DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Location

Norfolk International Airport (ORF)
Norfolk, Virginia

Introduction and Background

This Finding of No Significant Impact sets out the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) consideration of the environmental and other factors for Airport Layout Plan (ALP) approval for the *Environmental Assessment for the Runway 14/32 Closure and Associated Projects* (ORF Runway Closure EA). The Proposed Action includes the permanent closure of Runway 14/32, construction of a new Cargo Terminal and Apron, a new deicing apron, and General Aviation Hangar Development. This EA has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500-1508), and the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-248), as amended.

Background

The Airport property is located in the City of Norfolk, Virginia. ORF is small hub commercial service airport located in the City of Norfolk in the southeastern portion of the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Airport is the primary airport serving Coastal Virginia and the Outer Banks of North Carolina, with over 4.5 million passengers and over 75,000 operations in 2023. ORF is governed and operated by the Norfolk Airport Authority (Airport Authority or Authority), a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and an independent agency of the City of Norfolk.

ORF has two existing intersecting runways, consisting of a primary runway (Runway 5/23) and a crosswind runway (Runway 14/32). Runway 5/23 is oriented in a northeast/southwest direction and is has a useable runway length of 8,001 feet (in addition to a 1,000-foot-long displaced threshold, for a total pavement length of 9,001) and is 150 feet wide. Runway 14/32 is oriented in a northwest/ southeast direction and is 4,300 feet long (with a 575-foot displaced threshold, for a total runway length of 4,875 feet) and is also 150 feet wide. Runway 14/32 serves as a general aviation (GA) crosswind runway at ORF. A crosswind runway is typically needed when wind conditions do not allow for arrivals or departures on a primary runway.

The terminal facilities at ORF are currently separated into an Arrivals Terminal and Main Passenger Terminal. The Arrivals Terminal is primarily utilized by passengers concluding their flight at ORF and contains baggage claim services, as well as rental car and transportation network companies. The Main Passenger Terminal serves as the primary terminal for passenger processing, passenger security screening, and passenger enplaning and deplaning. The terminal is based on a pier layout, with 23 total gates in two separate concourses: Concourse A and Concourse B. Concourse A currently includes gates 1 through 9; the Concourse B includes gates 16 through 30.

Proposed Action

The elements of the Proposed Action evaluated in this EA are described in the following sections and shown on **Exhibit 1-1 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**. The Proposed Action consists of four

main projects, The Runway 14/32 Closure, Cargo Terminal and Apron Development, Deicing Apron with Recovery System, and GA Hangar Development. Each of these projects have subcomponents identified below:

Closure of Runway 14/32

The Airport Authority proposes to permanently close Runway 14/32 and remove the runway pavement, leaving only pavement necessary to access the adjacent cargo apron and the GA Facility. The project would include the following components:

- Permanently close Runway 14/32
    - Removal of runway airfield lighting and marking
    - Removal of runway directional and guidance signage
    - Removal of Runway Safety Area (RSA) designation and controls
    - Removal of FAA navigational aids
- Convert portions of Runway 14/32 to taxiway
    - Taxiway edge light construction
    - Adding directional guidance signs for new taxiway
    - Taxiway striping
- Runway 14/32 pavement removal from Taxiway V northwest to the former Runway 14 end
- Realignment of Taxiway C from Taxiway A to Taxiway B to establish a consistent 400-foot separation (Airport Layout Plan shows full length at 400 feet)

Cargo Terminal and Apron Development

A new air cargo sort facility is proposed in the cargo area of the airfield, immediately north of the proposed deicing facility. Currently the dedicated air cargo area is on the west side of the airfield, south of the terminal and is comprised of two multipurpose processing buildings shared by multiple cargo tenants. The existing facilities would be retained for cargo usage. Estimated sizes of the proposed facility improvements are listed in the following:

- Cargo apron: approximately 190,000 square feet
- Cargo building: approximately 56,000 square feet
- Auto parking: approximately 25,000 square feet
- Truck parking: approximately 80,000 square feet

Taxiway V would also be shifted by 114 feet to the northeast, providing additional space for aircraft parking and maneuverability. Automobile access would be provided via a two-lane road off the future alignment of Robin Hood Road.

Deicing Apron with Recovery System

A new terminal deicing apron would be constructed in the northwest portion of Airport property in the place of the existing Runway 14/32. The apron would encompass approximately 317,000 square feet. Currently, the deicing area is located on the terminal apron and does not have a built-in collection system. The new apron would allow the Authority to centralize deicing activities and provide a built-in collection system, which would provide an environmental benefit.

GA Hangar Development

A new GA apron and six hangars would be constructed to support GA operations associated with

the existing Fixed Base Operator (FBO). The project would construct six new hangars, totaling 148,200 square feet of additional hangar space. Five of the new hangars would each be approximately 130 feet by 200 feet in size, with a 150-foot by 200-foot apron. The remaining hangar would be 130 feet by 140 feet in size, with a 150-foot by 140-foot apron. Automobile parking, and automobile access from Miller Store Road would also be constructed to support the new hangars.

Federal Action

This action requires ALP Approval Authority. FAA Approval Authority is a Major Federal Action.

Purpose and Need

The purpose and need of each of the four projects and sub-components are different and described in detail below:

Purpose of the Project

The FAA's purpose of the Proposed Action is to fulfill FAA's statutory mission to ensure that the safe operation of the Airport and airway system is the highest aviation priority as set forth under 49 U.S.C. § 47101 (a)(1).

The Authority's purpose of the Proposed Action is to:

- Eliminate non-compliant elements of Runway 14/32;
- Provide sufficient facilities to meet forecasted cargo demand at the Airport;
- Provide sufficient GA facilities to meet GA demand at the Airport;
- Provide sufficient facilities to conduct deicing operations in an efficient and environmentally safe manner.

The Need for Runway 14/32

The primary need is to comply with FAA Design Standards. The existing shoulders and Runway Object Free Area (ROFA)[1] for Runway 14/32 do not meet FAA design standards. The existing runway does not have shoulders. To meet FAA design standards, 25-foot paved shoulders would be required along the entire length of the runway. The existing ROFA extends 41 feet from the Runway 14 end and 935 feet from the Runway 32 end. To meet FAA design standards full 1,000-foot ROFAs would need to be provided at each runway end. The existing Runway 14/32 deficiencies are depicted on **Exhibit 1-2 in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

The Need for Cargo Terminal and Apron Development

Air cargo facilities at ORF are currently undersized to adequately accommodate the existing level of cargo activity. The existing cargo area is located on the west side of the airfield, south of the terminal. It consists of two multipurpose processing buildings, providing tenants with approximately 88,000 square feet of space. The western facility is the largest of the two facilities, measuring approximately 65,000 square feet. The second building measures approximately 23,000 square feet in size.

[1] The ROFA is a rectangular area bordering a runway intended to provide enhanced safety for aircraft operations by ensuring the area remains clear of parked aircraft or other equipment not required to support air navigation or the ground maneuvering of aircraft.

As shown in **Table 1-3 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, the existing cargo processing building space does not meet the current need of approximately 98,792 square feet, with demand forecasted to grow to over approximately 143,800 square feet.

Adjacent to the air cargo facilities is an aircraft apron which is 207,450 square feet in size. Based on the facility requirement calculations, cargo operations currently exceed maximum capacity during peak periods. The dedicated air cargo apron is currently capable of supporting up to four widebody aircraft and one single-engine turboprop aircraft with angled parking; however, by Planned Activity Level (PAL) 1, it is forecasted that there would be a need for one additional cargo aircraft parking position, with a deficit of 31,050 square feet. This deficit grows to over 174,000 square feet by PAL 4, as shown in **Table 1-4 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

The Need for the Deicing Apron with Recovery System

Deicing operations at ORF are confined to the main terminal apron and the cargo apron on the west side of the airfield. The Airport's main deicing facility/pad is located on the northeast side of the main terminal apron and consists of three deicing positions, which are utilized on a first-come-first-serve basis.

Currently, the deicing area does not have a built-in collection system; rather, sweeper trucks are utilized to collect glycol from the pavement after application, which is then transferred to glycol storage tanks located near the fuel dispensing area, which is an inefficient use of operations staff, and not ideal from an environmental standpoint. After deicing services have ceased for the season, the glycol tanks are taken to an off-site facility where the recovered fluid is analyzed and disposed of accordingly. Each airline is responsible for its own glycol storage units.

Deicing services on the cargo apron are authorized in the non-movement area parallel to Taxiway V. Deicing services are not permitted within 100 feet of a storm drain or on the GA side of the airfield at ORF.

The Need for GA Hangar Development

Hangar requirements are generally a function of the number and type of based aircraft, owner preferences, hangar rental costs, and area climate. Due to seasonal weather conditions, hangars are highly desirable in the Norfolk, Virginia region as thunderstorms, hailstorms, winter weather, and intense wind can cause damage to parked aircraft. In the summer months heat and sun exposure can damage avionics and fade paint.

The Airport's sole FBO operates six bulk-hangars (corporate hangars), three sections of T-hangars, and a large aircraft parking apron. The bulk-hangars are currently at capacity, and there is a waiting list for new hangar leases. Further, the GA fleet mix at the Airport is anticipated to change with based aircraft growth, however, the Proposed Action would not increase the number of existing or forecasted aircraft operations. As such, additional larger hangar space is needed at ORF to accommodate demand. There is also a large apron area that provides additional tie-down positions that is used for short-term storage of transient aircraft parking.[2]

[2] The previously approved corporate hangars at the former ground runup enclosure site (GRE) provide three additional corporate hangars and additional apron space. The need for these hangars was in response to the needs of an existing tenant in the adjacent Hangar C7. This need was not included in the calculation of GA requirements in the Master Plan. Therefore, these new hangars are not included in the hangar space needs identified for this project.

