

Appendix F

FAA Comments & Responses





U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Seattle Airports District Office
1601 Lind Avenue, S. W., Ste 250
Renton, Washington 98055-4056

August 12, 2004

Mr. Charles Riordan
Senior Aviation Planner
Oregon Dept. of Aviation
3040 25th Street SE.
Salem, OR 97310

Dear Mr. Riordan:

Airport Layout Plan (ALP) Final Review Comments
Newport Municipal Airport
AIP No. 3-41-4100-13

The coordination for review within the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has been completed on the draft Airport Layout Plan set of drawings for the proposed improvements at Newport Municipal Airport. Our review comments, previously sent to you on June 10, 2004, are again provided herein.

Also, an aeronautical study (no. 2004-ANM-367-NRA) was conducted on the proposed development to determine its effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft. There were no objections based on that evaluation, but there were additional review comments arising from the coordination with other FAA divisions. Airway Facilities provided comments (see page 3) which were echoed by Air Traffic.

The Airport Layout Plan report will be accepted upon receipt of two copies of the final document. The FAA will approve the ALP and drawings related to Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 once our comments are reflected on the final drawings, with proposed development subject to environmental approval, where applicable. Please send us 3 sets of prints, signed and dated by the airport sponsor, plus 1 set of mylars (unsigned), and the ALP CADD files on disk, when they are finalized. We will return one 1 approved set to the sponsor. Please call me at (425) 227-2652 if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Don M. Larson
Airport Planner

Enclosures

cc:
Dennis Reno, Airport Supervisor
Rainse Anderson, W&H Pacific

SEA641:DMLARSON:dml:8/12/04:X2652:FILE:Oregon-13:Mc:Newport

**FINAL FAA REVIEW COMMENTS
DRAFT AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN (ALP) SET
NEWPORT MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

Sheet 1 – COVER SHEET

1. The month of submittal for final approval (which will probably be at least August, 2004) should be used. *Revised to September 2004.*

Sheet 2 – AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN

2. At such time as either the pavement or the edge lighting on Runway 16-34 is due for a major rehab, a cost comparison will have to be made between narrowing the runway vs. the cost of relocating the lighting system. The design standard runway width for airplane design group II (ADG-II) is 75', and 100' for ADG-III. For purposes of the ALP drawings, it is advisable to plan for narrowing Runway 16-34 to 100' at some point during the planning period. Show narrowing to 100' on the drawing, and note for "Future" in the Runway Data table. *A cost benefit analysis should be performed at the time of the next runway improvement project design to investigate the possibility of reducing the runway width to 100 feet. A note was added to the ALP and the CIP to address this issue.*

3. As shown, a future upgrade from airport reference code (ARC) B-II to ARC B-III will require 800' of runway safety area (RSA) before and beyond the declared landing distance available (LDA) and beyond the accelerate-stop distance available (ASDA). As the terrain drops off precipitously just beyond the ends of both runway-end existing 600' RSA's, it is unlikely that the required additional 200' on each end can be attained at reasonable cost through construction. Therefore, it is recommended that the increased RSA lengths be planned on the ALP through a future 200' displaced threshold on Runway 16, a 500' displaced threshold (an increase of 200') on Runway 34, and the use of declared distances (the future ASDA and LDA shown for Runway 16-34 in the Declared Distances table correctly account for this action). *Future displaced thresholds have been added for both runway ends to accommodate RSA and OFA future lengths.*

4. Along the future extension of the west side parallel taxiway, add "See Note 2". *Added.*

5. Show the radius critical area for the VORTAC as 1,000' (not 750'), per FAA Order 6820.10, VOR, VOR/DME, and VORTAC Siting Criteria. *The critical area radius for the VORTAC was revised to 1000 feet.*

