

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Aviation Administration

Northwest Mountain Region

Finding of No Significant Impact/
Record of Decision

For the Southern Infrastructure Improvement Projects at
the Salt Lake City International Airport

Salt Lake City, Utah

EAXX-021-12-ARP-1782201743

May 2026

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	Background (Section 1.2 of the FEA)	3
III.	Proposed Action (Section 1.3 of the FEA)	3
IV.	Purpose and Need (Section 1.4 of the FEA)	4
V.	Agency Actions and Approvals (Section 1.4 of the FEA)	5
VI.	Alternatives (Chapter 2 of the FEA).....	5
VII.	Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (Chapter 3 of the FEA).....	5
A.	Aviation Emissions and Air Quality (Section 3.3 of the FEA)	6
B.	Biological Resources (Section 3.4 of the FEA).....	6
C.	Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste (Section 3.5 of the FEA)	7
D.	Historical, Architectural, Archeological and Cultural Resources (Section 3.6 of the FEA)	7
E.	Land Use (Section 3.7 of the FEA).....	7
F.	Natural Resources and Energy Supplies (Section 3.8 of the FEA).....	7
G.	Socioeconomic and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks (Section 3.9 of the FEA)	8
H.	Visual Effects (Section 3.10 of the FEA)	8
I.	Water Resources (Section 3.11 of the FEA)	8
VIII.	Mitigation (Chapter 3 of the FEA)	9
IX.	Public Involvement (Appendix G of the FEA)	10
X.	Agency Findings.....	10
XI.	Decision and Order.....	12

I. Introduction

This document serves as the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) and provides the final agency determinations and approvals for the federal actions necessary to implement the Southern Infrastructure Improvement Projects at the Salt Lake City International Airport (SLC). This FONSI/ROD is based on the information and analysis contained in the Final Environmental Assessment (FEA) dated May 2026, which is hereby incorporated by reference. The FEA has been prepared pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1G, *FAA National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures*, and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. The FEA documents the evaluation of the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts associated with the proposed improvements.

II. Background (Section 1.2 of the FEA)

SLC is a commercial service airport located primarily within Salt Lake City in Salt Lake County, Utah, approximately five (5) miles northwest of downtown Salt Lake City (Figure 1-1 of the FEA). SLC is generally bound by Interstate 80 (I-80) to the south, North Wright Brothers Drive to the west, undeveloped land and wetlands to the north, and I-215 to the east. The airfield consists of three air carrier runways (17-35, 16L-34R, and 16R-34L) and one general aviation runway, 14-32, which SLC is in the process of decommissioning. There is one terminal and two concourses. A parking garage is located immediately south of the terminal. Rental car agency counters are in the Gateway Center adjacent to the parking garage, and rental car pick-up is located on the ground floor of the parking garage. Longterm parking is located south and west of the terminal buildings and is serviced by shuttle buses.

General aviation facilities, including fixed base operators, are located on the east side of the airfield. Cargo companies are located on the north and south ends of the airport campus. Delta Air Lines operates a reservations center headquartered at the Airport. Other facilities include two fire stations; Salt Lake City Police station and Airport Operations Center; North Support (SLCDA maintenance); Delta and SkyWest Airlines maintenance hangars; a U.S. Post Office; a convenience store and gas station; end of runway deicing pads; a glycol treatment facility; a Control tower; and toll plaza. The southern extent of the airport campus includes the Jordan Surplus Canal, Northpoint Canal and the former Wingpointe Golf Course.

The Jordan Surplus Canal was originally constructed between 1885 and 1886 and has been enlarged three times. The segment within the Project Area was realigned twice for airport development, once in the 1980s and once in the 1990s. The Jordan Surplus Canal flows northward then westward through the eastern and northern extents of the Project Area. The North Point Canal flows westward through the southern Project Area, then northward (through the pond) in the central Project Area, then westward through the northern Project Area. North Point Canal feeds into a pond located near the center of the proposed parking area. This pond and another man-made pond were water features for the former golf course.