Based on existing and forecasted demand, there is a need for additional hangar space at ORF. **Table 1-5 in the ORF Runway Closure EA** shows the current useable hangar space, the future hangar space requirements, and the forecasted deficit of hangar space.

Alternatives

The approach used in this EA was to identify and evaluate alternative concepts individually for each of the four areas of project needs. As described in the preceding section, those needs include:

1. Runway 14/32 Compliance
2. Cargo Terminal and Apron Development
3. Deicing Apron with Recovery System
4. GA Hangar Development

For this evaluation, a multi-step screening process was used to identify which of the preliminary alternatives would be carried forward for the project. The three screening steps are not ranked in order, with each step carrying the same overall level of importance.

Step 1 – Does the alternative meet the Purpose & Need (identified separately for Runway 14/32, Cargo Terminal and Apron needs, deicing apron needs, and GA hangar needs)?

Step 2 –Is the preliminary alternative practical or feasible to implement from a technical and operational standpoint?

Step 3 – Would the candidate alternative result in a safe and efficient use of navigable airspace and minimize airfield operational impacts?

If an alternative advanced through these steps, it was retained for a more detailed environmental evaluation in the EA. The screening process for the reasonable alternatives is portrayed conceptually in **Exhibit 2-8 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**. Each of the four project areas are described in detail below with the results of the screening criteria provided immediately after the description of the Alternative.

Runway 14/32 Compliance Alternatives

The Authority evaluated Runway 14/32 alternatives that would bring the runway into compliance with FAA design standards, while still maintaining a safe and operationally efficient Airport. The potential range of alternatives was limited by FAA design standards as well as by existing infrastructure and available property. Only two viable options were evaluated, the Proposed Action and the Bring the Runway into Compliance alternatives were fully described and analyzed in **Chapter 2 and in Exhibit 2-1 in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Alternative #1: Bring Runway 14/32 into Compliance

Alternative #1 would retain Runway 14/32 and maintain the existing operational characteristics. To do this, the Authority identified two potential options, which included upgrading and downgrading the Runway:

Option 1 would upgrade Runway 14/32 by extending the overall length to meet the needs and requirements.

Option 2 would downgrade the runway by shortening and possibly limiting aircraft weights so the final compliant runway fits within the Airport's existing property. [3] Both options are depicted on **Exhibit 2-1 in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Alternative #2: Close Runway 14/32 (Proposed Action)
Alternative #2 would permanently close Runway 14/32. The existing FAA design deficiencies would no longer be applicable after the closure of the Runway. Runway airfield lighting and markings, Runway directional and guidance signage, and RSA designation and controls would be removed. This alternative would also cancel the existing approach procedures prior to Runway 14/32 closure, which includes the following: Area Navigation (RNAV) Global Position Satellite (GPS) RWY 14, RNAV GPS RWY 32, VHF Omni Directional Range Radio (VOR)/ Distance Measuring Equipment (DME) RWY 32, and VOR RWY 14. Alternative #2 is depicted on **Exhibit 2-1 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Conclusion:
Only Alternative #2 would satisfy all three steps. Alternative #1, Options 1 and 2 would not be practical to implement from a technical and operational standpoint and would either result in off-Airport acquisitions and relocations or result in a runway that is not useable. Alternative #1 would also result in regional airspace concerns and prevent more beneficial use of limited Airport property. Alternative #1, Options 1 and 2 were therefore eliminated from further consideration. Based on this analysis, Alternative #2 was identified as the recommended alternative, and will be carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA for Runway 14/32 compliance alternatives.

2. Cargo Terminal and Apron Development Alternatives
As described in **Section 1.5.2 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, air cargo facilities at ORF are currently undersized to adequately accommodate the existing level of cargo activity, both by physical footprint and functionality. Based on the facility requirement calculations, cargo operations currently exceed maximum capacity during peak periods. Based on the existing usage and projected growth of cargo operations in the future, the Authority developed three conceptual air cargo facility alternatives, each of which is described in the following sections. These concepts were based on the availability of developable space with an airfield connection, and did not consider off-site or non-airside locations, each of which would require future analysis and redesign to be feasible. All three of these alternatives would require the closure of Runway 14/32.

Alternative #1: North Cargo Area Expansion (Proposed Action)
Alternative #1 would provide an approximately 56,000 square-foot cargo facility northeast of the current facilities, improving the physical footprint of cargo infrastructure and

[3] ORF Master Plan, Section 5.3.1 and Appendix M in the ORF Runway Closure EA – Runway 14/32 RSA Evaluation

allowing consolidation of cargo processors. This alternative would also include an approximately 80,000 square foot area dedicated to truck loading and unloading activity on the landside of the newly proposed facility, as well as an approximately 25,000 square foot parking area for ground-cargo vehicles and cargo operator employee parking.
This concept would shift Taxiway V (which provides access to the existing air cargo facility to Runway 5/23 via Taxiway C) approximately 114 feet northeast, providing additional space for aircraft parking and improved functionality. By shifting the taxiway, cargo operators would have the ability to park widebody aircraft perpendicular to the present facilities rather than the current angled configuration. In addition to parking reorientation, the apron would sufficiently accommodate up to five Boeing 767-300 aircraft (the most demanding cargo aircraft anticipated at the Airport) and two smaller Cessna 208 Caravan aircraft.

Approximately 190,000 square feet of additional cargo apron would be constructed to accommodate cargo activity and aircraft parking. This apron would also support maintenance, repair, and overhaul (MRO) activities. The additional pavement and infrastructure would repurpose portions of the pavement currently serving as Runway 14/32, lowering developmental costs, and would accommodate the proposed relocation of Robin Hood Road. Alternative #1 is depicted on **Exhibit 2-2 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Alternative #2 – Redevelopment of Air Cargo Facilities
Alternative #2 would demolish the existing cargo buildings for improved functionality and best-use of the developable area. As such, two new cargo facilities would be constructed, providing a minimum of approximately 56,000 square feet of total space. The largest of the two facilities (located northeast of the current building) would serve as a dedicated cargo sort facility, with vehicular parking to the north (landside) and an aircraft parking apron to the south (airside). The aircraft parking apron would utilize the pavement and infrastructure currently used for cargo related vehicular parking, aiding in cost efficiency. The new apron would measure approximately 900,000 square feet and could support up to ten cargo aircraft, allowing cargo operators more options and flexibility when processing freight.
Alternative #2 would also provide dedicated apron space capable of supporting up to two B767-300s. To allow for the development of the new cargo buildings and apron space, it would be necessary to shift Taxiway V approximately 400 feet to the west, converting the pavement currently used for a runway (Runway 14/32) to use as a taxiway.
Similar to Alternative #1, this alternative would also provide the option for the development of two MROs to the east of the shifted taxiway, enabling increased utilization of the available developable area, and would also accommodate the proposed relocation of Robin Hood Road. Alternative #2 is depicted on **Exhibit 2-3 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Alternative #3: Buildout of Air Cargo Facilities
Alternative #3 would demolish the existing cargo facilities and construct two new facilities to satisfy long-term requirements, with one facility being dedicated to cargo sort activities. A new aircraft parking apron for the sort facility would be necessary, measuring

approximately 900,000 square feet and capable of supporting up to ten B767-300 aircraft. The apron would repurpose existing pavement to decrease developmental costs. The smaller cargo facility's apron would also repurpose pavement from Runway 14/32 and would provide parking for up to three B767-300 aircraft. Landside parking and areas for loading and unloading activities would be provided to the west of each newly constructed cargo facility, again repurposing some existing pavement. Roadway access from the proposed Robin Hood Road realignment would serve these new facilities.

Alternative #3 would also provide the option of building two new MRO facilities on the southwest side of the developable area, along with a single apron for joint-use operations with the MRO facility operators. An access road would allow for entry from the proposed cargo drive to the proposed Robin Hood Road realignment. The locations of the recommended roadways would maintain the separation of cargo and MRO activities from FAA equipment and non-Airport related businesses (i.e., the existing catering company) adjacent to the developable area. The location of the roadways would also allow for the repurposing of existing infrastructure (i.e., cargo related vehicle parking and loading/loading space) used by cargo operators. Alternative #3 is depicted on **Exhibit 2-4 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Conclusions:

Only Alternative #1 would satisfy all three steps, assuming the closure of Runway 14/32. Alternatives #2 and #3 would not be practical to implement from a technical and operational standpoint because of operational impacts to the existing cargo facilities during construction and were therefore eliminated from further consideration. Alternative 1 would also be the most cost-effective due to the reuse of existing pavement and retention of existing cargo buildings and apron, rather than razing and replacing current facilities. Based on this analysis, Alternative #1 was identified as the recommended alternative, and will be carried forward for detailed environmental impact assessment as the Proposed Action for Cargo Terminal and Apron needs.

3. Deicing Apron with Recovery System Alternatives

As described in **Section 1.5.3 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, deicing facilities at ORF are currently confined to the main terminal apron and the cargo apron on the west side of the airfield. The existing facilities are not efficient, and do not provide the environmental benefits of a built-in collection system. To address these issues, the Authority developed two conceptual alternatives, each of which is described in the following.

