

McMinnville Municipal Airport
Airport Layout Plan Report

APPENDIX 1

FAA Correspondence



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation
Administration**

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

January 14, 2004

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

Dear Mr. Riordan:

Multiple-Airport Layout Plan Project
McMinnville Municipal Airport
AIP No. 3-41-4100-12

I have reviewed the Inventory, Forecasts and Environmental Review working papers submitted by the consultants for the Airport Layout Plan Update project for McMinnville Municipal Airport (MMV). The project is off to a good start, and the working papers are thorough and well-presented. My specific review comments at this time are as follows:

a. Page 2-13, last para., and page 2-14, first para. – The discussion notes the absence of a runway safety area (RSA) beyond the “stopway” on Runway 4. Therefore, by definition, that pavement cannot be designated as stopway (for purposes of declared distances) and should instead be called “paved overrun” or “blast pad”.

b. Page 3-29, Table 3-10 – The preferred forecasts of based aircraft and aircraft operations, respectively, are hereby approved and accepted for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) purposes.

Please call me at (425) 227-2652 if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Don M. Larson
Airport Planner

cc:
Don Schut, City of McMinnville
David Miller, Century West Engineering

SEA641:DMLARSON:dml:1/14/04:X2652:FILE:Oregon-12:M:McMinnville



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation
Administration**

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

January 30, 2004

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

Dear Mr. Riordan:

Multiple-Airport Layout Plan Project
McMinnville Municipal Airport
AIP No. 3-41-4100-12

I have reviewed the Airport Facility Requirements working paper submitted by the consultants for the Airport Layout Plan Update project for McMinnville Municipal Airport (MMV). My only specific review comments at this time are as follows:

a. Page 4-6, para. 2 – We concur that airport reference code (ARC) D-II is appropriate to establish design standards for Runway 4-22, and that ARC B-II is appropriate for Runway 17-35.

b. Page 4-8, Table 4-4, and page 4-10, para. 4 – Although the description of the runway safety area (RSA) beyond the approach end of Runway 22 is correct, FAA has determined that this RSA does meet design standards. This is based on the frangible fence section, standard gradients (i.e., ditch filling, etc.), and a lightly-traveled road across the extreme corner of the RSA.

c. Page 4-23, para. 3 – The aerial photo provided with this study (Figure 2-1) shows that gliders are parked close to the edge of Runway 17-35, a safety hazard. Gliders must be parked at least outside of the runway object free area (ROFA).

Please call me at (425) 227-2652 if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Don M. Larson
Airport Planner

cc:

Don Schut, City of McMinnville
David Miller, Century West Engineering
SEA641:DMLARSON:dml:1/30/04:X2652:FILE:Oregon-12:M:McMinnville

www.faa.gov/arp/anm



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation
Administration**

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

August 24, 2004

Mr. Charles Riordan
State Airports Manager
Oregon Dept. of Aviation
3040 25th Street SE.
Salem, OR 97310

Dear Mr. Riordan:

Multiple-Airport Layout Plan Project
McMinnville Municipal Airport
AIP No. 3-41-4100-12

I have reviewed the draft Airport Layout Plan Update narrative report for McMinnville Municipal Airport (MMV), and my comments are below. Comments 'a', 'b' and 'c' below are repeated (with revised page references) from my letters of January 14 and 30, 2004, on the previous working papers. Those comments have not been addressed, and the citations remain unchanged without explanation in the revised draft papers. FAA review comments must be addressed, either through suggested corrections or revisions, or through memo response, in order for the final report to be accepted by FAA as meeting grant requirements.

Old Comments

- a. **Page 2-13, paras. 1 and 2** – The discussion notes the absence of a runway safety area (RSA) beyond the “stopway” on Runway 4. Therefore, by definition, that pavement cannot be designated as stopway (for purposes of declared distances) and should instead be called “paved overrun” or “blast pad”. **Change wording.**
- b. **Page 4-8, Table 4-4, and page 4-10, para. 4** – Although the description of the runway safety area (RSA) beyond the approach end of Runway 22 is correct, FAA has determined that this RSA does meet design standards. This is based on the frangible fence section, standard gradients (i.e., ditch filling, etc.), and a lightly-traveled road across the extreme corner of the RSA. **Change to “Yes”.**
- c. **Page 4-22, para. 3** – The aerial photo provided with this study (Figure 2-1) shows that gliders are parked close to the edge of Runway 17-35, a safety hazard. Gliders must be parked at least outside of the runway object free area (ROFA). **This should be emphasized for an expedited correction planned in this study.**