III. Proposed Action (Section 1.3 of the FEA)

The Proposed Action, which is shown on Figure 1-3 of the FEA, includes the construction of the South End-Around Taxiway (SEAT) and South Parking Area, Employee Screening, and Bus Facility. The Proposed Action also includes the construction and operation of associated program support projects, operational infrastructure improvements, and stormwater improvements necessary for the implementation of the Proposed Action. This includes relocation of the Surplus and North Point canals; construction of a stormwater detention pond, stormwater pump station, and sewer lift station; relocation of North Temple alignment and salt storage facility; and relocation of the Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS) and Remote Transmitter/Receiver (RTR).

IV. Purpose and Need (Section 1.4 of the FEA)

The purpose and need for the Proposed Action are to improve airfield circulation; accommodate existing and future employee and tenant parking needs; and provide a separate screening facility for airport employees and tenants.

Airfield Circulation

The runway system at SLC consists of two parallel north-south runways (Runways 16R/34L and 16L/34R) and a third, nearly parallel north-south runway (Runway 17/35). The two parallel runways accommodate most commercial airline operations. Access to and from Runway 17/35 via Taxiway M requires aircraft to cross Runway 16L/34R. Aircraft must also cross Runway 16L/34R to access the Taxiway L Deice Pad via Taxiway Q. These runway crossings reduce operational efficiency because arrival separation on Runway 34R must be increased whenever aircraft crossings occur, effectively reducing the runway's arrival capacity.

During arrivals to and departures from Runway 16L/34R, aircraft traveling between the east and west sides of the airfield must wait at runway hold short positions until crossings are authorized. This creates operational bottlenecks, increases aircraft queuing and delays, and results in greater Air Traffic Control (ATC) workload and intervention.

Improved airfield circulation is needed to enhance runway safety, provide more predictable and timely gate arrivals, reduce fuel consumption and associated emissions, and increase runway capacity and hourly throughput to accommodate forecasted demand.

Employee Parking and Security Screening

A Public Parking and Rental Car Conceptual Alternatives Study was completed in February 2025 (InterVISTAS, 2025) to evaluate existing passenger and employee parking conditions and identify future parking needs at SLC. The study determined that, by approximately 2030, SLC would require an additional 5,494 economy parking stalls to meet projected passenger demand, as well as 2,350 additional employee parking stalls. Existing parking facilities, which currently provide 14,406 stalls, are already reaching capacity during peak periods. Employee parking is presently distributed among several lots located near employment areas throughout SLC, although most employee parking demand is accommodated within two primary lots shared by Airport employees and tenant staff. These lots currently provide approximately 3,750 stalls, while existing demand is estimated at 4,300 stalls.

Terminal-area employees are generally categorized as working in either secure or non-secure areas. Employees requiring access to secure areas must pass through the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Security Screening Checkpoint (SSCP) within the terminal, which contributes to congestion at the checkpoint.

Additional employee parking is needed to accommodate current and projected Airport and tenant employee demand. Existing employee parking facilities are nearing capacity during peak periods and are not sufficient to meet forecasted demand, which is projected to reach approximately 8,200 stalls by 2045 (InterVISTAS, 2025). In addition, the existing south employee parking lot has been identified as a preferred location for future passenger parking. Consistent with landside planning principles, the highest-value and revenue-generating uses should be located closest to the terminal to maximize customer service and convenience for passengers. As a result, employee parking is not considered the highest and best use of terminal-adjacent land.

A separate employee screening facility is also needed to reduce congestion at the TSA SSCP within the terminal and to improve access efficiency for current and future Airport and tenant employees by minimizing delays in reaching their work locations.

V. Agency Actions and Approvals (Section 1.4 of the FEA)

The FAA actions, determinations, and approvals necessary for the Proposed Action to proceed include:

- Unconditional approval of the ALP to depict those portions of the Proposed Action subject to FAA review and approval pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 47107(a)(16)(B).
- Approval and construction, installation, and relocation of FAA-owned equipment (including navigational and visual aids) and associated infrastructure as well as any resulting flight procedures updates from the relocation of navigational aids.
- Release of federal obligations to use property for non-aeronautical purposes, including any obligations under 49 U.S.C. § 47107, in accordance with FAA Order 5190.6B.
- Approval of changes to the airport certification manual pursuant to 14 CFR Part 139.
- Determination of project eligibility for Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding and to impose Passenger Facility Charges in accordance with 49 U.S.C. §§ 47101-47144.

