U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/
RECORD OF DECISION

Runway 4-22 and Runway 15-33 Runway Safety Area Enhancements

Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport
Arlington County, Virginia

Introduction: This document serves as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD) for the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) proposed federal actions as planned by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (the Authority), operator of the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport (DCA). The Authority’s purposed actions at DCA include: enhancements to the Runway 4-22 and Runway 15-33 Runway Safety Areas, (RSA), by shifting each runway and installing Engineered Material Arresting System (EMAS) on the approach ends of Runway 22, Runway 15, and Runway 33, reconstructing new taxiway connectors, placing up to 5.3 acres of fill in the Potomac River as support for Runway 33 RSA, and additional associated projects as listed under the Proposed Project section below and in Section II, 2.3 of the Final Environmental Assessment (EA). The complete EA is incorporated herein by reference.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before being able to take the federal action on any of the activities outlined in Section 2. In accordance with Title 40, Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) § 1501.3 of the President’s Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (CEQ), the implementing federal regulations for the NEPA of 1969, the FAA supervised preparation of an EA, dated March 2012. The EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA as defined in FAA Orders 5050.4B, Airport Environmental Handbook and 1050.1E, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures.

This FONSI/ROD is based on the March 2012 Final EA and its underlying supporting documentation, and it describes the purpose and need of the project, actions to be taken by the FAA, alternatives examined, and environmental effects of the preferred alternative, committed mitigation and the FAA’s decision. The nature and extent of the FAA’s decision is clearly stated in this FONSI/ROD and it is the Agency’s final decision document.

Proposed Project: The following is a listing of the major components of the Proposed Project.

Proposed Actions for Runway 4-22 include:

• Extending the Runway 4 end 460 feet southwest.
• Relocating Runway 4 landing threshold 260 feet southwest.
• Increasing the runway length available for takeoffs from Runway 4 from 4,911 feet to 5,000 feet.
• Reducing the runway length available for landing on Runway 4 from 4,911 feet to 4,800 feet.
• Reducing the runway length available for takeoffs from and landing on Runway 22 from 4,911 feet to 4,400 feet by designating declared distances
• Extending Taxiway B to the relocated Runway 4 end.
• Installing an Engineered Material Arresting System (EMAS), 170 feet wide by 336 feet long, at the existing Runway 22 end, capable of stopping the critical design aircraft (Airbus A 319) that overruns Runway 4 and exits the runway at speeds up to 70 knots.
• Relocating the Runway 22 end 371 feet southwest.
• Constructing a new taxiway connector to the relocated Runway 22 end.

**Proposed Actions for Runway 15-33**

• Shifting Runway 15-33 270 feet southeast.
• Installing EMAS, 170 wide and 353 feet long, at the relocated Runway 15 end, capable of stopping the critical design aircraft (Airbus A 319) that overruns Runway 33 and exits the runway at speeds up to 70 knots.
• Installing EMAS, 170 wide and 353 feet long, at the relocated Runway 33 end, capable of stopping the critical design aircraft (Embraer EMB-145) that overruns Runway 15 and exits the runway at speeds up to 40 knots.
• Constructing new taxiway connectors to the relocated runway ends.
• Placing up to 5.3 acres of fill in the Potomac River to support the Runway 15/33 RSA.
• Acquiring approximately 5.3 acres of land in the Potomac River from the National Park Service U.S. Department of the Interior to accommodate the placement of the proposed fill in the Potomac River

**Approach Aids**

• Relocating the Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) for Runway 15 to accommodate the relocation of the Runway 15 landing threshold.
• Either replacing existing Visual Approach Slope Indicators (VASIs) with PAPIs and reactivating the PAPI for Runway 4 or retaining either or both VASIs on Runway 22 and 33 and relocating them to accommodate the relocated landing threshold(s).
• Relocate the FAA’s Runway End Identifier Lights (REILs) at the four runway ends.