Alternative #1: Remote Terminal Deicing Apron (Proposed Action)

Alternative #1 would construct a remote terminal deicing apron, approximately 317,000 square feet in size, providing area for three deicing positions along the northwestern edge of Taxiway C and on a portion of the current Runway 14/32, which is presumed closed for this alternative. A deicing fluid (i.e., glycol) drainage system would be installed as part of this Alternative, however, deicing would be served by mobile trucks and deicing equipment, as impacts to terminal area operations would hinder the likelihood any permanent deicing equipment. This location is compatible with Air Cargo Alternative #1, which currently depicts cargo facility development within the area, and would provide a consolidated

commercial/cargo deicing location. Based on ingress and egress requirements for the taxilanes associated with the terminal gates, the overall length of the deicing bays would be adequate for single use and may be simultaneously occupied with two aircraft. The apron space would allow dual usage with remain overnight (RON) capability at night with positions for up to six RON aircraft. Alternative #1 is depicted on **Exhibit 2-5 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Alternative #2: Terminal Deicing Apron
Alternative #2 would construct a deicing apron southwest of the existing deicing pad, in the area currently occupied by Concourse B (which would need to be demolished as part of this alternative). This alternative would accommodate three aircraft deicing positions. This location would allow for utilization of existing apron space and aircraft ingress/egress nearby the terminal gates. Similar to the remote deicing facility, lane length is more than adequate for single aircraft use and may be utilized by up to two aircraft per lane at a time for simultaneous use, therefore increasing the overall deicing capacity at the Airport. Additionally, during non-deicing periods the area can accommodate up to six RON aircraft. Alternative #2 is also depicted on **Exhibit 2-5**. **in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Conclusions:
Only Alternative #1 would satisfy all three steps. Alternatives #2 would not be practical to implement from a technical and operational standpoint because of operational impacts associated with the closure of Concourse B. Based on this analysis, Alternative #1 was identified as the recommended alternative, and will be carried forward for detailed environmental impact assessment as the Proposed Action for deicing apron with recovery system needs.

4. GA Hangar Development Alternatives
As described in **Section 1.5.4 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, the is a need for additional hangar space at ORF. To address this need, the Authority developed two conceptual alternatives, each of which is described in the following.

Alternative #1: Expansion of the Existing GA Facilities (Proposed Action)
Alternative #1 would expand the existing GA facilities by constructing a new general aviation apron with six new hangars to support general aviation operations associated with the existing FBO. Five of the new hangars would each be approximately 130-foot by 200-foot in size, with a 150-foot by 200-foot apron. The remaining hangar would be 130-foot by 140-foot in size, with a 150-foot by 140-foot apron. In total, Alternative #1 would provide 148,200 square feet of additional hangar space. Because the need for GA hangar space depends on existing and potential future tenant requests, the proposed hangar facilities would be developed in phases, on an as-needed basis. Automobile parking, and access from Miller Store Road would also be constructed to support the new hangars. Alternative #1 is depicted on **Exhibit 2-6 in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Alternative #2: Construction of a New GA Facility

Alternative #2 would add a second FBO servicing additional apron space and aircraft storage located along the proposed future Runway 5R/23L eastern corridor. This alternative would provide approximately 327,600 square feet of new cargo apron, and two bulk-hangars (each 200-foot by 100-foot) providing a total of 40,000 square feet of aircraft storage. Alternative #2 would also provide sufficient space for a variety of hangars and types depending upon demand. Because the need for GA hangar space depends on existing and potential future tenant requests, the proposed hangar facilities would be developed in phases, on an as-needed basis. This alternative would provide automobile access from Miller Store Road and would require removal of Taxiway F. Alternative #2 is depicted on **Exhibit 2-7 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Conclusions: Only Alternative #1 would satisfy all three steps. Alternative #2 a would not be practical to implement from a technical and operational standpoint because of operational impacts to the existing fuel farm, and the removal of Taxiway F. Alternative #2 was therefore eliminated from further consideration. Based on this analysis, Alternative #1 was identified as the recommended alternative, and will be carried forward for detailed environmental impact assessment as the Proposed Action for GA hangar needs.

Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis in the EA

Based on the screening analysis, two alternatives were carried forward for further detailed environmental evaluation in the EA: the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action includes the only surviving alternative from each of the four categories (Runway 14/32 Compliance, Cargo Terminal and Apron Development, Deicing Apron, and GA hangar development).

No Action Alternative: With the No Action Alternative, no changes would be made from the existing conditions. While the No Action Alternative does not meet the purpose and need, it is required to be carried forward in the assessment of environmental impacts by 40 CFR § 1502.14(d). The No Action Alternative serves as a basis of comparison during the assessment of the impacts of the alternatives.

Proposed Action:

Runway 14/32 Compliance Alternative #2

This alternative would permanently close Runway 14/32, and remove all runway lighting, markings, directional signage, RSA designations/controls, and FAA navigational aids for Runway 14/32. A portion of the former Runway would also be converted into taxiway. A portion of Taxiway C would also be realigned as part of this alternative.

Cargo Terminal and Apron Development Alternative #1

This alternative would construct a new air cargo sort facility in the cargo area of the airfield, immediately north of the proposed deicing facility. Improvements would

include a new cargo apron, a new cargo building, automobile parking, and truck parking. Automobile access would be provided via a two-lane road off of the future alignment of Robin Hood Road.

Deicing Apron with Recovery System Alternative #1

This alternative would construct a new deicing apron in the northwest portion of Airport property in the place of the existing Runway 14-32. The apron would encompass approximately 317,000 square feet. The new apron would allow the Authority to centralize deicing activities and provide a built-in collection system**.**

GA Hangar Development Alternative #1

This alternative would construct a new GA apron and six hangars to support GA operations associated with the existing FBO. Five of the new hangars would each be approximately 130-foot by 200-foot in size, with a 150-foot by 200-foot apron. The remaining hangar would be 130-foot by 140-foot in size, with a 150-foot by 140-foot apron. Automobile parking, and automobile access from Miller Store Road would also be constructed to support the new hangars.

Affected Environment and Potential Consequences of the Preferred Alternative (Proposed Action)

This section includes a description of each of the environmental impact categories as listed in FAA Order 1050.1F to establish a "baseline" from which to assess potential impacts and the potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action. Under the No Action Alternative, the airfield layout, cargo facilities, deicing facilities, and GA hangar facilities would remain as they currently exist, without major improvement. Existing facility needs would continue to worsen as Airport activity continues to increase, and Runway 14/32 would remain non-compliant. More detail on the specific resource areas is located in **Chapter 3 and 4 in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Air Quality

Affected Environment:

The Airport is located in the City of Norfolk, which is located within the Hampton Roads Intrastate Air Quality Control Region. In the past, the City of Norfolk was designated as nonattainment for the 1979 1-hour ozone and 1997 8-hour ozone standards. However, the U.S. EPA determined the area had attained the 1979 1-hour ozone standard on July 28, 1997 and the 1997 8-hour ozone standard on June 1, 2007, re-designating the region to attainment for these pollutants. The area operated under a maintenance plan for ozone until the plan expired in 2018. The City of Norfolk is currently in compliance with all federally regulated air quality standards in effect at the time of the preparation of this document.

Potential Consequences:
The Proposed Action would conform to the State Implementation Plan and the Clean Air Act and would not have the potential to create any new violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), delay the attainment of any NAAQS, or increase the frequency or severity of any existing violations of the NAAQS. As such, no adverse impact on local or regional air quality is anticipated by the construction or operation of the Proposed Action. No further analysis or reporting is required under the CAA or NEPA.

In summary, there are no significant Air Quality impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

Biological Resources

Affected Environment:

Threatened and Endangered Species

Online consultation was conducted with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) via the Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool in August 2024. Results of this consultation identified the federally endangered Northern Long-Eared Bat (NLEB) (*Myotis septentrionalis*), the proposed endangered Tricolored Bar (*Perimyotis subflavus*), and the candidate species Monarch Butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) as potentially occurring within the project area. A copy of this consultation is provided in **Appendix C in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

State Designated Threatened, Endangered, Special Concern, or Significantly Rare Species

In addition to the USFWS information, Virginia Fish and Wildlife Information Service (VaFWIS) database was reviewed for occurrences within a three-mile radius of the Airport. The extensive list of the Virginia state designated threatened, endangered, or special concern species that are found in this search area is provided in **Appendix C in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Seventeen (17) USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) were identified as potentially occurring within the project area, all of which have been designated as BCC by the USFWS. These species are listed in **Table 3-3 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

A review of the Center for Conservation Biology Virginia Eagle Nest Locator website indicates the nearest known Bald Eagle nest is northwest of the Airport, approximately 0.75 mile from the Proposed Action, off of Lake Whitehurst. Another nest was known to occur approximately 1.65 miles east of the Proposed Action, off of the Little Creek Reservoir. A map of the known Bald Eagle nests is provided in **Appendix C in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Potential Consequences:
The Proposed Action would affect plants and animals through the redevelopment of previously disturbed land within the Study Area. No additional fragmentation of vegetation communities or wildlife habitat would result because the Airport has already been developed. Areas of wildlife habitat associated with forested areas on the Airport, Lake Whitehurst and surrounding forested buffers, or the Norfolk Botanical Gardens would not be impacted by the Proposed Action.

No new wildlife habitat would be created as a result of the Proposed Action, and all elements of the Proposed Action would be reviewed by the Airport's Wildlife Coordinator to ensure they would not increase wildlife hazards to aircraft operations.

The FAA initiated informal Section 7 consultation with the USFWS on October 21, 2024 with a determination the Proposed Action would result in a Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA) determination for the NLEB and Tricolored Bat and a no effect determination for the Monarch Butterfly. The USFWS concurred with the FAA's determination on October 30, 2024. FAA's consultation with the USFWS can be found in **Appendix C in the ORF Runway Closure EA**. Based on these findings, the Proposed Action is not likely to result in significant impacts to the Monarch Butterfly, NLEB, or Tricolored Bat when compared to the No Action Alternative.