VI. Alternatives (Chapter 2 of the FEA)

Chapter 2 of the FEA identified and evaluated reasonable alternatives that may meet the purpose and need in accordance with NEPA and FAA Orders 1050.1G and 5050.4B. Section 2.2 of the FEA explains the alternative evaluation process and provides the alternatives that were considered. The first level screening examined whether the alternative met the Purpose and Need. If the alternative satisfied the Purpose and Need, it moved to the second level. The second level screening evaluated which alternatives were reasonable and feasible based on a qualitative evaluation of factors related to operational impacts and cost. Alternatives that were determined to be reasonable and feasible were carried forward for detailed environmental impact analysis.

Based on the analysis of the alternatives for the individual needs, the FEA evaluated two alternatives:

Alternative 1 - No Action (Section 2.3.3 of the FEA):

The No Action Alternative assumes none of the federal actions or physical improvements included in the Proposed Action would occur. The No Action includes projects that have recently been constructed as part of the base case. The No Action is illustrated on Figure 1-2 in the FEA.

Alternative 2 - Proposed Action:

Alternative 2, Proposed Action, represents a composite of SEAT Alternative 1 (Figure 2-2 in the FEA) and Employee Parking Alternative 2 (Figure 2-3 in the FEA).

VII. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (Chapter 3 of the FEA)

The General Study Area (GSA) (Figure 1-3 in the FEA) represents the area where reasonably foreseeable impacts may occur due to the implementation of the Proposed Action or alternatives. The GSA includes an area encompassing 285 acres. The study area for certain resources varies from the GSA. Where that occurs, the applicable study area is explained in the resource section.

The following resources were determined not to be present and were not analyzed in the FEA (Table 3-1 in the FEA):

- Coastal Resources
- Farmlands
- Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act of 1965, as amended, Section 6(f)
- Noise and Noise Compatible Land Use
- US Department of Transportation Section 4(f)
- Wild and Scenic Rivers

A. Aviation Emissions and Air Quality (Section 3.3 of the FEA)

SLC is in an area that is considered in nonattainment for ozone (O₃), fine particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns aerodynamic diameter (PM_{2.5}), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂); maintenance for particulate matter less than or equal to ten microns aerodynamic diameter (PM₁₀); and in attainment for carbon monoxide (CO), , nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and lead (Pb).

Operation emissions were evaluated using the FAA's Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT), version 3F. The EPA's Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES), version 4, was used to estimate on-road vehicle and on-road construction vehicle emissions. Because emissions of ozone (O₃) cannot be calculated directly, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) (precursors to O₃ formation) are used as surrogates.

Construction activities are anticipated to begin in 2026 and end in 2040. Project-related motor vehicle emissions associated with the new employee south parking lot were estimated for opening year 2029 through build out year 2040 and for five years after build out (2045); and aircraft emissions associated with the south end-around taxiway were estimated for opening year 2040 and 2045 as the out year.

For the No Action, aircraft emissions result from those aircraft departing from Runway 35 using the existing taxiways; and motor vehicle emissions represent those that occurred from the airport entrance to the existing employee parking lot. For the Proposed Action, aircraft emissions result from those aircraft departing from Runway 35 using the south end-around taxiway; and motor vehicle emissions represent those that occurred from the airport entrance to the proposed employee parking lot. The analysis did not capture emissions from aircraft waiting for permission to cross Runway 16L/34R (known as "holding") and holding time is expected to decrease under SEAT Alternative 1. Construction, No Action and Proposed Action emissions are provided in Table 3-6 of the FEA.

Emissions are expected to be well below *de minimis* thresholds for O₃, PM_{2.5}, SO₂, and PM₁₀. The largest increase would be to CO. The potential increase in criteria pollutant emissions would not be expected to create any new violation or increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation of the NAAQS. Therefore, no significant long-term or short-term impacts to air quality are anticipated.

B. Biological Resources (Section 3.4 of the FEA)

A Biological Assessment was prepared to evaluate the Proposed Action's potential effects on Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species and critical habitats within the GSA. Because the GSA lacks suitable habitat for listed species and contains no designated critical habitat, the FAA determined the Action Alternatives would have no direct effects on these resources.

Construction activities may temporarily displace migratory birds and non-listed fish and wildlife due to localized habitat loss; however, these species are expected to relocate to similar surrounding habitat, resulting in less-than-significant impacts. Furthermore, no impacts to bald or golden eagles are anticipated, as no nests or roosting sites are documented within the GSA.