**Other Elements**

• Rerouting existing service roads in the vicinity of the RSA enhancements at Runway ends 4, 15, and 33.
• Grading and stabilizing soil in the RSA.
Agency Actions: The FAA actions involved in the implementation of the Proposed Project include the following:

1. Conditional approval of the updated ALP for Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, depicting the proposed airfield pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b), §44718, and § 47107(a)(16), and 14 CFR Parts 77 and 157;
2. Determination under 49 U.S.C. § 47107 relating to the eligibility of the Proposed Project for Federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP);
3. Determination under 49 U.S.C. §§ 40101(d)(1) and 47105(b)(3) whether the Proposed Project meets applicable design and engineering standards set forth in FAA Advisory Circulars;
4. Determination under 49 U.S.C. § 44502(b) that the Proposed Project is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense;
5. The relocation of existing visual and electronic NAVAIDS to meet the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 40103 (b)(1), to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace;
6. The relocation of visual and electronic NAVAIDS to meet the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 44502 (a)(1)(A), to establish and improve air navigational facilities wherever necessary;
7. Determination that the Proposed Project would meet the federal Clean Air Act requirements;
8. Continued close coordination with the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and appropriate FAA program offices, as required, for safety during construction pursuant to 14 C.F.R. Part 139 under 49 U.S.C. §44706;
9. Approval of appropriate amendments to the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Airport Certification Manual (ACM), as required, pursuant to 14 CFR Part 13; and
10. Determination of the effects on safe and efficient use of airspace, including a review of changes to air traffic procedures for consistency with the Potomac Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) Environmental Impact Statement, including the establishment of flight procedure modifications pursuant to 14 CFR Part 95, IFR Altitudes.

Project Purpose and Need (Section II of the EA): The purpose of the proposed improvements is to meet FAA design standards through compliance with FAA Order 5200.8, Runway Safety Area Program (RSAP) and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13, Airport Design. The FAA has determined that the RSAs for departures from Runways 4, 22, 15 and 33 do not meet the 1,000 feet FAA design standard. As a Federally obligated airport certificated under 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 139, Certification of Airports, the RSAs at DCA are required by FAA Order 5200.8, Runway Safety Area Program, and the 2006 U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Appropriations Act (HR 3058.6), to comply with FAA regulatory requirements by Federal Fiscal Year 2015.
Implementing the Proposed Project would enable the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority to bring the Runway 4-22 and Runway 15-33 RSAs at DCA into compliance with FAA Order 5200.8 and FAA AC 150/5300-13 for ARC C-III aircraft.

**Reasonable Alternatives Considered (Section III of the EA).** As described in detail in Section III of the Final EA, various alternatives were developed and screened for ability to meet the project purpose and need. Alternatives also had to comply with FAA RSA Design Standards, be financially practical, avoid potentially significant environmental impacts, and not adversely impact current or future operational standards. Relocating or realigning the runways were not considered reasonable because there is insufficient land area available to relocate or realign either runway, at its required length, without affecting the George Washington Memorial Parkway, existing passenger terminal buildings, passenger aircraft aprons, or ancillary Airport facilities.

Alternatives identified in the EA included:
- Three action alternatives for Runway 4-22 (Alternatives 0422-1, 0422-2, and 0422-3)
- Seven action alternatives for Runway 15-33 (Alternatives 1533-1, 1533-2, 1533-3, 1533-4, 1533-5, 1533-6, and 1533-7)
- Alternatives Not Within FAA Jurisdiction
- The No Action alternative

These alternatives are described in detail in Section III, 3.2.2, on Exhibits III-2 and III-3 and Tables III-2 and III-3.

Alternatives not within FAA jurisdiction were dismissed because they would not meet the project purpose and need. The No Action alternative would not meet the project purpose and need, but was carried forward as a baseline for comparison of impacts, pursuant to Council of Environmental Quality regulations and FAA Orders 1050.1E and 5050.4B.

All of the three action alternatives identified for Runway 4-22 would meet the project purpose and need and are financially practical. Alternative 0422-1 was dismissed from further consideration because reductions in available runway length would adversely impact airport operations. Alternative 0422-2 was dismissed because it would have adverse impact on 13.8 acres of riverbed in the Potomac River. Alternative 0422-2 was retained for future study and identified as the preferred alternative for Runway 4-22.

Of the seven action alternatives for Runway 15-33, Alternatives 1533-3, 1533-4, 1533-5, and 1533-6 did not meet the project purpose and need and were dismissed from further consideration. Alternative 1533-1 met the purpose and need, but would have resulted in decreased runway length availability which would have adversely affected operations. It was therefore dismissed from consideration. Alternative 1533-2 also met the purpose and need, but would have resulted in the greatest environmental impacts and was not financially practical. This alternative was also dismissed from further study.
The remaining alternative for Runway 15-33, Alternative 1533-7, met the project purpose and need, minimized potential environmental impacts, was financially practical to construct, and maintained runway length. Alternative 1533-7 was retained for future study and identified as the preferred alternative for Runway 15-33.