New Comments

- d. **(Inside front cover page)** – When the final report is produced, add the following disclaimer statement:

“The preparation of this document may have been supported, in part, through the Airport Improvement Program financial assistance from the Federal Aviation Administration as provided under Title 49, United States Code, section 47104. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the FAA. Acceptance of this report by the FAA does not in any way constitute a commitment on the part of the United States to participate in any development depicted therein nor does it indicate that the proposed development is environmentally acceptable in accordance with appropriate public laws.”

- e. **Page 6-3, para. 1, Table 6-1 (Years 5-20), and page 6-8, para. 2** – The FAA share of eligible costs for projects in 2008 and beyond should be shown at 90 percent. Although it may be extended in future legislation, the 95 percent share for 2004-2007 is called a “temporary increase” in Section 161 of the “Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization ACT”.

I have also reviewed the draft ALP set of drawings for the airport. My preliminary review comments are enclosed, and have been forwarded to other FAA divisions reviewing the ALP and conducting an aeronautical study on the proposed improvements. These comments are provided at this time as a convenience to the consultants and to expedite revisions to the drawings.

The plans should not be finalized for submittal until the aeronautical study has been completed, as additional revisions may be necessary. I will forward final comments upon completion of the aeronautical study. Please call me at (425) 227-2652 if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Don M. Larson
Airport Planner

cc:
Don Schut, City of McMinnville
David Miller, Century West Engineering

SEA641:DMLARSON:dml:8/24/04:X2652:FILE:Oregon-12:M:McMinnville

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

Sheet 1 – COVER SHEET

1. The month of submittal for final approval (which will probably be at least October, 2004) should be used.

Sheet 2 – DATA SHEET AND AIRPORT TERMINAL AREA

2. On the Runway Data 4/22 table, for percent effective gradient, existing, if the listed runway end elevations are correct, and the runway is essentially flat in between, the gradient should be 0.02%

3. On the Runway Data 17/35 table, for percent effective gradient, existing, if the listed runway end elevations are correct, and the runway is essentially flat in between, the gradient should be 0.04%

4. Show the appropriate heading for each end of the runway templates on the wind rose. Also, label the azimuth ticks in 10° increments, and draw a centerline running through and slightly beyond the templates for exact alignment on the azimuth.

Sheet 3 – AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN

5. Show the 500' radius critical area for the ASOS, per FAA Order 6560.20B, Siting Criteria for Automated Weather Observing Systems (AWOS).

6. Show a specific plan to reconfigure or relocate the glider staging area, so that implementation can be expedited for safety.

7. Some dimensions scale to incorrect lengths, such as: (a) the runway protection zone (RPZ) for Runway 4 (1685' instead of 1700'); (b) the RPZ for Runway 22 (2480' instead of 2500'); and (c) the object free area (OFA) for Runway 17 (380' instead of 300'). Correct where needed.

8. Include a Legend on this sheet, too.

Sheet 4 – FAR PART 77 AIRSPACE PLAN

9. On the Runway 4 end, delete the black runway shading from the paved overrun/blast pad area.

10. The approach surface to Runway 35 scales to an incorrect length (5250' instead of 5000').

11. It appears that some terrain southeast of the airport may penetrate the conical surface. Verify and so indicate, if needed.

12. The ALP shows a fence (in symbol) in the primary surface near the Runway 35 threshold. If that is accurate, it is an obstruction and should be shown on this plan (and in the obstruction disposition table and on other drawings, as applicable).

Sheet 5 – RUNWAY 22 APPROACH SURFACE PLAN & PROFILE

13. On the plan view, label key elevations.

Sheet 6 – RUNWAY 4 APPROACH SURFACE PLAN & PROFILE

14. Label the runway ends on the profile view.

Sheet 7 – RUNWAY 17/35 APPROACH SURFACE PLAN & PROFILE

15. Label the runway ends on the profile view.

ALL DRAWINGS

16. Revisions must be made where appropriate for consistency with the above comments.



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation
Administration**

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

November 2, 2004

Mr. Charles Riordan
State Airports Manager
Oregon Dept. of Aviation
3040 25th Street SE.
Salem, OR 97310

Dear Mr. Riordan:

Airport Layout Plan (ALP) Final Review Comments
McMinnville Municipal Airport
AIP Project No. 3-41-4100-12

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 McMinnville Municipal Airport. Our review comments, previously sent to you on August 24, 2004, are again provided herein.

