

United States Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) / Record of Decision (ROD)

Runway Incursion Mitigation and Related Improvements

at the Boise Airport
Boise, Ada County Idaho

EAXX-021-12-ARP-1755170436

June 2026

1. Introduction

This document serves as the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Record of Decision (ROD) and provides final agency determinations and approvals for the federal actions necessary to implement the proposed airfield improvements at the Boise Airport (Airport Location ID BOI). This FONSI/ROD is based on the information and analysis contained in the attached Final Environmental Assessment (EA), signed June 4, 2026, which is incorporated herein by reference. The EA has been prepared pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1G *FAA National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures* and US DOT Order 5610.1D *DOT's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts*.

2. Background

The Airport is a medium hub airport located in the City of Boise in Ada County in southwest Idaho. The City of Boise (Airport Sponsor) owns the Boise Airport under the supervision of the Boise Airport Commission. The Airport is the largest commercial service airport in Idaho and serves residents of the Boise City—Nampa, Idaho metropolitan area. There are two parallel runways at the Airport, differentiated from each other by Right "R" and Left "L" designations. Runway 10L/28R is 10,000 feet long by 150 feet wide; and Runway 10R/28L is 9,763 feet long by 150 feet wide. The two runways are parallel but staggered in alignment.

Other facilities at the Airport include navigational aids (NAVAIDS), a network of taxiways, taxilanes, and aprons; as well as cargo operators, fixed-based operators, Idaho Air National Guard, Idaho Army National Guard, maintenance and safety facilities, and the terminal building, among other Airport features and structures.

The 2019 Master Plan Update (2019 MPU) identified a “hot spot” and areas of taxiway geometry that do not meet current FAA standards and should be corrected to improve safety and align the thresholds of the parallel runways. Additionally, the 2019 MPU identified the geometry of some taxiways as not meeting current FAA standards. Also, since 2016 there have been 18 documented wrong surface landings at the airport due to the staggered runway thresholds.

3. Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would address the runway safety deficiencies that have led to runway incursions by physically removing the FAA-designated hot spot, correcting nonstandard taxiway geometry, and aligning the two runway thresholds to meet current FAA Airport Design Standards. The Proposed Action is discussed in detail in Section 1.2 and shown on Figure 1-4 in the EA. Detailed components of the Proposed Action, shown in Figure 1-4, include:

- Remove 1,341 feet from the end of Runway 10R and extend Runway 28L by 1,578 feet for a total new Runway 10R/28L length of 10,000 feet
- Remove Portions of Taxiway J
- Construct Taxiway P off the Runway 28L end
- Construct Taxiway B off of Taxiway W
- Remove Portion of Taxiway F
- Relocate Runway 10R Distance Measuring Equipment (DME)
- Replace and Relocate Runway 10R Localizer
- Relocate Runway 10R Approach Lighting System with Sequenced Flashing Lights (ALSF-2) and remove the ALSF-2 support bridge
- Replace and Relocate Runway 10R VASI with Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs) in a new location
- Relocate Runway 10R Glideslope
- Relocate Runway 10R Runway Visual Range (RVR)
- Replace and Relocate Runway 28L VASI with PAPIs in a new location
- Remove 10R Inner Marker
- Remove and Replace Runway 28L Medium Intensity Approach Lighting System with Runway Alignment Indicator Lights (MALSR)
- Relocation of the NAVAIDs as noted above would also include the relocation of associated equipment / storage shelters
- Install new conduit and underground vaults for utilities such as power and fiber optic transmission systems in support of the NAVAIDs
- Amend instrument flight procedures

4. Purpose and Need

Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the EA present the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to enhance runway safety at the Airport by eliminating a hot spot, correcting nonstandard taxiway geometry, and reducing the likelihood of wrong

surface landings as identified during the 2019 MPU process and the Safety Risk Management Panel by aligning the thresholds of parallel runways.