**Assessment (Section IV of the EA):** Section IV, *Affected Environment,* of the EA discusses the sounding area and environmental resources that could potentially be affected by the Proposed Project. Past, present, and future actions are also identified to determine any cumulative impacts of these actions. Section V, *Environmental Consequences,* of the EA provides a detailed discussion on any reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences of the Proposed Project as compared to the No Action. The following presents a summary of the study results. Details regarding the analysis and results can be found in Section V of the Final EA released March 2012.

**Aircraft Noise (EA Section V, 5.2):** To determine whether significant changes in noise exposure would result from implementation of the Proposed Project noise contours were developed using FAA’s Integrated Noise Model (INM), Version 7.0b. These contours and modeling results were used to estimate the differences in noise exposure between the Proposed Project and the No Action Alternative. The Proposed Project would shift the noise exposure area slightly southeast off Runway 15-33 and slightly southwest off Runway 4-22 as compared to the No Action. The area exposed to aircraft noise of DNL 75 and higher would remain on the airport or over water. The land area exposed to DNL 65 and higher would be slightly smaller in comparison to the No Action. No noise-sensitive areas exposed to aircraft noise of DNL 65 or higher are expected to experience an increase of DNL 1.5 or more when compared to the No Action. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not result in any significant changes in noise exposure.

**Compatible Land Use (EA Section V, 5.3):** The EA considered potential impacts that could result from changes in elevation of the Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 Obstructions to Navigation approach surfaces and the Obstruction Clearance Surface over the Potomac Yards development due to the relocation of the Runway 4 landing threshold. Minor elevation changes as a result of the Proposed Project will not conflict with applicable land use plans or policies, including plans for residential development. The Proposed Project will not result in any increase in wildlife attractants.

**Air Quality (EA Section V, 5.4):** The region surrounding the airport has been designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as moderate nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone standard and in moderate attainment/maintenance for the 1997 PM2.5 (particulate matter) in the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Arlington County, Virginia, is designated as being in nonattainment of the 8-hour ozone and PM2.5. Arlington County is designated as a moderate attainment/maintenance area for CO and as an attainment area for all other criteria pollutants. An emissions inventory from construction activities was developed using the methodologies outlined in U.S. EPA AP-42, Compensation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors Fourth Edition, Volume II: Mobile Sources and analyzed using the MOBILE6.2 module in the Emissions and Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS) 5.1.1. The emissions
associated with the Proposed Project would not exceed applicable *de minimis* thresholds as documented in the EPA’s general conformity regulations, nor would the emissions be regionally significant.

Similar to aircraft noise, the Proposed Project would have no effect on the number or type of aircraft using the Airport or runway use; would have a negligible effect on average aircraft taxiing times; and would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the NAAQS. Therefore, a general conformity determination is not required for the Proposed Project.

**Water Quality (EA Section V, 5.5):** The Proposed Project is unlikely to have adverse permanent impacts on water quality. The same number and types of aircraft operations will occur under the Proposed Project as compared to the No Action; therefore the amount of contaminants to be controlled will not be increased.

The Proposed Project would be designed and constructed to reduce soil erosion and control potential inputs of chemical nutrients and sediments to the adjacent receiving waters, namely, the Potomac River, Roaches Run, and Four Mile Run. All construction plans and contracts would be prepared in accordance with FAA AC 150/5370-10F, Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports, which includes requirements for temporary air and water pollution, soil erosion, and siltation control. Non-point source water pollution control measures are discussed in Section 5.15.2.2 of the Final EA. In terms of point source water pollution control, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) manages the overall Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program and regulates point-source storm water discharges from the Airport into the Potomac River, Roaches Run, and Four Mile Run. All operational activities at the Airport are managed in accordance with the provisions and requirements of the Airport’s existing NPDES permit. As part of the NPDES permit, the Authority maintains a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes all major Airport tenants as co-permitees at DCA. The proposed additional impervious surface resulting from the Proposed Project would be designed to manage storm water runoff in accordance with the storage and pre- and post-flow requirements of the Virginia Stormwater Management Handbook as well as the guidance in FAA AC 150/5320-5C, Surface Drainage Design (or current version), and the Northern Virginia BMP Handbook. Depending on the ultimate design of the proposed facilities and any subsequent changes to the storm water characteristics or outfalls, a modification to the existing NPDES permit and SWPPP may be required.

