

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

Washington Dulles International Airport  
Dulles, Loudoun County, Virginia

International Arrivals Building Expansion

1. **Introduction.** This document is a Finding of No Significant Impact on the environment as a result of a development proposal by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA), owner and operator of Washington Dulles International Airport (IAD). MWAA's proposed project involves expansion of the International Arrivals Building at IAD. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) before being able to take the federal action of further processing of an application for Federal assistance in funding various airport development and for approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts the proposed airport development projects. Approval of the ALP is authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (Public Laws 97-248 and 100-223).
2. **Project Purpose and Need.** The purpose of the proposed project is to address current and future deficiencies, and to improve its ability to handle a large share of the airport's international market. When the International Arrivals Building (IAB) was opened in 1991, it had a peak-hour capacity of approximately 2,000 passengers per hour. Changes in passport control procedures in recent years, among other factors, have reduced the peak-hour capacity to 1,000 passengers per hour. By 2011, demand is expected to increase to 1,900 passengers per peak hour.
3. **Proposed Project.** The following is a listing of the various components of the proposed project:
  - Expansion of existing facility from 190,000 to 370,000 square feet.
  - Demolish the existing Shop 1 Annex (Building 2409).
4. **Reasonable Alternatives Considered.** As described in the Environmental Assessment (EA), the alternative courses of action evaluated include: (1) Relocating the IAB on the east side of the Terminal in an expanded form, (2) Relocating the IAB to between Concourse A/B and the Terminal in an expanded form, (3) Relocating the IAB to a below ground facility with a sterile/secure tunnel allowing passengers to move from the airside to the facility on the landside, (4) Relocating the IAB northwest of the Terminal along the cargo building line, (5) No Action and (6) Proposed Action – Expansion of the existing IAB. Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4 were rejected from further coordination due to MWAA's substantial investment in the existing facility and the high costs of replacement.
5. **Assessment.** The attached EA addresses the effect of the proposed project on the quality of the human and natural environment, and is made a part of this finding. The following impact analysis highlights the more thorough analysis presented in the Final EA prepared in May 2007.

**Air Quality:** IAD is located in Loudoun County, an area designated as non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter as described in Section 5 of the EA. The projected emissions from the proposed project were analyzed and found to be below *de minimis* levels specified in 40 CFR Part 91.153 pursuant to Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. These emissions are summarized on page 8 of the EA and are clearly below the *de minimis* levels specified in the federal regulation and are not regionally significant. Therefore, based on this information, the FAA has determined that the proposed project is presumed to conform to the State Implementation Plan for the state of Virginia.

**Historical, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources:** The proposed project requires the demolition of the existing Shop 1 Annex, and modifications to the west doors of the Shop 1 Building. These buildings are contributing elements of the National Register eligible Dulles Airport Historic District. These changes will have an adverse effect on the Dulles Airport Historic District. The IAB is not considered a historic property, however; the proposed project will occur in the center of the historic district, directly adjacent to the Main Terminal. The potential impact of the proposed exterior design on the historic architectural character of the Main Terminal and surrounding historic district will be considered, thereby, mitigating potential adverse effect of the changes to the IAB proper. A Memorandum of Agreement between MWAA and the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer was executed on May 8, 2007 to resolve the project's adverse effects on historic properties (Appendix D of EA).

6. **Public Participation.** The Draft EA was made available to the public from March 30, 2007 to April 30, 2007. Comments received on the Draft EA were responded to in the Final EA (Appendix E).

7. **Mitigation Measures.** The FAA will require that MWAA implement the following mitigation measures, if they decide to pursue the proposed project:

1. The proposed project will have an adverse effect on historic resources, the Shop 1 Annex Building and the Shop 1 Building. MWAA shall ensure stipulations set in the executed Memorandum of Agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officer are met.
2. A Stormwater Management Plan and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, utilizing Best Management Practices will be developed to control impacts to water quality due to erosion and sedimentation during the project construction.
3. Construction contract provisions shall contain the provisions of FAA AC 150/5370-10A, *Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports* item P-156, temporary air, water pollution, soil erosion and siltation control and FAA AC 150/5320-5B, *Airport Drainage*. All necessary permits for construction of the proposed project shall be obtained prior to construction.

8. **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). 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:**

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Terry J. Page, Manager  
 Washington Airports District Office

5/9/07  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

**DISAPPROVED:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Terry J. Page, Manager  
 Washington Airports District Office

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date