The Proposed Action is needed because the 2019 MPU development process identified runway safety issues at the Airport including FAA-designated hot spots, nonstandard taxiway geometry, and staggered runway thresholds that increase the risk for runway incursions and wrong surface landings. Improvements to correct those issues would require shifting and/or relocating NAVAIDs as described in Section 1.2 of the EA.

5. Federal Agency Actions and Approvals

The FAA actions, determinations, and approvals necessary for this project to proceed include the following:

1. Unconditional approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) to depict those portions of the Proposed Action as described in Section 1.2 of the EA, which are subject to FAA review and approval pursuant to 49 USC 47107(a)(16)(B).
2. Determination that Environmental Analysis Prerequisites associated with any future Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding applications regarding the Proposed Action have been fulfilled pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 47101 and/or the imposition and use of Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) have been fulfilled pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 40117, as implemented by 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 158.25.
3. Amendments to existing instrument approach and departure procedures at the Airport.
4. Relocate and/or replace the following FAA-owned NAVAIDs: relocate Runway 10R DME, replace and relocate Runway 10R localizer, remove 10R inner marker, relocate Runway 10R ALSF-2, replace Runway 10R VASI with Runway 10R PAPIs, relocate Runway 10R glideslope, relocate Runway 10R RVR, replace Runway 28L VASI with PAPIs, and replace Runway 28L MALSR.
5. Construct fiber optic cable loop through reimbursable agreement between the Airport Sponsor and FAA.

6. Alternatives

In Chapter 3 the EA identified and evaluated reasonable alternatives that may accomplish the objectives of the Proposed Action in accordance with NEPA, FAA Order 1050.1G, US DOT Order 5610.1D, and FAA design standards. The EA carried forward for detailed evaluation the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. The alternatives that were carried forward are briefly summarized below.

6.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Airport would not implement any improvements or other associated actions. The No Action Alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need. However,

its consideration serves as a baseline for comparison of potential impacts from the Proposed Action.

6.2 Alternative 2: Align Runway 10R/28L Threshold (Part of Proposed Action)

This alternative removes 1,341 feet from the end of Runway 10R and extends Runway 28L by 1,578 feet for a total new Runway 10R/28L length of 10,000 feet. This change would allow for two full parallel runways at the Airport, 10,000 feet in length, with aligned runway thresholds. Relocation and/or replacement of associated NAVAIDs on the runways will also be necessary. Due to FAA requirements for NAVAID locations, the relocated NAVAIDs for Runway 10R/28L would conflict with existing Taxiway F. To correct this, the Airport Sponsor would remove portions of Taxiway F, and extend Taxiway B. To correct taxiway geometry and remove the hot spot, the Airport Sponsor proposes to remove portions of Taxiway J.

7. Affected Environment

The General Study Area, as seen in Figure 4-1 of the EA, encompasses about 4,143 acres and is entirely within Ada County. The General Study Area includes the Project Construction Area and an additional buffer to account for a larger geographic area in which other reasonably foreseeable project impacts to resource categories may occur (e.g., air quality, noise-sensitive land uses, socioeconomic impacts, U.S. Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) resources, and historic and cultural resources).

The General Study Area boundary was based on the Airport's existing Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) 65 decibel (dB) noise contour and the boundary lines were squared off to follow natural boundaries and roadways in the Airport vicinity. The Project Construction Area encompasses about 1,125 acres, is entirely on Airport property, and represents the area where ground disturbing activities (including construction staging) for the Proposed Action would occur. The Project Construction Area is mostly rectangular but extends to the south near West Gowen Road. This extension addresses the area in which NAVAID cabling would be replaced and includes the Airport's electrical vault.

Given the location of the Airport, the following resources are not present in the Project Study Area:

- Coastal resources
- Farmlands
- Floodplains
- Wild and Scenic Rivers

8. Environmental Consequences

Chapter 4 of the EA evaluates each of the environmental impact categories identified in FAA Order 1050.1G and includes the environmental consequences of the No Action Alternative, and

the Proposed Action. No thresholds of significance are expected to be exceeded for any of the categories. Below is a summary of the findings.