The siltation and turbidity of the Potomac River in the vicinity of the RSA enhancements, (Runway 33 end) are not likely to result in long term adverse effects. Modeling of the velocity of the Potomac River predicted slight decreases in average velocity. The riverbed along the downside (south) side of the RSA extension would experience a somewhat higher deposition in the vicinity of the proposed RSA extension, but with decreasing deposition with increasing flow.
Wetland and Waters of the United States (EA Section V, 5.6): The Potomac River is classified as a navigable, tidally influenced Water of the United States. The Proposed Project would require that areas of riverbed which are structurally unsuitable be dredged and replaced with fill material suitable for supporting EMAS for the Runway 33 end and the structure supporting the Runway 15 end. The RSA enhancements for the Runway 33 end would impact the Potomac River (a Water of the United States) by compressing and placing structurally suitable fill material over or replacing unsuitable riverbed material from approximately 5.3 acres of the bottom of the Potomac River. The potential impacts could include: the loss of approximately 3.3 acres of the Potomac River; disturbing submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) in the District of Columbia; changes to the circulation in the Potomac River, thereby causing scour or siltation near the project site; and temporary increases in turbidity during construction.

During the detailed design of the Proposed Project, the Authority will apply for a Section 404 permit and will abide by the terms and accompanying water quality certifications. A Section 10 permit under the Rivers and Harbor Act may also be required.1

Floodplains (EA Section V, 5.7): The Proposed Project could add up to 5.3 acres of new fill beyond the Runway 33 end and will result in approximately 8 acres of new impervious surface to the 65 acres of the 100-year flood plains that currently exist in the project area. Considering the tidal influence and vast expansion of the Potomac River in the area, and the location of the proposed improvements relative to Four Mile Run, the Proposed Project will not present any barriers to floodflow passage. Due to the large drainage basin of the Potomac River, the Proposed Project would have negligible, if not imperceptible, impacts to the lateral extent, depth, or duration of flooding, and would not increase flood risk at the Airport or on adjacent properties upstream or downstream of the Airport.

Coastal Resources (EA Section V, 5.8): There are no coastal barrier resources within the vicinity of the Proposed Project. Coastal resources that would not be affected include dunes management, non-point-source and point-source water quality, shoreline sanitation, air quality, and coastal lands management activities. Up to 5.3 acres of riverbed in the Potomac River would be filled. Significant impacts to coastal resources would not be expected because: (a) the Proposed Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with local, state, and federal guidelines; (b) the Authority would be expected to minimize and mitigate unavoidable impacts, if any; and (c) the Authority would be expected to secure, comply with, and update the applicable stormwater permits and pollution prevention plans. The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality concurred that the Proposed Project would be considered consistent with the Virginia Coastal Resources Management Program.2

1 Theresita Crockett-Augustine, Department of the Army, Norfolk District, Corps of Engineers, “NAO-02979 (National Airport)” letter to Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority, October 23, 2008. Volume II, Appendix J.
Fish, Wildlife, and Plants (EA Section V, 5.9): Because of the location and extent of the proposed improvements, the existing operational use of Airport property, and the transient nature of any species that would possibly use the habitats within or near the project area, no rare, threatened, or endangered species; species of concern; —nor will Species of Greatest Conservation Need be affected by the Proposed Project. There will be no taking or relocation of species. There will be no loss of critical terrestrial or aquatic habitat. Temporary disruption of aquatic habitat will occur during construction, but will not result in significant impacts to species.

Light Emission and Visual Impacts (EA Section v, 5.10): The Airport is within an urban environment with high ambient light emissions. The emissions from the new airfield lighting will not be discernible against the background of existing airfield lighting. The Authority will coordinate with the U.S. Coast Guard to identify any requirements to light the new infill area of the Potomac River at the Runway 33 end to ensure safe river navigation.

Department of Transportation Act of 1966, Section 4(f) and Lands and Water Conservation Funds Section 6 (f) (EA Section V, 5.11): The Airport is bordered to the north and west by publically owned parks, recreation areas, and a wildlife/waterfowl refuge. Public lands are also located east of the Airport, across the Potomac River and there are on-airport historic structures and an archaeological site within the terminal and hangar areas. There are no public lands that were purchased with Section 6 (f) Lands and Water Conservation Funds. The area that will be physically disturbed as a result of the proposed Project does not contain any Section 4 (f) or Section 6 (f) protected resource, therefore the project will not result in a Section 4 (f) use. The Proposed Project will not result in increased aircraft activity or changes in flight patterns or procedures. Any shift in noise or visual effects will be negligible and will not constitute a constructive use of any Section 4 (f) resource.