No significant impacts to migratory birds would occur as a result of the Proposed Action when compared to the No Action Alternative. Suitable habitat does not exist within the proposed areas of disturbance, and the Airport Authority actively manages wildlife to discourage the congregation of birds and eliminate the Airport's attractiveness to wildlife. Therefore, construction related impacts are expected to be minor and limited to transient birds migrating through the Study Area.

Additionally, because no additional project related improvements would occur after construction is completed, and the number of aircraft operations, fleet mix, and flight procedures would not change between the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action, there would be no additional impacts from the operation of the proposed action to biological resources when compared to the No Action Alternative in 2030 or 2035 once construction is complete.

In summary, there are no significant Biological Resource impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

Climate

Affected Environment:

GHG Emissions Inventory

The Airport Authority developed a Green House Gas (GHG) emissions inventory for the purpose of this analysis for the year 2023 in accordance with FAA guidelines.[4] GHGs differ from each other in their ability to absorb energy and how long they stay in the atmosphere. The Global Warming Potential (GWP) is a standard of measurement that was developed to allow comparisons of the global warming impacts of different gases by converting each gas amount to a carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e). GWPs provide a common unit of measure, which allows for one emission

[4] FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures (including the Desk Reference); FAA Order 5050.4B, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions; and FAA's Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook Version 3 Update 1.

estimate of these different gases. The GHG emissions inventory was prepared using the same data (see **Appendix B in the ORF Runway Closure EA**) as developed for the criteria pollutant emissions inventory in the previous air quality section. **Table 3-4 in the ORF Runway Closure EA** summarizes the GHG emissions from aircraft at the Airport for 2023.

The total emissions in 2023 from both aircraft and ground service equipment at the airport was 46,929 metric tons of CO_2e.

Potential Consequences:
The results of the GHG emission inventory prepared for the Proposed Action were compared to the results of the No Action Alternative of the same future year to disclose the potential increase in GHG emissions caused by the Proposed Action. The results of the construction emissions analysis were also added for 2030, because there is expected to be construction activity in 2030 that would generate GHG emissions. There is a difference in GHG emissions in 2030 due to construction activities, resulting in approximately 5,282 metric tons CO_2e per year. Other than the construction emissions in 2030, the operations emissions for 2030 and 2035 were identical to the No Action Alternative. The results of the comparison between the 2030 and 2035 Proposed Action and the 2030 and 2035 No Action Alternative are shown in **Table 4-8 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

In summary, the Proposed Action is unlikely to have a significant impact on the Climate.

Coastal Resources

Affected Environment:
The project study area is located within the Virginia Coastal Zone, however, the project lies outside of locally designated Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas. As such, the area is not subject to Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations.

Potential Consequences:
Because the Proposed Action is located within the Virginia Coastal Zone, a CZMA Federal Consistency Determination was developed and submitted to the VDEQ on March 13, 2024. On April 17, 2024, the VDEQ concurred that the Proposed Action would comply with the enforceable policies of Virginia's CZMP and would be conducted in a manner consistent with the CZMP.

Additionally, because no additional project related improvements would occur after construction is completed, and the number of aircraft operations, fleet mix, and flight procedures would not change between the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action there would be no additional operational impacts to coastal resources when compared to the No Action Alternative in 2030 or 2035 once construction is complete.

In summary, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on Coastal Resources.

Department of Transportation 4 (f) and 6 (f) Resources

Affected Environment:

Section 4(f) Resources

Two public parks are located immediately adjacent to the study area: the Norfolk Botanical

Gardens, and Azalea Acres Playground. Within the Norfolk Botanical Gardens is a 30-acre area known as the Norfolk Azalea Garden (DHR ID #122-1007) which in 2005 was determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. These resources are depicted on **Exhibit 3-2 in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Section 6(f) Resources
There are no Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Section 6(f) resources in the study area.

Potential Consequences:
Three Section 4(f) resources are located adjacent to, but outside of the Study Area, including the Norfolk Botanical Garden, the Norfolk Azalea Gardens, and the Azalea Acres Playground. None of these properties would experience a physical use as the Proposed Action occurs entirely within Airport property. The Proposed Action would not result in measurable increases in noise, air quality emissions, water pollution or other impacts when compared to the No Action Alternative that would dissipate the aesthetic value, harm wildlife, or restrict access of the 4(f) properties, therefore no constructive use would occur.

Additionally, because no additional project related improvements would occur after construction is completed, and the number of aircraft operations, fleet mix, and flight procedures would not change between the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action there would be no additional operational impacts to Section 4(f) properties when compared to the No Action Alternative in 2030 or 2035.

In summary, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on Department of Transportation 4 (f) or 6 (f) resources.

Farmlands

Affected Environment and Potential Consequences
The No Action and Proposed Action do not have the potential to affect farmlands because there are no farmlands present within the Study Area.

In summary, neither the No Action nor the Proposed Action would have an impact on Farmlands.

Hazardous Materials, Solid Wastes and Pollution Prevention

Affected Environment:
Hazardous Materials
Current activities at the Airport that generate or involve the use of hazardous materials include aircraft fueling, and maintenance (of aircraft, ground service equipment, motor vehicles, buildings, and grounds). Activities that occur at the Airport also use hazardous materials and generate hazardous wastes from various maintenance shop operations, and construction activities. In addition, many tenants who lease Airport buildings use hazardous materials and generate hazardous waste. These wastes are disposed of by the tenants, and the Airport Authority does not take ownership of tenant's hazardous waste.

National Priorities List
There are no National Priorities List sites located within the Study Area. The nearest site is the Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek, located over 2.5 miles from the Study Area.

RCRA Hazardous Waste Generators
A review of the EPA's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Information (RCRAInfo) found there are four hazardous waste generator sites within the Study Area. Additionally, the VA Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) reported two petroleum spills at the airport in 1992. Both sites are closed cases with DEQ.

Solid Waste and Recycling
The Airport Authority has a contract with Waste Management and TFC Recycling for its recycling and waste hauling needs. These contractors are responsible for collecting the waste and recycling and hauling off-site for disposal.

Pollution Prevention
The Airport Authority follows all applicable processes to address pollution prevention and to reduce the risk of pollutant transport should discharges or emissions occur during the operation of the Airport, or construction of any new facilities. Additionally, several plans and a permit are maintained by the airport/ These include a Virginia Pollution Discharge and Elimination System Permit, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan (SPCC).

Potential Consequences:
The Proposed Action would involve construction activities within areas with the potential for contamination. The following describes these areas.

Hazardous Materials

- *NPL Sites* - The nearest NPL site (Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek) is located over 2.5 miles from the Study Area, and therefore would not be impacted by the Proposed Action.
- *RCRA Sites* - Four RCRA documented hazardous waste generator sites are located within the Study Area. Although Site 2 (FedEx) is located just outside of the DSA, none of these sites would be directly impacted by the Proposed Action, as shown on **Exhibit 4-1 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.
- *VDEQ Hazardous Waste Sites* - Three VDEQ sites were identified in the cities of Norfolk or Virginia Beach: BAE Systems Norfolk Ship Repair (located at 750 West Berkley Avenue), Naval Station Norfolk (1530 Gilbert Street), and Controls Corporation of America (1501 Harpers Road). Each is over six miles away from the Study Area, and therefore none of these sites would be impacted by the Proposed Action. In addition, there would be no impacts to the four VDEQ listed petroleum release sites because each have since received regulatory closure.

Solid Waste and Recycling
Construction activities associated with the Proposed Action would generate additional solid waste such as construction debris (such as asphalt, concrete, and wood), building materials (such as steel,

wood, glass, and plastic products), and other materials commonly associated with facility demolition and construction. Since the Southeastern Public Service Authority's Suffolk Landfill is expected to have sufficient capacity through 2037 at a minimum (dependent on planned expansion projects that would add additional capacity).

Pollution Prevention
The Proposed Action would result in construction activity with the potential to result in the release of hazardous materials and/or pollution. The Airport Authority has several processes to address pollution prevention that would mitigate any risks of pollutant transport should spills occur during construction or operation of the new facilities, or if unknown areas of contamination are encountered during construction. These include a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan (SPCC), and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

The Airport Authority also holds an existing Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permit (#VA0089737). The permit requires compliance with all effluent standards mandated by the Clean Water Act through proper operation and maintenance of all facilities and systems of treatment and control which are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit. ORF is also required to monitor the existing stormwater discharges from the Airport for effluents of concern and report those to DEQ. Because of strict compliance with existing permits and regulations, the project is unlikely to have adverse impacts on water quality.

Additionally, because no additional project related improvements would occur after construction is completed, and the number of aircraft operations, fleet mix, and flight procedures would not change between the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action there would be no additional impacts from operation of the proposed projects, to hazardous materials, solid waste, or pollution prevention from the operation of the proposed action when compared to the No Action Alternative in 2030 or 2035. As with the No Action Alternative, existing passenger-related waste generation would continue to increase as the number of projected passengers increases. This would occur at the same rate as the No Action Alternative because the number of future passengers would be the same with the same waste disposal practices.

In summary, with the implementation of BMPS, those identified in the SWPPP and SPCC plans, and the VPDES permit, no significant impacts from solid waste or hazardous materials/wastes are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.