Due to the proximity of the airfield, the proposed improvements must comply with wildlife hazard management guidelines to maintain aviation safety. Consequently, the design and placement of stormwater infrastructure are strictly restricted. In coordination with a USDA wildlife biologist, steps will be taken to minimize the relocated canal's attractiveness to wildlife, and all stormwater drainage features will be engineered to drain completely within 48 hours.

Consequently, implementation of the Action Alternatives would not result in significant impacts to biological resources.

C. Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste (Section 3.5 of the FEA)

Construction equipment utilized for the Action Alternatives would require common hazardous substances such as oil, fuel, solvents, and batteries. All hazardous materials used during construction would be handled, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

The Proposed Action could encounter known moderate-risk hazardous sites within the study area, including contaminants associated with a former railroad line, adjacent underground storage tanks (USTs), and nearby airport fueling operations (FEA Table 3-9). However, implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to these sites. Potential impacts would be temporary and mitigated through a Contaminated Soil and Groundwater Management Plan—which will outline specific Best Management Practices (BMPs)—alongside a project-wide Health and Safety Plan.

Additionally, construction would temporarily generate routine solid waste, such as building materials and debris. The selected contractor would be responsible for managing and disposing of this waste in compliance with all regulatory requirements. Long-term solid waste generation would not appreciably increase compared to the No Action Alternative, and regional landfill capacity is sufficient to accommodate the temporary influx. Because the project would not alter waste collection methods, exceed disposal capacities, or disrupt recycling diversion goals, impacts related to hazardous substances and solid waste would be less than significant.

D. Historical, Architectural, Archeological and Cultural Resources (Section 3.6 of the FEA)

Although the Jordan Surplus Canal and North Point Consolidated Canal are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the specific segments being relocated were determined non-eligible. The relocated segments will tie back into the existing eligible portions of the canals, which will result in minor temporary impacts. Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the FAA submitted a finding of No Adverse Effect to the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on June 11, 2024; the Utah SHPO concurred with this finding on June 12, 2024. Additionally, the FAA initiated government-to-government consultation with ten Native American Tribes on January 29, 2024. No responses or concerns were received from the tribes.

E. Land Use (Section 3.7 of the FEA)

The Proposed Action would occur entirely on SLC property and would be consistent with the conditionally approved ALP. The Proposed Action would also be consistent with the Airport District and AFPP overlay district. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not significantly impact land uses within the study area.

F. Natural Resources and Energy Supplies (Section 3.8 of the FEA)

The Proposed Action would increase natural resource and energy consumption during both construction and operation; however, this increase can be readily accommodated by existing regional capacity. Because project demands are well within available supply limits, implementation of the Proposed Action would result in less-than-significant impacts to natural resources and energy infrastructure.

G. Socioeconomic and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks (Section 3.9 of the FEA)

Construction of the Proposed Action would temporarily stimulate local economic activity through job creation, resulting in a minor, beneficial socioeconomic effect within the GSA. Because all project components would be constructed on existing airport property, the project requires no land acquisition and would not result in residential or business relocations. Consequently, the Action Alternatives would not result in significant socioeconomic impacts.

Furthermore, the Proposed Action would not increase environmental health or safety risks to children. The project vicinity lacks residential land uses, schools, daycare facilities, or preschools, and the project would not alter exposure to air, food, drinking water, soil, or consumer products. Therefore, the Proposed Action lacks the potential to cause disproportionate health or safety risks to children.

H. Visual Effects (Section 3.10 of the FEA)

The Proposed Action includes new sources of light emissions from the illumination of new parking area and SEAT. This new lighting would not be distinguishable from the existing ambient lighting. Changes in light intensity caused by the Proposed Action would not be considered significant.

The Proposed Action includes new Airport related development that would be visually consistent and compatible with the land uses in the immediate vicinity. Visual elements of the Proposed Action would be consistent with the existing visual character and setting. No significant changes to the visual character of the area, noticeable contrasts with existing visual character, or obstructions of important visual resources are expected to occur because of any of these elements of the Action Alternatives.