Historic, Archaeological, Architectural, and Cultural Resources (EA Section V, 5.12): On-Airport historical resources consist of structures and an archaeological site within the terminal and hanger areas. The nearest off-Airport historic resource is the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The entire Airport, including the entire airfield, is located on fill and therefore, has a low potential for intact archaeological resources. There are limited areas of the original shoreline that have not been disturbed and may contain intact archaeological resources, but these areas are outside the limits of potential disturbance for the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project will not result in any adverse noise or visual effects on historic resources. The District of Columbia Historic Preservation Officer and the VA Department of Historic Resources/VA State Historic Preservation Officer have all agreed with the Authority's determination of "No Adverse Effect".3

Natural Resources and Energy Supply (EA Section V, 5.13): The Proposed Project will have only minor increases in energy consumption and will not require the use of any scarce or rare materials.

Hazardous Material, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste (EA Section V, 5.4): There is known contamination in the area referred to as the South Investigation Site. The nature and extent of this contamination is not known. Investigations will be conducted to determine if further remediation is required. During construction any material found to be hazardous will be disposed of in accordance with Federal and State requirements. In-water construction will be conducted in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 permit conditions. Once complete, the Proposed Project will not generate any hazardous material or solid waste.

Construction Impacts (EA Section V, 5.15): There will be temporary impacts to air quality, localized water quality, land and water habitats of common species, noise and possibly hazardous materials. All impacts associated with construction of the Proposed Project will be below significant thresholds. Adherence to any permit requirements will minimize or mitigate for any potential construction impacts.

Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Health and Safety Risks (EA Section V, 5.16): Consistent with FAA Order 1050.1E, an analysis of Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Health and Safety Risks is triggered when the potential for significant impacts exist, due to extensive relocation, fragmentation of neighborhood and communities, or disproportionately high adverse impacts on low-income or minority communities, or creates health or safety risks to children. The area of potential disturbance is located entirely within Airport property limits, including the area in the Potomac River in which the Runway 33 RSA enhancements would be constructed therefore; the Proposed Project will not require the relocation of residents or business. The Proposed Project will not result in any potential changes to transportation, planned development or employment. In addition, there are no significant impacts to noise, changes to traffic patterns, water quality or use, or any other resource that may adversely affect communities. Because there are no significant natural or social impacts, no disproportionate impacts on low-income or minority populations will occur. For the same reasons, the Proposed Project will not create any children’s health or safety risks.

Secondary (Induced) Impacts (EA Section V, 5.17): The Proposed Project will not affect the surrounding community by causing shifts of or growth in population, increased public service demands, or changed business or economic activity.

Cumulative Impacts (EA Section V, 5.18): Past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects at the airport and surrounding community were considered and evaluated to see if the collective impacts from these projects or actions would result in significant impacts to any resource category. Actions considered included those purposed or implemented by the Authority as well as other agencies or entities. Each of these actions underwent, or will undergo, a separate environmental analysis to determine potential impacts and
mitigation. Actions that had potential, or realized, environmental impacts were considered as part of this EA. These actions included; the installation of an in-line baggage screening system at the airport, the relocation of the North Boat House, and Runway 1-19 RSA enhancements. Even when impacts to resources were considered collectively, the Proposed Project will not result in any significant cumulative environmental impacts.

Public Participation (EA Section VII): Opportunities for comment and consultation were provided during both project scoping and analysis development of the EA. Notice of a February 17, 2010 public information workshop to explain the scoping process, FAA’s RSA Program, the environmental resources that may be affected by the Proposed Project, and the EA timeframe was advertised in The Washington Post on January 13 and 14, 2010. An agency scoping meeting was conducted on February 18, 2010. The public and relevant agencies were offered an opportunity to provide comments at the meetings and/or by mail or email. Copies of all public and agency scoping comments are provided in Volume II, Appendix B of the EA.

A notice of public availability and workshop for the Draft EA was published in The Washington Post on December 1 and 2, 2010. The public workshop was held on January 5, 2010. The EA was made available at four public locations and on the Authority’s website. Copies of the Draft EA were provided directly to all relevant Federal, State and local agencies. The public and relevant agencies were offered an opportunity to provide comments at the meetings and/or by mail or email. The review and comment period initially ran from December 3, 2010 through January 21, 2010. In response to comments received from the City of Alexandria, Potomac Yard Development LLC and MRP Realty, and the review and comment period was extended to March 7, 2010. Notice of the extension was advertised in The Washington Post on February 10, 2011 and on the Authority’s website. All comments received and the responses to these comments are included in Volume II, Appendix J of the Final EA.