Historical, Archaeological, Architectural, and Cultural Resources

Affected Environment:

Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources Study Area/Area of Potential Effect (APE)
The Virginia Department of Historic Resources provided Virginia Cultural Resources Information System (VCRIS) search results for the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and areas adjacent to the APE, identifying the following properties and/or sites:

- 122-1007 – Norfolk Azalea Garden
- 122-5005 – Bridge No. 8003 (Robin Hood Road)
- 122-5994 – CSX Railroad (Beneath Route 64)
- 134-5569 – House at 5875 Burton Station Road

- 134-5463 – House at 5852 Burton Station Road
- 44NR0017 – Native American artifact scatter, temporary camp, or trash scatter
- 44NR0035 – Lake Whitehurst East submerged Native American camp site

The Norfolk Azalea Garden (Site 122-1007) was determined eligible for listing in the NRHP in 2005. None of the other sites have been reviewed for NRHP eligibility.

There are no known tribal lands of interest located within the project area/APE. Tribal consultation letters were sent by the FAA to the Delaware Nation, Nansemond Indian Tribe, and Pamunkey Indian Tribe in March 2024. A copy of this correspondence is included in **Appendix D in the ORF Runway Closure EA.** To date, the FAA has not received a response from any of the tribes; however, should a response arrive prior to construction, the Airport will make every effort to comply with the tribal concerns.

Potential Consequences:
The Norfolk Azalea Garden (DHR ID #122-1007), which is adjacent to the APE, was determined eligible for listing in the NRHP in 2005, under Criteria A, B and C, and the Virginia Landmarks Register. However, the Norfolk Botanical Gardens is outside of the APE. No other NRHP eligible historic sites/resources are present within the APE.

As mentioned previously, while there are no known tribal lands of interest located within the project area/APE, tribal consultation letters were sent by the FAA to the Delaware Nation, Nansemond Indian Tribe, and Pamunkey Indian Tribe in March of 2024. To date, the FAA has not received a response from any of the tribes, however, should a response arrive prior to construction, the Airport Authority would make every effort to comply with the tribal concerns.

In a letter dated April 22, 2024, the FAA made a finding of no adverse effect to historic properties from the Proposed Action. On May 23, 2024, the SHPO concurred with the finding of no adverse effect and concluded that no historic properties would be affected. A copy of this correspondence can be found in **Appendix D in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

Additionally, because no additional project related improvements would occur after construction is completed, and the number of aircraft operations, fleet mix, and flight procedures would not result in noticeable changes between the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action there would be no additional impacts from operation of the proposed projects to historic, architectural, archaeological, or cultural resources when compared to the No Action Alternative in 2030 or 2035.

In summary, pending a response from the Delaware Nation, the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and the Pamunkey Indian Tribe, the Proposed Action is unlikely to have an impact on Historical, Archaeological, or Cultural Resources.

Land Use

Norfolk International Airport is located in both the City of Norfolk and the City of Virginia Beach.

Affected Environment:

Existing Land Use

The predominant land uses within the Study Area include transportation, open space/recreational, and single-

family. Land uses directly adjacent to the Airport are primarily single-family residential to the west, commercial south, a mix of industrial, military, and single-family residential to the east, and recreational and single-family to the north. Existing land uses are depicted on **Exhibit 3-4 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

The portion of the Study Area within the City of Norfolk is designated as "Utility/Transportation," which includes all ports and airports located within the City limits.

The portion of the Study Area within the City of Virginia Beach is located inside of the Burton Station Strategic Growth Area. The Burton Station Strategic Growth Area (SGA) is predominantly industrial, but also has significant tracts of land devoted to residential and commercial uses with a considerable amount of undeveloped land that lacks a good network of internal streets.

Potential Consequences:
The Proposed Action would result in land use changes on the Airport, including the closure of Runway 14/32, construction of new cargo facilities, construction of a new deicing pad, and additional GA hangar development. All of these changes would occur on the Airport and would be consistent with the Airport Master Plan. The following describes the consistency of the Proposed Action with other local land use plans.

City of Norfolk - PlanNorfolk2030
All elements of the Proposed Action would occur in the City of Norfolk, within the areas designated as "Utility/Transportation". None of the elements of the Proposed Action would be inconsistent with this plan, which is supportive of the Airport's Master Plan.

City of Virginia Beach – 2016 Comprehensive Plan
None of the elements of the Proposed Action would occur within the City of Virginia Beach or be inconsistent with the plan. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be consistent with the City of Virginia Beach Comprehensive Plan, which supports the Airport Master Plan.
The Proposed Action would be consistent with all Airport and local jurisdiction planning documents and would not significantly alter the future land use patterns in the area. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant land use impacts when compared to the No Action Alternative.

Additionally, because no additional project related improvements would occur after construction is completed, and the number of aircraft operations, fleet mix, and flight procedures would not change between the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action there would be no additional impacts from operation of the proposed projects on land use to when compared to the No Action Alternative in 2030 or 2035.

In summary, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on surrounding Land Uses and is consistent with planned and proposed development at ORF

Natural Resources and Energy Supply

Affected Environment:
Natural resources used at the Airport include sand, concrete, stone, wood, and gravel. These resources are not in short supply and are readily available in the Study Area and surrounding areas. Fuel is dispensed at the airport as gasoline, diesel, and Jet A.

The new facilities proposed as part of the Proposed Action would result in increased energy demand for heating, cooling, lighting, and other uses**.** Energy is supplied as electricity and natural gas. There is no shortage of energy supplies in the Norfolk Area.

Potential Consequences:

Natural Resources

Construction of the Proposed Action would require the use of typical paving materials such as sand, gravel, concrete, asphalt, and water, and construction materials such as steel, wood, and glass. These materials are not in short supply in the Norfolk area and construction of the Proposed Action is not expected to exceed the available supply.

Energy Supply

Approximately 204,200 square feet of additional building space would be constructed as part of the Proposed Action, representing an increase of 21.8 percent over the No Action building area. Future estimates for electricity and natural gas demand are based on this additional area of buildings, using the same ratio of building area to energy use. The proposed surface parking areas and airfield elements such as taxiway extensions and aprons would not result in appreciable electricity usage and were therefore not included. While implementing the Proposed Action would increase the demand for electricity and natural gas, there is no shortage of energy resources in the Norfolk area, and the additional demand would not exceed the available energy supplies.

Additionally, Because the total number of passengers at ORF is expected to continue to increase under the No Action scenario, there would be additional demand on water and energy associated with operations in 2030 and 2035. The increase in demand is expected to be proportionate to the annual number of passengers and is depicted in **Table 4-10 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**. No significant impacts related to the use of natural resources would occur as there is an ample supply of water and energy to handle this increase in demand.

In summary, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on Natural Resources or Energy Supply.

Noise and Noise- Compatible Land Use

Affected Environment:

A detailed evaluation of noise levels using the most current data (2022-2023) can be found in **Section 3.3.10 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**. The 65 DNL noise contour encompasses 1.1 total square miles within the cities of Norfolk and Virginia Beach. The 65 DNL contour extends approximately 0.97 miles to the northeast and 0.7 miles southwest of ORF. The area within the contour to the southwest is made up of a mix of single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial, and industrial land uses. The area within the contour to the northeast is made up of industrial, open space land uses, and much of the contour in this area is over water.

There are no noise sensitive areas such as public schools, churches, hospitals, or parks within the 65 DNL Noise Contour for the Existing (2023) Condition.

Potential Consequences:

Construction Impacts:

Construction of the Proposed Action would generate increased noise during construction activities such as paving, grading, and structural work. This noise would occur at different times and locations throughout the construction period between 2025 and 2030. Since the project is still in the planning phase, specific construction activities and timing are unknown at this time, but the bulk of the proposed work would likely occur during weekday, daytime hours. Construction activities that involve active taxiways may occur during nighttime hours to limit operational and safety impacts. Construction related noise would vary based on the type of equipment used (examples provided in **Table 3-8**) and proximity to the construction site (example sound levels estimated in **Table 4-14),** and it is likely that multiple activities would be occurring at once, involving multiple types of construction equipment. To simulate multiple pieces of construction equipment being used at once, the Authority analyzed the sound levels produced by the simultaneous use of eight of the loudest construction equipment anticipated for the Proposed Action (eight pneumatic tools at 85 dBA each). The sound levels generated by this equipment usage was estimated at three different noise sensitive land surrounding the Airport:

- Azalea Acres Neighborhood (west of the Airport)
- Glengariff Neighborhood (north of the Airport)
- Residential properties along Burton Station Road (south of the Airport)

Each of these construction noise receptors is described in the following and shown on **Exhibit 4-2 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**.

- *Azalea Acres neighborhood* - This neighborhood is located west of the Airport and is composed of single-family homes, many of which date to the 1950s and 1960s. The nearest residential receptor is approximately 1,400 feet from the proposed cargo building improvements, and approximately 1,800 feet from the proposed Taxiway C improvements. At this distance, construction related noise would be reduced by more than 30 dBA because of the sound dissipation over distance. With the assumed simultaneous use of eight pneumatic tools, the resulting noise levels from this equipment would be below 64 dBA at this location, not counting the shielding effect of the buildings and forested areas located between the Proposed Action and the residential receptors.
- *Glengariff Neighborhood* - This neighborhood is located north of the Airport and is composed of single-family homes. The nearest residential receptor is approximately 1,200 feet from the proposed Runway 14/32 removal project. At this distance, construction related noise would be reduced by more than 30 dBA because of the sound dissipation over distance. With the assumed simultaneous use of eight pneumatic tools, the resulting noise levels from this equipment would be below 64 dBA at this location, not counting the shielding effect of the buildings and forested areas located between the Proposed Action and the residential receptors.
- *Residential properties along Burton Station Road* - There are several single-family homes along Burton Station Road, the nearest of which is duplex located at 6000 Burton Station Road, at the intersection of Barrs Road and Burton Station Road. From this location, the

proposed corporate hangar expansion project would be approximately 400 feet away. At this distance, construction related noise would be reduced by 24 dBA because of the sound dissipation over distance. With the assumed simultaneous use of eight pneumatic tools, the resulting noise levels from this equipment would be 70 dBA at this location, not counting the shielding effect of the existing trees located between the Proposed Action and the residential receptors. However, it should be noted that the type of construction proposed in this area would not involve the use of pneumatic equipment because there would be no demolition of buildings or pavement necessary for the proposed corporate hangar expansion project; therefore, actual sound levels would likely be less.

