water Resources (Wetlands, Floodplains, Groundwater, and Surface Water).** A delineation of aquatic resources was conducted on November 1, 2022. The field survey was preceded by review of aerial photography, soil maps, topographic maps, precipitation data and Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Flood Hazard Layer Viewer mapping. The analysis included the 500-year floodplain to satisfy the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard requirement.

As documented in Section 4.12.3.1 of the Final EA, the No Action alternative would not include development of a standard RSA, therefore no construction activity that could affect wetlands, floodplains, surface waters, or groundwater would occur. The Proposed Project alternative is analyzed in Section 4.12.3.2 of the Final EA. Wetlands delineated in the areas beyond the Runway 12 and 30 ends would not be impacted with the RSA improvement project. Appendix K, to the Final EA, provides the wetland delineation. The relocated patrol road segment and perimeter fence segments will be designed to avoid the existing wetlands. No impact to wetlands is anticipated. Approximately 0.24 acres of the Runway 12 end portion of the RSA would be located within 0.2% - annual-chance (or 500-year) floodplain. Approximately 0.63 acres of the RSA beyond the Runway 30 end is in the 0.2% - annual-chance floodplain. These encroachments into the floodplain are not considered a significant encroachment when considering the significant impact criteria identified in Section 4.12.2 of the Final EA. No natural and beneficial floodplain values would be impacted by the Proposed Project alternative. Surfaces within the RSA would remain permeable, and the Proposed Project would have little to no effect on groundwater recharge. The Proposed Project alternative would not involve any cut, fill, or grading into any existing streambed. Best management practices to prevent sediment and pollutants from entering existing surface waters would be utilized. Transitions to existing grades outside the RSA will be stabilized with erosion control measures. No surface water alteration or fill would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project alternative. No change to impervious surfaces would occur with the Proposed Project alternative, therefore no impact to groundwater supplies would occur. Section 4.12.4 of the Final EA summarizes that the Proposed Project is not likely to result in water resource impacts within or surrounding the GSA, and that no significant impact to water resources would occur.

- L. Cumulative Impacts.** Section 3.13 of the Final EA identifies the Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions considered in the Cumulative Impacts analysis of Section 4.13 of the Final EA. The evaluation considered Air Quality, Biological Resources; Climate; Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; Historical Architectural, 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; and Water Resources (Wetlands, Floodplains, Surface Waters and Groundwater) environmental impact categories. No significant cumulative impacts were identified in the Final EA.

6. Environmentally Preferred Alternative and FAA Preferred Alternative

In connection with its decision to approve the proposed ALP revisions, the FAA considered the environmental impacts from the Proposed Project and the No Action alternatives. The FAA

determined that all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the Proposed Project have been adopted and there would be no significant environmental impacts from the Proposed Runway 12/30 Safety Area Improvement Project at BIH, and the project would not jeopardize the safe and efficient operations at the Airport. The No Action alternative has fewer environmental effects than the Proposed Project alternative, and thus would be the environmentally preferable alternative. However, the No Action alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the proposed project.

Thus, the FAA's preferred alternative is the Proposed Project, as defined in the Final EA and this FONSI and ROD. FAA selected this alternative because it meets the Purpose and Need of the proposed project and would result in no significant adverse environmental effects.

7. Public Participation.

The County conducted early outreach, on January 13, 2023, regarding preparation of the EA and to identify any issues or concerns about the proposed Runway 12/30 Safety Improvement Project. A copy of the outreach letter and the list of federal, state, Local, and Tribal contacts are provided in Appendix E, items E-1 and E-2, respectively. The public was encouraged to review and comment on the Draft EA, which was released for public review on April 11, 2024. The County published a Notice of Availability of the Draft EA in the Inyo Register and on the County's website at <https://www.inyocounty.us/services/public-works>. Print copies of the Draft EA were also available at the Bishop Airport, 703 Airport Road, Bishop, California. The newspaper Proof of Publication is included in Appendix F of the Final EA. A Public Workshop was held at the Bishop Airport to discuss the Proposed Project, the analyses in the Draft EA and answer questions for the public on May 14, 2024. No members of the public attended the workshop or submitted comments. The 30-day public review comment period ended on May 21, 2024. No comments were received on the Draft EA.

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 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.