I. Water Resources (Section 3.11 of the FEA)

Wetlands

The Proposed Action would permanently impact up to 23.64 acres of jurisdictional wetlands. Avoidance and minimization of wetlands impacts were incorporated to the extent possible for the Proposed Action. The Airport Sponsor will obtain a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit for the wetland impacts. As required for the Section 404 permit, the Airport Sponsor will develop and implement a mitigation plan to compensate for all unavoidable wetland impacts and obtain all applicable permits prior to construction. The implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in a reasonably foreseeable significant impact on wetlands as all impacts would be mitigated.

Surface Waters

The Proposed Action would affect 6,163 linear feet of the Jordan Surplus Canal, 17.07 acres of the North Point Canal ponded area, 2,874 linear feet of the North Point Canal's concrete-lined section, and 4.4 acres of ponds (Figure 3-4 of the FEA). The Proposed Action Alternatives would add new impervious areas, which will result in an increase in stormwater runoff.

The Proposed Action includes improvements to and expansion of the Stormwater Drainage System to provide the additional detention and treatment capacity needed to support development. The Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to surface waters, nor would it result in an exceedance of water quality standards or contamination of public drinking water supply.

Floodplains

The Jordan Surplus Canal is designated as a Flood Zone A floodplain. The relocated canal would be designed to maintain the conveyance and storage capacity of the existing floodplain. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to the floodplain because they would not result in (1) a considerable probability of loss of human life, (2) likely future damage associated with the encroachment that could be substantial in cost or extent, or (3) a notable adverse impact on the floodplain's natural and beneficial floodplain values.

Groundwater

Groundwater within the GSA does not support beneficial uses, as it is not used for drinking water, irrigation, or industrial supply purposes, and no groundwater wells are present within the GSA. The Proposed Action would neither create new water supply wells nor reduce groundwater levels in a manner that could affect groundwater users in surrounding areas. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would not be expected to result in significant impacts on groundwater resources.

VIII. Mitigation (Chapter 3 of the FEA)

SLC has committed to the following mitigation measures as part of the Proposed Action:

- Carrying out the operation and maintenance plans described in the *Salt Lake City International Airport Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan*.
- Utilizing Best Management Practices (BMPs) to limit impacts during construction. This includes, but is not limited to, utilizing BMPs to minimize surface transportation impacts, protect against sediment and soils entering the canals outside the project area, reduce construction noise, and minimize increases in air emissions and water usage. A special provision will be included to inform the contractor of the potential for encountering hazardous materials.
- Having a qualified biologist conduct a pre-construction nest survey 5-7 days before the start of construction if construction takes place during nesting and breeding season (April to August). If nests are found, the USFWS' Nationwide Standard Conservation Measures will be used to develop BMPs.
- Adhering to the applicable FAA Advisory Circulars, including, but not limited to, FAA AC 150/5370-10, *Standard Specifications for Construction of Airports* and FAA AC 150/5200-33, *Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports*.
- Developing a compensatory wetland mitigation plan to avoid and minimize wetland impacts.
- Maintaining the conveyance and storage capacity of the existing floodplain and preparing a Letter of Map Revision once construction is completed.
- Obtaining all applicable permits prior to construction, including, but not limited to, a USACE Section 404 permit and a USACE Section 408 permit as well as an NPDES permit.
- Ensuring no vehicle or material storage occurs in wetland areas or other sensitive areas.
- Stopping work if previously unidentified archaeological resources are uncovered during construction and notifying the FAA of the discovery. SLC will secure the site until cleared by the FAA and UT SHPO. Work will not resume until authorized by the FAA.
- Preparing a Contaminated Soil and Groundwater Management Plan and a Health and Safety Plan prior to the start of construction.
- Handling, storing, and disposing of hazardous materials in accordance with applicable federal, state and/or local regulations.

IX. Public Involvement (Appendix G of the FEA)

The Draft EA was released for agency and public review on August 17th, 2025, and comments were accepted through September 18th, 2025. To facilitate comments, SLC hosted a public open house on August 27th, 2025 at the Airport. Comments could be submitted in writing (either at a public meeting or by mail) and/or electronically (either by email or through the project website).

SLC received a total of five comment submissions on the Draft EA. The FAA and SLC considered and addressed each individual comment provided; however, individual responses are not required as part of the EA process. A copy of the comments and responses to those comments are provided in Appendix G of the FEA. Several sections of the FEA were updated from the Draft EA in response to comments received and regulatory changes. The revisions are listed in **Table A** of the FEA.