Each of these areas would experience temporary noise increases during construction activities, which may exceed ambient noise levels and be noticeable to residential properties. This could result in temporary conversation interference, activity interference (e.g., reading or watching television), or annoyance. However, this temporary noise would be limited to daytime working hours and be limited through the implementation of standard construction BMPs that include, but are not limited to, work-hour limits, equipment exhaust muffler requirements, elimination of "tail gate banging", ambient-sensitive backup alarms, construction noise complaint mechanisms, as well as consistent and transparent community communication.

2030 Operational Impacts:
The change in contour size, and subsequent change in the number of homes (six additional houses) located within the 65 DNL would be the result of closing Runway 14/32 and adding those operations to Runway 5/23. There are no public schools, churches, hospitals, or parks within the 65 DNL Noise Contour for the 2030 Proposed Action noise exposure contour. As referenced in **Section 4.11.1 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, the FAA's significance threshold for noise is if the Proposed Action "would increase noise by DNL 1.5 decibels (dB) or more for a noise sensitive area that is exposed to noise at or above the DNL 65 dB noise exposure level, or that would be exposed at or above the DNL 65 dB level due to a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase, when compared to the No Action Alternative for the same timeframe". None of the impacts would be result in an increase greater than DNL 0.34 dB, which would not be noticeable as a one- or two-dB increase is not perceptible to the average person.

2035 Operational Impacts:
12 additional houses (adding to the 91 that are already located in the 65-70 noise contour) are, or will be, located southwest of the Airport, along Cape Henry Avenue and Ashby Street in the Foxhall neighborhood. As noted previously, the change in contour size, and subsequent change in the number of homes located within the 65 DNL would be the result of closing Runway 14/32 and adding those operations to Runway 5/23. There are no public schools, churches, hospitals, or parks within the 65 DNL Noise Contour for the 2035 Proposed Action noise exposure contour. None of the impacts would be result in an increase greater than DNL 0.34 dB, which would not be noticeable as a one- or two-dB increase is not perceptible to the average person.

In summary, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on noise sensitive land uses.

Socioeconomics and Children's Environmental Health and Safety

Affected Environment

Socioeconomics

- *Induced Economic Growth* - The Proposed Action would result in the creation of construction jobs and income, and additional revenue from the new facilities being created. Therefore, the Study Area would experience a beneficial economic affect from the Proposed Action.
- *Division of Communities* - The Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport property, with no additional land acquisition required. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur related to division of communities when compared to the No Action Alternative.
- *Relocation of Residences/Businesses* - The Proposed Action would not require the acquisition of any residences of businesses. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts when compared to the No Action Alternative.
- *Disruptions of Local Traffic Patterns* - The Proposed Action would provide a new access controlled gated connection with Miller Store Road, to and from the proposed GA hangar expansion. There are two existing connections to Miller Store Road from the GA complex, and this new connection would be limited to tenants of the six new corporate hangars proposed as part of this project and is therefore not expected to result in significant impacts to traffic along Miller Store Road.
- *Substantial Loss in Community Tax Base* - The Proposed Action would result in minimal impacts to the community tax base and would likely benefit the local tax base by providing additional employment opportunities and supporting the overall growth of the area. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts when compared to the No Action Alternative.

Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks

The Proposed Action would not result in significant changes to health and safety risks including air, food, drinking water, recreational waters, soil, or products children may use or to which they would be exposed. No schools are located in areas where impacts are identified; however, children living in these residential areas may experience increases in noise. No significant noise impacts were identified, and there are no separate noise impact standards for children. The Proposed Action would not increase health and safety risks attributable to products or substances that a child is likely to come in contact with or ingest, such as air, food, water, recreational waters, soil, or products they may be exposed to

Potential Consequences

Construction Impacts:

Socioeconomics

Five areas are analyzed to determine the potential socioeconomic impacts (positive or negative) associated with the Proposed Project. They are Identified as Induced Economic Growth, Division of Communities, Relocation of a Residence/Business, Disruptions of Local Traffic Patterns, and Substantial Loss of Community Tax Revenue. The analysis for both construction and operations impacts are identified below.

- *Induced Economic Growth* - The Proposed Action would result in the creation of construction jobs and income, and additional revenue from the new facilities being created. Therefore, the Study Area would experience a beneficial economic affect from the Proposed Action.
- *Division of Communities* - The Proposed Action would occur entirely on Airport property, with no additional land acquisition required. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur related to division of communities when compared to the No Action Alternative.
- *Relocation of Residences/Businesses* - The Proposed Action would not require the acquisition of any residences of businesses. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts when compared to the No Action Alternative.
- *Disruptions of Local Traffic Patterns* - The Proposed Action would provide a new access controlled gated connection with Miller Store Road, to and from the proposed GA hangar expansion. There are two existing connections to Miller Store Road from the GA complex, and this new connection would be limited to tenants of the six new corporate hangars proposed as part of this project and is therefore not expected to result in significant impacts to traffic along Miller Store Road.
- *Substantial Loss in Community Tax Base* - The Proposed Action would result in minimal impacts to the community tax base and would likely benefit the local tax base by providing additional employment opportunities and supporting the overall growth of the area. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts when compared to the No Action Alternative.

Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks

The Proposed Action would not result in significant changes to health and safety risks including air, food, drinking water, recreational waters, soil, or products children may use or to which they would be exposed. As noted in **Section 4.11 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, the Proposed Action would result in non-permanent noise impacts during construction within the Azalea Acres and Glengariff neighborhoods, as well as other properties located along the perimeter of the Airport property. No schools are located in areas where impacts are identified; however, children living in these residential areas may experience increases in noise. No significant noise impacts were identified, and there are no separate noise impact standards for children. The Proposed Action would not increase health and safety risks attributable to products or substances that a child is likely to come in contact with or ingest, such as air, food, water, recreational waters, soil, or products they may be exposed to; consequently, the Proposed Action would not result in health and safety risks to children when compared to the No Action Alternative.

<u>Operational Impacts</u>

Socioeconomic

- *Induced Economic Growth* - The Proposed Action would support economic growth for the Airport and surrounding areas by providing facilities necessary to accommodate existing and future tenant needs in both 2030 and 2035. The proposed closure of Runway 14/32 would also free up land at the 34 end of the Runway, that has been identified by the City of

Virginia Beach as part of the Burton Station SGA. Development in this area is currently restricted by aircraft related height restrictions and the runway clear zone (which must remain free of structures or other development that could create a place of public assembly).

The ultimate vision for the Burton Station SGA includes a medium density residential and neighborhood commercial village, an expanded industrial park with an improved network of street connections, a new commercial center to complement the retail outlets, and commercial corridors reconfigured to create a more continuous development pattern of multi-story buildings accommodating residential, commercial and office uses.[5] Therefore, the Study Area would experience a beneficial economic affect from the Proposed Action, and no significant negative economic impacts resulting from induced economic growth are anticipated when compared to the No Action Alternative.

- *Division of Communities* - No additional impact to, or division of communities would occur as a result of the Proposed Action in 2030 or 2035 when compared with the No Action Alternative.
- *Relocation of Residences/Businesses* - No additional relocation of residences/businesses would occur as a result of the Proposed Action in 2030 or 2035 when compared with the No Action Alternative.
- *Disruptions of Local Traffic Patterns* - No additional disruptions of local traffic patterns would occur as a result of the Proposed Action in 2030 or 2035 when compared with the No Action Alternative.
- *Substantial Loss in Community Tax Base* - The Proposed Action would continue to benefit the local tax base in 2030 and 2035 by providing additional employment opportunities and supporting the overall growth of the area. Additional retail tax revenues would be expected from new tenant leases associated with the proposed improvements. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts when compared to the No Action Alternative.

Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks

No additional impacts to children's environmental health would occur as a result of the Proposed Action in 2030 or 2035, when compared to the No Action Alternative.

In Summary, the Proposed Action would not significantly impact Socioeconomics or Children's Health and Safety.

Visual Effects and Light Emissions

Affected Environment:

Light Emissions

The Airport is currently illuminated by various types of lighting on the airfield and landside facilities. Lighting that emanates from the airfield includes runway, apron, and navigational lighting such as: hold position lights, stop-bar lights, and runway and taxiway signage. Airfield lighting is located along taxiways and ramps for guidance during periods of low visibility, and to assist aircraft movement on the airfield. Aircraft lighting, such as landing lights, position and navigation lights, beacon lights, and vehicle lighting are other types of light sources on the airfield. Lights for

[5] City of Virginia Beach Burton Station Strategic Growth Area; https://planning.virginiabeach.gov/comp-plan/strategic-growth-areas/burton-station

landside facilities include fixtures associated with buildings, roadways, and parking facilities. The Airport is located in a developed area comprised of other uses that are also lighted and contribute to the overall light emissions in the area, including office buildings, hotels, retail areas, and other commercial and industrial uses.