9. 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 Project. The proposed unconditional approval of the portion of the Bishop Airport ALP that depicts the proposed RSA improvements to Runway 12/30 at Bishop Airport would not involve any environmental impacts, that would exceed the 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 that the Proposed Project meets the purpose and need for the proposed action, would not cause any significant environmental impacts, and is the most reasonable, feasible and prudent alternative. The FAA has decided to approve the Proposed Project as described in Section 3 of this FONSI and ROD.

10. Agency Findings.

The FAA makes the following determination for this project based on information and analysis set forth in the Final EA and other portions of the administrative record.

- a. **FAA finds, the proposed project is reasonably consistent with existing plans of public agencies for development of the area [49 U.S.C. § 47106(a)].** The Proposed Project is consistent with the plans, goals and policies for the area, including the County of Inyo General Plan. The Proposed Project is also consistent with the applicable regulations and policies of federal, State and local agencies.
- b. **FAA finds the proposed project is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense [49 U.S.C. § 44502(b)].**
- c. **Independent and Objective Evaluation:** As required by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR § 1506.5) the FAA has independently and objectively evaluated this Proposed Project. As described in the Final EA, the Proposed Project and the No Action alternatives were studied extensively to determine the potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures for those impacts. The FAA provided input, advice, and expertise throughout the analysis, along with administrative and legal review of the project.
- d. **Biological Resources.** The FAA determined that the Proposed Project would have *no effect* on federally-listed species or critical habitat.
- e. **Historic, Archaeological, Architectural and Cultural Resources.** The FAA finds the proposed project will not adversely affect any historic properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The FAA conducted government to government consultation with Indian Tribes and consultation with the California SHPO pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA, as amended.
- f. **Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, and Department of Transportation Order 5610.2, Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations:** The Proposed Project would not cause significant impacts; therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts to human health or environmental impacts on minority or low-income populations.
- g. **Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks:** The FAA has determined there would be no environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children by implementing the Proposed Project.
- h. As necessary, before construction begins, the FAA will review a Construction Safety and Phasing Plan to maintain aviation and airfield safety during construction pursuant to FAA AC 150/5370-2F, Operational Safety on Airports During Construction, [14 CFR Part 139 (49 U.S.C. §44706)].

- i. As necessary, after construction is completed, FAA review of changes to the airport's certification manual following completion of construction of the proposed project pursuant to [14 C.F.R. Part 139]
- j. As necessary, after construction is completed, FAA review of appropriate amendments to air carrier operations specifications pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 44705.

11. Decision and Orders.

Based on the information in this FONSI/ROD and supported by detailed discussion in the Final EA, the FAA has selected the Proposed Project at the FAA's Preferred Alternative. The FAA must select one of the following choices:

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

Approval signifies that applicable federal requirements relating to the proposed airport development and planning have been met. Approval permits Inyo County to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Project. Disapproval would prevent Inyo County from implementing the Proposed Project at BIH.

Under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, I find that the Proposed Project is reasonably supported. I, therefore, direct that action be taken to carry out the agency actions discussed more fully in Section 3 of this FONSI/ROD.

- Unconditional approval of the portion of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts the standard RSA for Runway 12/30 subject to FAA approval pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 47107(a)(16).
- Determination under 49 U.S.C. §§ 47106 and 47107 that are associated with the eligibility of the Proposed Project for federal funding under the AIP program; 49 U.S.C. § 40117, as implemented by 14 CFR § 158.25 to use to use PFCs collected at the Airport to assist with construction of eligible elements of the Proposed Project as shown of the ALP; and potential funding through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021, (Public Law 117-58).

This order is issued under applicable statutory authorities, including 49 USC §§ 40101(d), 40103(b), 40113(a), 44701, and 44706.

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 as set forth in 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 otherwise include any condition requiring consultation pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for this action.

APPROVED:

Cathryn Cason
Manager, Los Angeles Airports District Office
Western-Pacific Region, LAX-600

Date

DISAPPROVED:

Cathryn Cason
Manager, Los Angeles Airports District Office
Western-Pacific Region, LAX-600

Date

RIGHT OF APPEAL

This FONSI/ROD constitutes a final order of the FAA Administrator and is subject to exclusive judicial review under 49 U.S.C. § 46110 by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person contesting the decision resides or has its principal place of business. Any party having substantial interest in this order may apply for review of the decision by filing a petition for review in the appropriate U.S. Court of Appeals no later than 60 days after the order is issued in accordance with the provisions of 49 U.S.C. § 46110.