X. Agency Findings

The FAA makes the following determinations for the Proposed Action based upon a careful review of the attached FEA, comments on the Draft EA, and appropriate supporting information.

The following determinations are prescribed by the statutory provisions set forth in the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as codified in 49 USC §47106 and 47107.

i. The project is reasonably consistent with existing plans of public agencies responsible for development of the area surrounding the airport (49 USC §47106(a)(1)).

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of project grant funding applications. Construction of the Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport property and would be consistent with the plans, goals and policies for the area.

SLC is within Salt Lake County, zoned as a special purpose district (specifically an “airport district”) under the Salt Lake City municipal code title 21a – Zoning. Salt Lake City code 21a.32.060 defines the purpose of the airport district code is to “provide a suitable environment for the Salt Lake City international airport and private uses that function in support of the airport facility. This district is appropriate in areas of the city where the applicable master plans support this type of land use.”

Salt Lake City also delineates an Airport Flight Path Protection (AFPP) overlay district under Salt Lake City code 21a.34.04036 to protect land uses below aircraft navigation routes. The AFPP overlay district rules declare that the creation or establishment of an airport hazard is a public nuisance and an injury to the region served by SLCIA; that it is necessary in the interest of the public health, public safety, and general welfare that the creation or establishment of airport hazards be prevented; and that the prevention of these hazards should be accomplished, to the extent legally possible, by the exercise of the police power without compensation. Thus, local plans and land use regulations have been developed to discourage uses incompatible with Airport operations.

ii. The interests of the community in or near which the project may be located have been given fair consideration (49 USC §47106(b)(2)).

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of airport development project grant funding applications. The Draft EA was released for agency and public review on August 17th, 2025, and comments were accepted through September 18th, 2025. To facilitate comments, an open house was held at SLC. Comments could be submitted in writing (either at a public meeting or by mail) and/or electronically by email or through the project website. The Airport Sponsor

received a total of five comment submissions on the Draft EA. The FAA and the SLC considered and addressed each individual comment provided.

iii. The airport sponsor has taken, or will take, actions to restrict land use in the airport vicinity, including adoption of zoning laws, to ensure the uses are compatible with airport operations (49 USC §47107(a)(10)).

The determination prescribed by this statutory provision is a precondition to agency approval of airport development project grant funding applications. As a recipient of AIP funding, the Airport Sponsor has signed grant assurances that require them to take appropriate action, to the extent reasonable, including the adoption of zoning laws, to restrict the use of land adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of, the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations, including landing and takeoff of aircraft. The most current land uses and zoning designations of the surrounding jurisdictions were obtained for analysis. The land use analysis considered existing and future land use plans within and surrounding the Airport and evaluated the Proposed Action to determine whether it would be compatible with land use guidelines.

iv. Determination that the airport development is reasonably necessary for the use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense pursuant to (49 USC § 44502(b)).

The FAA has determined that implementation of the Proposed Action would maintain the safety, utility, and efficiency of SLC. Implementation of the Proposed Action would enhance safety at the Airport by meeting FAA Airport Design Standards consistent with the FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13B, Change 1, Airport Design, and the FAA's regulations described in 14 CFR Part 77, Safe, Efficient Use and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace.

XI. Decision and Order

After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained herein, the undersigned finds that the proposed Federal action, namely the Proposed Action, is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101 (a) of NEPA and other applicable environmental requirements and is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment or otherwise, including any condition requiring consultation pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA. As a result, FAA will not prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

This decision does not constitute a commitment of funds under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP); however, it does fulfill the environmental prerequisites to approve applications for grants of AIP funds for the Proposed Action in the future. (49 USC § 47101)

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the FAA, I approve and direct that agency action be taken to carry out implementation of the Proposed Action.

Jesse A. Lyman
Manager
Denver Airports District Office
Northwest Mountain Region (ANM)

Right of Appeal

This FONSI/ROD constitutes a final order of the FAA Administrator and is subject to the exclusive judicial review under 49 USC § 46110 by the US Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the US 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 US Court of Appeals no later than 60 days after the order is issued in accordance with the provisions of 49 USC § 46110.