Residential neighborhoods, which are considered most sensitive to light emissions, are present in all directions of the Airport. However, the closest residential areas to the Proposed Action are in the Azalea Acres Neighborhood (approximately 750 feet west of the Airport boundary), the Glengariff Neighborhood (approximately 1,000 feet north of the Airport boundary) and residences located along Burton Station Road (the closest of which is approximately 300 feet southeast of the Airport boundary). Of these neighborhoods, only select homes along Burton Station Road have a direct line of site to the Airport.

Visual Resources/Visual Character

The Airport has a highly developed visual character, typical of an urban industrial area. The Airport's runways occupy an area that is approximately one mile wide by two miles long. Airport buildings include a 134-foot-tall control tower, passenger terminal, multiple concourses, multi-story parking garages, hangars, and other buildings. Most building structures are one to two stories in height, with some larger and taller structures intermingled.

North and west of the Airport is primarily residential in nature, with the exception of the Norfolk Botanical Garden, a 158-acre botanical garden and arboretum, that abuts the Airport property to the north. South and east of the Airport the land use is more industrial and commercial in nature, with large business parks and the Norfolk Premium Outlets. Representative views of the Airport are shown on **Exhibit 3-8 in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Potential Consequences:

Light Emissions

The Study Area is currently illuminated by a number of different light sources including navigational lights, building lights, parking lot lights, and streetlamps. The Proposed Action would add exterior lights for the new buildings, airfield improvements, and parking areas. These new light sources would occur within the boundary of the Airport and would be designed to provide illumination to serve the Airport's needs while avoiding off-site glare and light pollution. None of the elements of the Proposed Action would occur in residential or other light sensitive areas, and no new light sources would be directed towards these areas. Potential off-Airport lighting impacts would also be limited by the presence of trees along Lake Whitehurst and south of Miller Store Road. With the exception of runway related work (which would not be visible from off-Airport receptors), it is anticipated that construction would occur during daytime hours, so construction related light impacts are not anticipated.

As a result, the new light sources associated with the Proposed Action would not create additional annoyances, interfere with normal activities, or adversely affect the visual character in the areas surrounding the Airport. New light sources would be indistinguishable from ambient lighting levels at and around the Airport and would not result in significant light emissions impacts when compared with the No Action Alternative.

Visual Resources and Visual Character
The Proposed Action would affect the existing viewshed by constructing new buildings, structures, and pavement. None of the four vantage points illustrated in **Section 3.3.12 in the ORF Runway Closure EA** would be substantially altered as a result of the Proposed Action. The views from Burton Station Road would change with the addition of new visual elements (the proposed hangars), however, the resulting views would remain consistent with the visual character of the Airport and that vantage point. Each view would be essentially the same after construction of the Proposed Action, with only minor changes to background building profiles and locations.

Although the Proposed Action would introduce new visual elements within the Study Area, the impacts from these new elements would be limited to views from certain angles or vantage points. Since the topography of the Study Area is generally flat, many of the views would be obstructed by intervening buildings and vegetation. New buildings, and airfield pavement would be similar in context to the existing visual environment of large one- or two-story structures.

Additionally, because no additional project related improvements would occur after construction was completed, and the number of aircraft operations, fleet mix, and flight procedures would not change between the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action there would be no additional operational impacts to visual resources when compared to the No Action Alternative in 2030 or 2035.

In Summary, the Proposed Action would not significantly impact Visual Effects.

Water Resources
Water resources encompass Wetlands, Floodplains, Surface Waters, and Ground Water.

Affected Environment:
Wetlands
Based on a review of National Wetlands Inventory mapping, there are several wetlands located within the Study Area, totaling approximately 36 acres (not including open water lakes and ponds). Of the 36 total acres, approximately 34.6 acres of those are forested/shrub wetlands, 1.3 acres are emergent, and 0.1 acre are riverine. Wetlands are depicted on **Exhibit 3-9: Wetlands and Waters of the United States in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Airport wide wetland delineations were conducted in October of 2020. On February 5, 2021, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued a Jurisdictional Determination confirming the delineated wetlands and boundaries. This Jurisdictional Determination is valid until February 5, 2026. A copy of this delineation can be found in **Appendix E of the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Floodplains
According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map 5101040039H (effective 02/17/17) and the Virginia Flood Risk Information System, both 100-year and 500-year floodplains are located within the Study Area, primarily associated with, and including Lake Whitehurst. The total of 100-year floodplains in 136.7 acres. The total of 500-year floodplains in 7.3 acres. Floodplains are depicted on **Exhibit 3-10: 100-Year and 500-Year Floodplains in the ORF Runway Closure EA.**

Surface Waters

There are several surface waters located within the Study Area, including Lake Whitehurst, and other unnamed drainage systems. Lake Whitehurst is a publicly accessible lake that serves as one of Norfolk's eight freshwater reservoirs, providing drinking water for Norfolk and surrounding communities. There are no Wild and Scenic Rivers or river segments listed in the National River Inventory located within the Study Area. The nearest listed river is the Northwest River, located over 20 miles away, near the Virginia/North Carolina border.

The Virginia Department of Health noted that there are no groundwater wells within a 1-mile radius of the project site. There are three surface water intakes located within a 5-mile radius of the project site.

The Airport Authority holds an existing Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES0 permit (permit #VA0089737), which is the state-administered program regulating the discharge of stormwater from the Airport. This includes compliance with all effluent standards mandated by the Clean Water Act through the proper operation and maintenance of all facilities and systems of treatment and control which are installed or used by the permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of the permit.

Groundwater

The Study Area is located within the Eastern Virginia Groundwater Management Area, which includes all commonwealth land east of Interstate 95, except for the eastern shore. According to monitoring data collected at the nearest United States Geological Survey sampling point on West Little Neck Road in Virginia Beach (located approximately 5 miles from the Airport), the depth to groundwater generally varies from six to nine feet below surface level.[6]

There are no EPA-designated Sole Source Aquifers in the vicinity of the Proposed Action. The nearest aquifer, the Columbia and Yorktown-Eastover Multi-Aquifer System is located over 20 miles away, across the Chesapeake Bay on the Eastern Shore of Virginia.
The Virginia Department of Health Office of Drinking Water indicated that there are no public groundwater wells within a 1-mile radius of the project site. There are three surface water intakes located within a 5-mile radius of the project site (each is outside of the Study Area):

- City of Norfolk, Moores Bridges West Raw Intake (PWS ID 3710100)
- City of Norfolk, Moores Bridges WB/LP/LW Raw Intake (PWS ID 3710100)
- City of Norfolk, In-Town Lakes (PWS ID 3710100)

Potential Consequences:

Wetlands

As shown on **Exhibit 4-5 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, no jurisdictional wetlands are located within the DSA for the Proposed Action. Therefore, no impacts to wetlands would occur.

Floodplains

As shown on **Exhibit 4-6 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, no 100 or 500-year floodplains are

[6] https://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis/dv?referred_module=sw&site_no=365411076071602 (accessed 2/29/2024)

located in the DSA for the Proposed Action. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not adversely affect any beneficial floodplain values.

Surface Waters

As shown on **Exhibit 4-5 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, no waters of the U.S. or other jurisdictional surface waters are located within the Study Area of the Proposed Action. Therefore, no direct impacts to surface waters would occur.

The Proposed Action would improve glycol recovery efforts at the Airport during winter deicing activities by providing a built-in runoff collection system, fully separating glycol contaminated runoff from other clean runoff. Centralized deicing facilities have the highest reported performance of available glycol collection practices, with seasonal collection performance in the range of 35–80% of glycols applied at the facilities.[7] Therefore, the Proposed Action would have a beneficial impact on water quality impacts associated with deicing activities.

Construction of the Proposed Action would involve grading, excavation, and construction activities that could temporarily increase the generation of surface pollutants, such as contaminated soils, fuels, oil, trash, and construction byproducts such metals, paints, and miscellaneous chemicals stored and used during construction. Potential water quality impacts would be addressed through compliance with an VPDES Construction General Permit. This permit is required for any project that would disturb greater than one acre of soil. A SWPPP would also be required to identify measures to prevent the discharge of sediments and other pollutants into the storm drain system or surface waters.

Additionally, because no additional project related improvements would occur after construction is completed, and the number of aircraft operations, fleet mix, and flight procedures would not change between the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action there would be no additional operational impacts to water resources when compared to the No Action Alternative in 2030 or 2035.

Groundwater

No EPA-designated sole source aquifers or public groundwater wells are located in the Study Area for the Proposed Action, and construction of the Proposed Action would abide by all applicable regulations required by the VPDES permit and SWPPP to prevent spills from causing adverse impacts to groundwater. In addition, enhanced glycol recovery efforts resulting from the Proposed Action would reduce the potential for groundwater impacts resulting from de-icing fluid contamination, further reducing the likelihood of impacts. Therefore, no significant impacts to groundwater would occur.

In Summary, no significant impacts are anticipated to Water Resources from the Proposed Action.

[7] Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) Fact Sheets, Deicing Practices. *Fact Sheet 21: Centralized Deicing Facilities* (April 2020). https://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/acrp/acrp_rpt_014_2eFactSheet.pdf

Wild and Scenic Rivers

As shown on **Exhibit 4-5 in the ORF Runway Closure EA**, no waters of the U.S., Wild and Scenic Rivers, or other jurisdictional surface waters are located within the Study Area of the Proposed Action.