Mitigation Measures (EA Section VI): The FAA will require that the Authority implement the following mitigation measures should it decide to pursue the Propose Project.

1. Develop and implement erosion and sediment control measures in accordance with the latest version of the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook and Virginia Stormwater Management Laws and Regulations.
2. Abide by the conditions of the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality’s concurrence with the Coastal Consistency Certification, including completion of a Water Quality Impact Assessment.
3. Design and construct the project in accordance with the general performance standards of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act.
4. Use best management practices to reduce air quality pollution during construction.
5. Dispose of all material excavated from within the South Investigation Site (SIS) off airport and test any material prior to disposal and dispose of any hazardous material in accordance with state and federal requirements.

6. Coordinate with the U.S. Coast Guard regarding any lighting requirements.

7. Obtain a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit and a Section 10 permit under the Rivers and Harbors Act and submit a Joint Permit Application to the Virginia Marine Resource Commission for review.

8. Abide by all permit terms, including mitigation for the impacts on submerged aquatic vegetation.

**Decision and Order:** The FAA identified Alternatives 0422-2 (for Runway 4-22 Safety Area) and 1533-7 (for Runway 15-33 Safety Area) as the FAA’s preferred alternative. FAA must now 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 would signify that applicable federal requirements relating to airport development and planning have been met and would permit the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority to proceed with the proposed development and possibly receive federal funding. In addition, Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority is required to comply with FAA grant assurances upon acceptance of a grant offer. If FAA did not approve these agency actions the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority would be prohibited from proceeding with implementation of the Proposed Project.

**Decision:** I have carefully considered the FAA’s goals and objectives in relation to the various aeronautical aspects of the Proposed Project at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport as discussed in the March 2012 Final EA. The review included: the purpose and need that this project would serve; the alternative means of achieving the purpose and need for the project; the environmental impacts of the alternatives discussed herein; and the mitigation that will be required to preserve and enhance the human environment.

Under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, I find that the project is reasonably supported. I therefore direct that action be taken to carry out the following agency actions discussed more fully in Section 2 of this FONSI/ROD, including:

1. Conditional approval of the ALP pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b) and § 47107(a)(16), and determination of effects upon the safe and efficient utilization of navigable airspace pursuant to 14 CFR Parts 77 and 157 and 49 U.S.C. §44718;

2. Determination under 49 U.S.C. §§ 40101(d)(1) and 47105(b)(3) as to whether the Proposed Project meets applicable design and engineering standards set forth in FAA Advisory Circulars;
3. Determination under 49 U.S.C. § 47107 relating to the eligibility of the Proposed Project for Federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP);

4. Determination under 49 U.S.C. § 44502(b) that the airport development is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense;

5. Maintain continued close coordination with the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and appropriate FAA program offices, as required, for safety during construction. (14 C.F.R. Part 139) (49 U.S.C. §44706);


7. The relocation of existing visual and electronic NAVAIDS to meet the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 40103 (b)(1), to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace;

8. The relocation of visual and electronic NAVAIDS to meet the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 44502 (a)(1)(A), to establish and improve air navigational facilities wherever necessary; and

9. A determination of the effects on safe and efficient use of airspace, including a review of changes to air traffic procedures for consistency with the Potomac Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) Environmental Impact Statement, including the establishment of flight procedure modifications pursuant to 14 CFR Part 95, IFR Altitudes.

I have carefully and thoroughly considered the facts contained in the attached EA. Based on that information, I find 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). I also find the proposed Federal action, with the required mitigation referenced above, will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any condition requiring any consultation pursuant to Section 102 (2)(C) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an EIS for this action.

Approved:  

\[\text{Signature}\]  
Carmine Gallo  
Regional Administrator  
Eastern Region  

4/2/12  
Date
Right of Appeal

This decision, including any subsequent actions approving a grant of Federal funds to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority in Washington D.C., is taken pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 47101 et seq., and constitutes an order of the Administrator which is subject to review by the U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals for the District of Columbia, or U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeal for the circuit in which the person contesting the decision lives or has a principal place of business in accordance with the provisions of Section 1006 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 49 U.S.C. Section 46110.