



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Orlando Airports District Office
8427 SouthPark Circle, Ste 524
Orlando, FL 32819
Phone: (407) 487-7229
Fax: (407) 487-7135

August 21, 2020

Mr. Ed Wuellner
Executive Director
Northeast Florida Regional Airport
4796 US 1 North
St Augustine FL 32095

Dear Mr. Wuellner:

RE: Northeast Florida Regional Airport (SGJ)
St. Augustine, Florida
Conditional Airport Layout Plan Approval (ALP)

The Northeast Florida Regional Airport ALP, prepared by Passero Associates, and bearing your signature, is approved and the master plan is accepted. A signed copy of the approved ALP is enclosed.

The FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, section 163(d), has limited the FAA's review and approval authority for ALPs. The Act limits the FAA's authority to those portions of the ALP that:

- Materially impact the safe and efficient operation of aircraft at, to, or from the airport;
- Adversely affect the safety of people or property on the ground adjacent to the airport as a result of aircraft operations; or
- Adversely affect the value of prior Federal investments to a significant extent.

FAA has not made a determination on whether or not it retains review and approval authority for any proposed facilities depicted on the ALP associated with this letter (unless otherwise noted). Under Section 49 USC §47107(a)(16) (as revised per section 163(d) of Pub.L. 115-254), FAA must separately determine whether it retains approval authority for each individual proposed facility depicted on an ALP before construction occurs.

Although section 163(d) has limited the FAA's review and approval authority of proposed projects depicted on an ALP, airport sponsors must continue to maintain an up-to-date ALP in accordance with Federal law, 49 U.S.C. §47107(a)(16).

The following proposed projects are not justified at this time:

- Proposed New Runway 13R/31L
- Proposed Runway 24 Extension
- Proposed Taxiway Bravo Extension

We do not concur with the following proposed projects:

- Proposed Traffic Signalization at U.S. Highway 1
- Proposed Gate Signal and At-Grade Crossing
- Proposed Parallel Rail Line West of U.S. Highway 1 (Runway 13 RPZ)
- Proposed Development within the Runway 13 Departure Surface

We recommend the parcels West of U.S. Highway 1 containing conservation easements be monitored for potential wildlife attractants.

An aeronautical study (2019-ASO-5487-NRA) was conducted on the proposed development. This determination does not constitute FAA approval or disapproval of the physical development involved in the proposal. It is a determination with respect to the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and with respect to the safety of persons and property on the ground.

In making this determination, the FAA has considered matters such as the effects the proposal would have on existing or planned traffic patterns of neighboring airports, the effects it would have on the existing airspace structure and projected programs of the FAA, the effects it would have on the safety of persons and property on the ground, and the effects that existing or proposed manmade objects (on file with the FAA), and known natural objects within the affected area would have on the airport proposal.

The FAA has only limited means to prevent the construction of structures near an airport. The airport sponsor has the primary responsibility to protect the airport environs through such means as local zoning ordinances, property acquisition, aviation easements, letters of agreement or other means.

This ALP approval is conditioned on acknowledgement that any development on airport property requiring Federal environmental approval must receive such written approval from FAA prior to commencement of the subject development. This ALP approval is also conditioned on acceptance of the plan under local land use laws. We encourage appropriate agencies to adopt land use and height restrictive zoning based on the plan.

Approval of the plan does not indicate that the United States will participate in the cost of any development proposed. AIP funding requires evidence of eligibility and justification at the time a funding request is ripe for consideration. When construction of any proposed structure or development indicated on the plan is undertaken, such construction requires normal 45-day advance notification to FAA for review in accordance with applicable Federal Aviation Regulations (i.e., Parts 77, 157, 152, etc.). More notice is generally beneficial to ensure that all statutory, regulatory, technical and operational issues can be addressed in a timely manner.

Please attach this letter to the Airport Layout Plan and retain it in the airport. We wish you great success in your plans for the development of the airport.

Sincerely,

Stephen Wilson
Community Planner

Enclosure

cc:

AJV-E2 w/ALP

AJV-E24 w/ALP

AJW-E24B w/ALP

ASO-290 w/ALP

ASO-620 w/ALP

FDOT/2 w/ALP

Passero Associates w/ALP

Path and File Name:

(SGJ) - FAA OE/AAA Aeronautical Study Number 2019-ASO-5487-NRAFAA, Air Traffic Obstruction Evaluation Group; No Objection W/Provision

ALP reviewed as a planning document and this evaluation does not include any obstacle evaluations. Any changes to the runway physical end latitude/longitude coordinates or elevations must be uploaded into this iOEAAA runway/data base, to ensure the FAR Part 77 and TP calculations are run on the most recent data. All proposed construction projects (terminal buildings, taxiways, etc), and associated equipment must be filed separately as individual studies for impact on the National Airspace System.

FAA, Flight Procedures; IFR Effect

EFPTeam has no objection to the proposed changes per this study. All future construction projects/relocation(s) will be subject to a separate aeronautical study to insure current/future TERPs surfaces are protected. Review of this proposal is not considered a request for IFP development, FP Team must be notified at least 36 months prior to runway extension (and required NAVAID relocations) listed in this study to ensure timely instrument procedure amendments. An Obstacle survey meeting VG/NPI must be completed based on future threshold locations, new GS/PAPI location(s) (and likely close-in TERPs surface penetrations removed) to avoid loss of current IFR minimums [ILS and RNAV (GPS) w/WAAS-LPV minimums, see AC 150-5300-18B]. TERPs 20:1 visual surface penetrations (FAAO 8260.3D Para 3.3.2, formula 3-3-1) should be removed/mitigated or future procedures will be restricted to daytime only minimums. RWY 13R/13L will be considered a visual runway with no IFR departures. RWY 24 will be extended and improved to a NPI Runway. The extension of RWY 24 encroaches on the intercostal water way (ICW). The airport should conduct a study to determine the maximum height of vessel in the traverse way IAW FAR Part 77. This should include two heights: one for the ICW and one for the waterway to the airport waterway ramp. Enclosure 1 depicts the VGS and Visual surface areas. Vessels in this area could impact the 20:1 surface (night operations) depending on the height assessed. Extensive tree/vegetation removal is required in the VGS and visual area which may include the opposite side of the ICW. Runways 13R/31L and RWY 24 extension have been added to the database to protect these landing surfaces from future development encroaching on specified category of runway. OE/NRA studies currently in progress have not been evaluated.

FAA Tech Ops; No Objection W/Provision

Airport Layout Plans (ALPs) are long term planning initiatives and limited in scope, therefore conceptual in nature. ALP approval does not constitute blanket approval of new structures given the absence of detailed structure information required for comprehensive review. All new structures require separate aeronautical study submissions with detailed building plans for independent study. Ensure appropriate Notice of Construction/Alteration, FAA 7460-1, is filed for review of all permanent and temporary structures.