In Summary, no impacts are anticipated to Wild and Scenic Rivers as a result of the Proposed Action.

Cumulative Impacts (Past, Present, and Future Projects):

This discussion of cumulative impacts discusses only those environmental categories where environmental impacts could result from implementation of the Proposed Action.

Air Quality

The Proposed Action would result in construction related emissions resulting from equipment used to construct the various project elements. However, the projected increases in emissions are not expected to create any new violation of the NAAQS. As a result, the Proposed Action is not expected to produce significant air quality impacts. No operational emissions would result from the Proposed Action, because the Proposed Action would not result in an increase of aircraft operations.

Other past Airport, roadway, and development projects have resulted in construction and/or operational related air emissions; however, the combined effect of these actions has not reached a level of significance to prevent attainment of all NAAQS for the Hampton Roads Interstate Air Quality Control Region. The past projects are already considered as part of the current attainment status of the region. None of the present or future projects are expected to generate emissions above the *de minimis* threshold for individual pollutants, or cause pollution levels for any of the NAAQS to lose attainment status. Therefore, the Proposed Action, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, is not expected to result in significant impacts to air quality.

Biological Resources

The Proposed Action would not directly impact any federally listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat, and a NLAA finding was made for threatened or endangered species located off Airport. Potential impacts to other non-listed species and migratory birds would result from the permanent removal of existing habitat areas such as undeveloped and vegetated areas. These impacts would not be significant in nature, and the Airport Authority would utilize BMPs, where applicable, to minimize the extent of impacts.

Other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects are likely to contribute to the overall loss of natural habitat in the area; however, the combined effect of these projects is not anticipated to be significant. Future impacts would be minimized due to compliance with local Chesapeake Bay resource protection areas, and policies found in local comprehensive plans that encourage tree planting and preservation of wetlands and wildlife habitat areas. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action, when combined with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in significant adverse impacts to biological resources.

Climate

The Proposed Action would result in additional construction related GHG emissions. Construction GHG emissions would result from on-road and off-road construction vehicles during construction of the proposed project elements.

Other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are known to exist that, in combination with the GHG emissions from the Proposed Action, would also generate GHG emissions from transportation (burning of fossil fuels), electrical use, and land use changes.

Natural Resources and Energy Supply

Increases in demand for construction materials are likely to occur during construction of the Proposed Action due to the size and scale of the proposed project elements. This demand would be compounded by other present and future projects that are anticipated to occur during the same time frame; however, no long-term shortage of construction materials is expected in the Norfolk area. Therefore, the Proposed Action when combined with reasonably foreseeable future projects would not be expected to result in a significant effect on consumable natural resources.

The Proposed Action would also increase the demand for energy supply to power new facilities and infrastructure being constructed. However, this increase is not likely to be significant and would be partially offset with the development and use of energy efficient technologies and renewable energy sources that would reduce the burden on energy resources. The existing and future energy supply in the Norfolk area is anticipated to meet the combined demand of the Proposed Action and all reasonably foreseeable future projects.

Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use

The 2030 Proposed Action 65+ DNL noise contour would include six additional residences, due to the closure of Runway 14/32 and the addition of those operations to Runway 5/23. No noise sensitive areas within the 65+ DNL would experience a 1.5 dB DNL or higher increase for the 2030 Proposed Action. Therefore, there would be no significant aircraft noise impacts in 2030.

Past actions affecting the number of aircraft operations or fleet characteristics have been incorporated into the existing and future modeled noise contours. No other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are expected to result in significant permanent noise impacts. Given the limited extent of noise-related impacts, the implementation of the Proposed Action, when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not result in significant impacts to noise and noise-compatible land uses.

Cumulative Impact Conclusion

The level of cumulative impacts anticipated to occur within these environmental resource categories is not significant due to the types of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, the extent of the built environment in which they would occur, the lack of certain environmental resources in the area, and regulatory and permitting requirements for the Proposed Action and other future projects. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative environmental impacts.

In Summary, the Proposed Action would not significantly contribute to cumulative impacts to any resource category on or near the airport.

Coordination with General Public and Agencies

A Notice of Availability (NOA) was published in the legal section of the Virginian Pilot on November 13, 2024, and made available in the Virginian Pilot's online legal notices website (www.classifieds.pilotonline.com) and the Public Notice Virginia website (www.publicnoticevirginia.com) for 30 days. The NOA described the Proposed Action, provided the public meeting date and location, informed the public on how to review a copy of the Draft EA, and initiated the public comment period. Copies of these notices are provided in **Appendix H, *Public Involvement in the ORF Runway Closure EA.***

A public meeting was held on December 4, 2024, from 6:00 pm until 8:00 pm at the Delta Hotels Norfolk Airport Lighthouse Ballroom, located at 1570 North Military Highway, Norfolk, Virginia. The public meeting consisted of display boards detailing the environmental review process and findings of the Draft EA. Airport and consultant staff were available to provide additional information and answer questions. Comment forms were provided at the meeting, providing the opportunity for attendees to provide written comments on the project, and an email address was provided for submittal of electronic comments. No written or emailed comments were received. Four people attended the public meeting.

Upon issuance of a finding by FAA, the final document and finding are to be made available for a 30-day public review period.

Mitigation Requirements and Permits

Air Quality

Construction of the Proposed Action would result in a short-term increase of particulate matter (airborne fugitive dust) emissions from vehicle movement and soil excavation in and around the construction site. The Airport Authority would ensure that measures are taken to reduce fugitive dust emissions by adhering to guidelines included in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5370-10H, *Standard Specifications for Construction of Airports*.[8]

Methods of controlling dust and other airborne particles would be implemented to the maximum possible extent and may include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- Exposing the minimum area of erodible earth;
- Applying temporary mulch with or without seeding;
- Using water sprinkler trucks;
- Using covered haul trucks;
- Using dust palliatives or penetration asphalt on haul roads; and,
- Using plastic sheet coverings.

In addition, when possible, utilizing alternatively fueled equipment and reducing the idling time on equipment would be employed to minimize potential air quality impacts.

[8] FAA AC, 2014, Standard Specifications for Construction of Airports, Item C-102, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion, and Siltation Control, AC 150/5370-10H.

Biological Resources

In accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, any activity during nesting season (which runs from April 15 through August 15 of any year) would require the area to be checked for active nests prior to construction. If nests are identified, a buffer would be established until the birds vacate the nest.
In an effort to minimize impacts, the Airport Authority would implement BMPs, such as silt fencing, during construction activities to protect against sediment and soils entering nearby drainages that wildlife may use. The Airport Authority would also draw upon the US Fish and Wildlife's Standard Nationwide Conservation Measures[9], as well as other measures designed to protect all birds and their resources regardless of the type or location of the activity. To limit potential affects to the Northern Long Eared Bats or Tricolored bats, construction working hours will be limited to daylight hours, where possible, to reduce potential impacts to bat feeding and high activity times, and the use of artificial light will be avoided in the areas within 1,000 feet of suitable bat habitat by working during daylight hours.

Climate

No mitigation measures are required to mitigate the GHGs attributed to the Proposed Action. However, for FAA NEPA reviews of proposed actions that would result in increased emissions of GHGs, consideration should be given to whether there are areas within the scope of a project where such emissions could be reduced. GHG emissions reduction can come from measures such as changes to more fuel-efficient equipment, delay reductions, use of renewable fuels, and operational changes.

Historic Preservation

No impacts were identified for historic properties; therefore, no mitigation is required. However, with regards to tribal concerns: The FAA shall follow the procedures in 36 CFR 800.13 for post-review discoveries if potential historic properties are discovered or if unanticipated effects on known historic properties are found after the agency has completed Section 106 consultation for the undertaking.

1. If a post-review discovery is made during implementation of an undertaking conducted under this EA, all activities within a 100- foot radius of the discovery would cease, and the Airport Sponsor shall take steps to protect the discovery, and promptly report the discovery to the FAA, DHR/Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO), and tribes that have expressed an interest in this area.
2. If the FAA has approved the undertaking and construction has commenced, determine actions that the agency official can take to resolve adverse effects, and notify the DHR/THPO, any Indian Tribe that might attach religious and cultural significance to the affected property, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (the Council) within 48 hours of the discovery. The notification shall describe the agency official's assessment of National Register eligibility of the property and proposed actions to resolve the adverse effects. The DHR/THPO, the Indian Tribe and the Council shall respond within 48 hours of the notification. The agency official shall take into account their recommendations regarding National Register eligibility and proposed actions, and then carry out appropriate actions. The agency official shall provide the DHR/THPO, the Indian Tribe and the Council a report of the actions when they are completed.

[9] https://www.fws.gov/media/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures

In the case that human remains are encountered during construction activities:

1. If human remains and associated cultural items, as defined by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), are encountered, the Airport Sponsor would immediately notify the FAA and follow the regulations at 43 CFR § 10. A NAGPRA plan of action would be implemented.
2. If human remains, funerary objects, sacred ceremonial objects or objects of national or tribal patrimony are discovered on state, county, municipal, or private lands, either through archaeological excavation or during construction, and no Burial Agreement is in place the Airport Sponsor shall require the person in charge to immediately cease within a 100-foot radius of the discovery, take steps to protect the discovery, and immediately notify the FAA, DHR/THPO, and tribes that have expressed an interest in the area.

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.

Recommended:

Genevieve Walker

April 23, 2025
Date

Genevieve Walker, Environmental Protection Specialist
Washington Airports District Office

Approved:

MATTHEW J THYS 2025.04.23 14:51:45 -04'00'

Date

Matthew J. Thys, Manager
Washington Airports District Office