6. The "Existing/Future" runway protection zone label for Runway 16 should be re-labeled "Future". Based on the current approach minima for the instrument landing system (ILS), an "Existing" RPZ of 1000' x 1700' x 1510' should be shown and labeled "Vis. Min. $\geq \frac{3}{4}$ Mi." (i.e., visibility minima not lower than $\frac{3}{4}$ mile). If the minima are not to be increased in the future, this smaller-only RPZ could be shown as "Existing/Future". *Lower than $\frac{3}{4}$ mile visibility minima are to be accommodated in the future, therefore, the existing RPZ was revised as noted above.*

7. The "Existing/Future" runway protection zone label for Runway 34 should be re-labeled "Future". Based on the current approach minima for Runway 34, an "Existing" RPZ of 500' x 1700' x 1010' should be shown and labeled "Vis. Min. ≥ 1 Mi." (i.e., visibility minima not lower than 1 mile). If the minima are not to be increased in the future, this smaller-only RPZ could be shown as "Existing/Future". *Greater than or equal to $\frac{3}{4}$ mile visibility minima are to be accommodated in the future, therefore, the existing RPZ was revised to 500' x 1000' x 700' for Approach Category B aircraft..*

8. Runway 2-20 is not correctly aligned on the wind rose with the azimuth or the drawing (the true bearing is off a few degrees). *The alignment was modified to line up correctly.*

9. All runway end elevations should be shown to the nearest tenth of a foot, per AC 150/5300-13, para. 503.b. *Elevations are now shown to the nearest tenth of a foot per AVN website elevations (as directed by Don Larson).*

10. On the Airport Data table

- a. For Airport Reference Point, change to:
N 44° 34' 49.3" W 124° 03' 28.5" (listed coordinates do not plot correctly) *Listed coordinates were changed as requested.*
- b. For Navigational Aids, delete "AWOS-3" (not a navaid). *Delete from Navaids.*

11. On the Runway Data table

- a. For Runway Width, Future, 16 and 34, change to "100'" (see comment no. 2). *Future runway width was not modified per recommendation that the width be evaluated at the time of the next major runway improvement project.*
- b. For Instrument Approach Aids, Existing, 16 and 34, add "GPS". *Added.*
- c. For both RSA and OFA Dimensions, Future, 16 and 34, change to "600'" and refer to a note (also to be added) that the 800' RSA will be met in part through the use of declared distances (see comment no. 3). *Dimension was changed and a note was added.*
- d. As specified in Advisory Circular 150/5300-13, Airport Design, show runway end coordinates to the nearest .01 second accuracy, as follows:
Runway 16 - N 44° 35' 12.63" W 124° 3' 33.74"
Runway 34 - N 44° 34' 19.39" W 124° 3' 30.26"
Runway 02 - N 44° 34' 43.45" W 124° 3' 34.73"
Runway 20 - N 44° 35' 7.01" W 124° 3' 9.59" *Runway end coordinates were revised as noted.*
- e. For Threshold Displacement, Future, Runway 16, change to "200'"; and for Runway 34, change to "500'". *Changed as noted.*
- f. For Declared Distances, Existing and Future, 16 and 34, all TORA should be "5398'". *TORA revised to 5398'.*

Sheet 5 – RUNWAY 16/34 & 2/20 PROTECTION ZONE PROFILES

12. On both runway profiles, indicate the actual profiles of the runway; at a minimum, the intersection elevation of 129', as shown on the plan views. *Actual profiles of the runway are not available, but the intersection elevation has been shown as requested.*

ALL DRAWINGS

13. Revisions must be made where appropriate for consistency with the above comments. *Additional revisions were made to other plans as appropriate.*

NEW COMMENTS (POST-COORDINATION)

14. Airway Facilities provided the following comments: (1) The hangars designated #15 are very close to the VOR, and will require careful coordination, and possible non-metallic materials in order to avoid VOR impacts. The sponsor should file a Notice of Proposed Construction early in the design stage when a decision is made to pursue construction. (2) The AWOS should have a 500 foot radius protection zone shown, in which proposed buildings must be analyzed for impact on wind measurements. (3) No VOR relocation is planned, and if needed, would need to be funded by the sponsor. 1) *Noted.* 2) *Noted.* 3) *Future VOR was removed.*