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Yes, it’s ALL we do!

8 offices
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- Raleigh, NC
- Harrisburg, PA
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- Albuquerque, NM
- Atlanta, GA
- Oklahoma City, OK

70 aviation-enthusiastic employees
Last Year:
10 Things You Need to Know About Airports

1. Why are airports important? *(Why does our community need an airport?)*
2. A pilot’s perspective of the airport *(What does the user see?)*
3. Funding basics *(Who’s paying for that runway extension?)*
4. Airport Master Plans and ALPs *(How does master planning for an airport work?)*
5. Overview of the NEPA process *(environmental regulations and requirements)*
6. Airport design standards *(a.k.a. Alphabet soup)*
7. Airspace basics *(Why all the height restrictions?)*
8. Noise basics *(How loud is too loud?)*
9. Compatible Land Use *(Can’t we all just get along?)*
10. Sources for Planners *(Where do we go for more information?)*
This Year:
Deeper Dive into Three Topics

1. Compatible Land Use
2. Noise
3. Land Acquisition
4. Questions and Discussion
1. Compatible Land Use

Source: USDOT “Fast Lane” blog, February 29, 2016
1. Compatible Land Use

Preserve and Protect the Airport Environ

- Safety zones
- Standard Traffic patterns
- Overflight areas
- Noise contours
- 14 CFR Part 77 height restriction criteria
1. Compatible Land Use
1. Compatible Land Use

**Typical Airport Traffic Pattern**

Traffic Pattern Altitude is normally 1,000 ft above the elevation of the airport surface.

Source: NCTOCG Technical Guide for Compatible Land-Use Planning in North Texas

Source: airnav.com
1. Compatible Land Use

Source: Delta Airport Consultants, Inc.
1. Compatible Land Use

- 14 CFR Part 77, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace

Source: 14 CFR Part 77, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace

Source: Washington DOT
1. Compatible Land Use

Source: Delta Airport Consultants, Inc.

Aircraft Glidepath
19:1 Slope

Threshold Sitting Surface 34:1 Slope

50:1 Approach Inner (10,000')
40:1 Approach Outer (40,000')
Visibility < 3/4 Mile

Source: Delta Airport Consultants, Inc.
1. Compatible Land Use

Source: Delta Airport Consultants, Inc.
1. Compatible Land Use

Source: lynchburgva.gov

Source: Frederick County 2030 Comprehensive Plan
1. Compatible Land Use

Source: City of Santa Monica Districting Map, Effective July 24, 2015

Source: gspairport.com
1. Compatible Land Use

Botetourt wind farm would be a hazard to aviation, FAA says in preliminary report

Source: Roanoke Times online, January 19, 2016
1. Compatible Land Use

Sources for planners:

- FAA Advisory Circular 150/5190-4A, Model Zoning Ordinance to Limit Height of Objects Around Airports
- ACRP Report 27, Enhancing Airport Land Use Compatibility

[Image of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5190-4A and ACRP Report 27]
2. Noise

Source: Delta Airport Consultants, Inc.
2. Noise

- Flight Tracks
- FAA Approach Plates- www.airnav.com

Source: smgov.net

Sprinks Municipal Airport. Source: NCTCOG.
2. Noise
2. Noise
2. Noise

- 14 CFR Part 150, Airport Noise Compatibility Planning
2. Noise

Source: “Community Noise,” NTID 300.0 EPA, December 1971
2. Noise
2. Noise

Source of photo: www.cloverfield.org
Santa Monica Loses Airport Lawsuit In Victory For GA Proponents

by Adam Thatcher
February 14, 2014, 3:30 PM

The city of Santa Monica has been working for years to close its airport, but a recent ruling has made that plan more unlikely. (Photo: Matt Thatcher)

Office of the Chief Counsel
Attention: FAA Part 16 Airport Proceedings Docket
AGC-610
Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Ave. S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20591

Re: Part 16 Complaint
National Business Aircraft Association, Kraeger Aviation, Inc., Harrison Ford, Justine Aviation, Kim Davidson Aviation, Inc., AeroFilm, Touris Bullo, James Ross, Paramount Citrus LLC and Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association v. City of Santa Monica, California

Dear Sir or Madam:

Pursuant to 14 CFR 6.16.23, National Business Aircraft Association, Kraeger Aviation, Inc., Harrison Ford, Justine Aviation, Kim Davidson Aviation, Inc., AeroFilm, Touris Bullo, James Ross, Paramount Citrus LLC and Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (collectively “Complainant(s)”) bring this complaint against the City of Santa Monica, California (the “City”), which is the owner, operator and sponsor of Santa Monica Municipal Airport (“SMB” or the “Airport”). This complaint is based on regulation 14 CFR Part 16 – Expansion or Reduction of Airports, of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the federal government to relieve and defend their agreements with local governments, including Airport Improvement Program grant agreements and Federal Property Act deeds. In doing so, the FAA will assure these airports, which are important national assets, are accessible and properly maintained as needed.

In addition to the federal government and the FAA’s general jurisdiction over the NAS, there are at least three specific matters that implicate those agreements and access to these airports must be maintained.

First, in some cases airports have been established by the federal government during a global conflict, such as World War II, to accommodate military assets needed in defense of our nation and its allies. Many of the airports previously controlled and operated by the federal government, were instead used to be local authority to operate under the authority granted by the Department of the Army. However, under this authority the local authority accepts ownership and control of the airport with the explicit condition that it must be operated in perpetuity as part of the NAS.

Second, airports agree with the FAA when they accept federal grant money under the Airport Improvement Program. These agreements, called “lump-sum agreements,” generally require airports to remain in good condition and are subject to periodic audit. In the event of an audit, the airports agree to pay the federal government Grant Agreement, for a set period of time—usually many years. The intention of these agreements is extended when any additional money is accepted by the local authority or in cases where the agreement is allowed to receive additional federal funds being awarded.

Third, since these airports are a national asset, the FAA’s revenue opts for policy that requires local authorities to utilize any monies generated on the airport for the purpose of operating and improving the facilities to operate—a viable alternative which continues as long as the airport is in use, even if any of the other two have ended.

The Honorable Michael Huerta
Administrator
Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20591

Administrator Huerta:

An airport that is loss has been lost in the struggle to close the airport. This complaint brings the issues to light and seeks to ensure that the airport remains accessible and usable for the benefit of the community.

[End of letter]
2. Noise

- Consequences of Doing Nothing

Source of photo: Tipton Against Airport Expansion
3. Land Acquisition
3. Land Acquisition
3. Land Acquisition

• Identify property

• Environmental (NEPA) clearance; EDDA
  • Public involvement

• Appraisal and review appraisal

• Boundary survey

• Voluntary offering by property owner; or, offer and negotiation

• If no agreement, what next?
  • Eminent Domain
Glad to answer questions

Mary Ashburn Pearson, AICP
mapearson@deltaairport.com
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