8.1 Aviation Emissions and Air Quality

The Proposed Action would not increase or change the number or type of aircraft operations at the Airport beyond the current forecast. As such, project related operational emissions are not anticipated to increase. The project is in an area that is in attainment for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards, so the General Conformity Rule does not apply. That said, long-term project-related emissions would be well below *de minimis* threshold values. Temporary emissions and associated air quality impacts will be short-term and of minimal local impact. As a result, the Proposed Action will have *no significant impact on air quality*.

8.2 Biological Resources

The Project Construction Area is heavily developed and disturbed and does not provide suitable habitat for general wildlife, federally protected species, migratory birds, or state-sensitive species. Per the significance thresholds established in FAA Order 1050.1G, the Proposed Action will have *no significant impact on biological resources*.

8.3 Section 4(f) and Land and Water Conservation Fund Section 6(f) Resources

No physical use or constructive use of historic resources, parks, recreational areas, or refuge resources protected under Section 4(f) will be required under the Proposed Action. As a result, the Proposed Action will have *no significant impact on Section 4(f) resources*.

8.4 Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention

Construction and operation of the Proposed Action will not involve known hazardous materials sites or result in the Airport producing an appreciably different quantity or type of hazardous waste. Construction of the Proposed Action will have the potential to cause short-term, temporary impacts regarding hazardous materials, solid waste, and pollution prevention. Waste materials generated will be handled and disposed of in accordance with appropriate federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The Proposed Action will have *no significant impact on hazardous materials, solid waste, or pollution prevention activities*.

8.5 Historical, Architectural, Archeological and Cultural Resources

Through coordination, the FAA determined and the Idaho SHPO concurred that there would be "*No Historic Properties Affected*" as a result of the Proposed Undertaking. That said, the Airport Sponsor will ensure that construction plans label the area around the Compass Swing Base as "do not disturb" and construction documents will contractually require the contractor to install construction fencing around the Compass Swing Base to prevent disturbance to the resource. An additional contract provision will obligate the Contractor to adhere to an

Inadvertent Discovery Plan protocol in the unlikely event that there is an unanticipated discovery of archeological material during construction. As a result, the Proposed Action will have *no significant impact on historical, architectural, archeological and cultural resources*.

8.6 Land Use

Under the Proposed Action, no additional incompatible land uses and no additional significance thresholds were identified. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have *no significant effect on land use within the vicinity of the Airport*.

8.7 Natural Resources and Energy Supplies

Impacts resulting from the implementation of the Proposed Action are anticipated to be insignificant with respect to energy supply, natural resources, and sustainable design, as no energy shortfalls or impacts on energy availability are expected. In addition, there should not be increased consumption from air or ground vehicles that would produce shortages in supplies, beyond the temporary use of construction equipment. Construction materials and fuel sources to construct and operate the Proposed Action are readily available in the region. Therefore, the Proposed Action will have *no significant impact on natural resources and energy*.

8.8 Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use

Construction of the Proposed Action would produce noise from construction vehicles and machinery and would generally be limited to the immediate vicinity of the construction activity. Additionally, construction will necessitate a shift in operations from Runway 10R/28L to Runway 10L/28R during the seven-month construction period in 2028 and the eight-month construction period in 2029. This shift in operations will result in a temporary expanded Proposed Action DNL 65 dB noise contour. It is estimated that 94 residents and 36 housing units will experience this temporary increase in 2028 and 101 residents and 37 housing units will experience this temporary increase in 2029.

Implementing the Proposed Action would decrease the number of residents, housing units, and acreage in the DNL 65+ dB noise contours as compared to the No Action Alternative and would not result in a DNL 1.5 dB increase over any noise-sensitive sites either during construction or implementation of the Proposed Action. Therefore, there would be *no significant noise impact*. As a result no mitigation is required or proposed.

8.9 Socioeconomic Impacts and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks

The analysis did not identify any significant impacts to socioeconomics or children's environmental health and safety risks that would occur by implementing the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action activities are limited to the land within and immediately surrounding the Airport, and would have no effect on economic activity, employment, income, housing, public

services, social conditions, or low-income populations in the vicinity of the Airport. The Proposed Action would have no effect on children's environmental health and safety as the proposed construction areas are limited to land currently owned by the Airport or used for agricultural purposes. Therefore, the Proposed Action will have *no significant impact on socioeconomics or children's environmental health and safety*.

8.10 Visual Effects (Including Light Emissions)

Implementing the Proposed Action would relocate and/or replace existing NAVAIDs and shift runway edge lighting and runway end lighting. With the Runway 10R end to be aligned with the Runway 10L threshold, the lighting associated with the runways and NAVAIDs would be relocated and/or replaced further to the east on the Airport property. The Airport Sponsor would remove the ALSF-2 bridge over New York Canal, resulting in darker skies over that area of the canal during the night when the lights would be visible. Additionally, removal of Taxiway J would remove the blue medium-intensity edge lights. Because BOI has existed in this area for many decades with comparable lighting features, these new facilities are not anticipated to create an annoyance among people or interfere with normal activities.

Overall, from the ground, the visual character of the Airport would not experience a significant change as a result of the operation of the Proposed Action. Aerially, the visual character of the Airport would change in that the runway thresholds would be aligned for the safety of the pilots using the Airport. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have *no significant effect on light emissions, and the visual character within the Study Area* and the general vicinity of the Airport.

8.11 Water Resources

Under the Proposed Action, no impact to wetlands or surface waters will occur. The Proposed Action would not involve construction or excavation activities with the potential to affect groundwater due to the low groundwater table within the Project Construction Area. No groundwater withdrawals, construction of new groundwater wells, or modification of groundwater wells are proposed. With adherence to stormwater permits and applicable laws, the Proposed Action would have *no significant impact on water resources*.

9. Mitigation/Minimization

The Airport Sponsor has committed to some minimization measures as part of the Proposed Action. The agreed upon minimization measures are included in Chapter 4 of the EA and summarized below.

- The Airport Sponsor will ensure that construction plans label the area around the Compass Swing Base as "do not disturb". Construction documents will contractually require the contractor to install construction fencing around the Compass Swing Base to prevent disturbance to the resource.

- The Airport Sponsor will ensure construction documents include a contract provision obligating the Contractor to adhere to an Inadvertent Discovery Plan protocol in the unlikely event that there is an unanticipated discovery of archeological material during construction.

10. Public and Agency Involvement

Public and Agency coordination and involvement is discussed in Chapter 5 and Appendix L of the Final EA and summarized below.

On June 7, 2022, BOI held an agency scoping meeting and a separate public scoping meeting. A total of 11 agency representatives signed into the agency scoping meeting and attended a presentation on the project. A total of 14 members of the public signed into the scoping meeting, which functioned as an “open house” workshop where members of the public could view exhibit boards containing project information and direct questions to members of the Airport Sponsor and the EA consultant team.

As documented in the EA, BOI and FAA coordinated with specific agencies throughout the development of the EA, to determine resources present and potential impacts to those resources.

The Draft EA was made available from April 1, 2026, through May 1, 2026. BOI held a public workshop during the 30-day review period. Ten entities signed into the public workshop, which included a presentation. Two comments were received. Comments were addressed in the EA and identified no new significant impacts or areas where additional analysis were necessary.

11. Decision and Order

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

This decision does not constitute a commitment of funds under the AIP; however, it does fulfill the environmental prerequisites to approve applications for grants of AIP funds for the proposed project in the future (49 U.S.C § 47101).

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

Prepared By: Heidi S. Bruner, P.E.
Environmental Protection Specialist
Helena Airports District Office

Approved By:

_ Jason Ritchie, P.E.
Director (A), Office of Airports
FAA Northwest Mountain Region

Date

Right of Appeal

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