Also, an aeronautical study (no. 2004-ANM-483-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. Additional review comments arising from the coordination with other FAA divisions have also been included on the attachment (see New Comments, page 3).

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

1 Enclosure

cc:
Don Schut, City of McMinnville
David Miller, Century West Engineering

SEA641:DMLARSON:dml:11/2/04:X2652:FILE:Oregon-12:Mc:McMinnville

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

Sheet 1 – COVER SHEET

1. The month of submittal for final approval (which will be at least November, 2004) should be used.

Sheet 2 – DATA SHEET AND AIRPORT TERMINAL AREA

2. On the Runway Data 4/22 table, for percent effective gradient, existing, if the listed runway end elevations are correct, and the runway is essentially flat in between, the gradient should be 0.02%
3. On the Runway Data 17/35 table, for percent effective gradient, existing, if the listed runway end elevations are correct, and the runway is essentially flat in between, the gradient should be 0.04%
4. Show the appropriate heading for each end of the runway templates on the wind rose. Also, label the azimuth ticks in 10° increments, and draw a centerline running through and slightly beyond the templates for exact alignment on the azimuth.

Sheet 3 – AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN

5. Show the 500' radius critical area for the ASOS, per FAA Order 6560.20B, Siting Criteria for Automated Weather Observing Systems (AWOS).
6. Show a specific plan to reconfigure or relocate the glider staging area, so that implementation can be expedited for safety.
7. Some dimensions scale to incorrect lengths, such as: (a) the runway protection zone (RPZ) for Runway 4 (1685' instead of 1700'); (b) the RPZ for Runway 22 (2480' instead of 2500'); and (c) the object free area (OFA) for Runway 17 (380' instead of 300'). Correct where needed.
8. Include a Legend on this sheet, too.

Sheet 4 – FAR PART 77 AIRSPACE PLAN

9. On the Runway 4 end, delete the black runway shading from the paved overrun/blast pad area.
10. The approach surface to Runway 35 scales to an incorrect length (5250' instead of 5000').
11. It appears that some terrain southeast of the airport may penetrate the conical surface. Verify and so indicate, if needed.
12. The ALP shows a fence (in symbol) in the primary surface near the Runway 35 threshold. If that is accurate, it is an obstruction and should be shown on this plan (and in the obstruction disposition table and on other drawings, as applicable).

Sheet 5 – RUNWAY 22 APPROACH SURFACE PLAN & PROFILE

13. On the plan view, label key elevations.

Sheet 6 – RUNWAY 4 APPROACH SURFACE PLAN & PROFILE

14. Label the runway ends on the profile view.

Sheet 7 – RUNWAY 17/35 APPROACH SURFACE PLAN & PROFILE

15. Label the runway ends on the profile view.

ALL DRAWINGS

16. Revisions must be made where appropriate for consistency with the above comments.

NEW COMMENTS (POST-COORDINATION)

17. See enclosed comments from other FAA divisions. Please make needed corrections and provide information from available sources to the extent specified in the approved scope of work.

- a) **Airway Facilities:** AF agrees with the comment that a 500 foot radius circle around the ASOS needs to be shown. This is a protected zone in which any buildings must be screened for potential effects on ASOS wind measurement accuracy. In addition, we note that when/if Runway 4/22 is narrowed to 100 feet wide, it may be necessary to either modify the Runway 04 REIL (FAA owned), or submit a waiver to siting standards allowing the REIL to remain as is.
- b) **Air Traffic:** No Objection, assuming those issues mentioned in the comments by Seattle ADO are handled satisfactorily. A new study will have to be submitted when Runway 4/22 is narrowed to 100 feet wide, to satisfy the issues raised by AF on the Runway 04 REIL.
- c) **Flight Procedures:** No adverse IFR effect due to decrease in Rwy 17/35 length. Review of circling minimums and Rwy 17 IFR Departure minimums will be required when Rwy end is relocated.
- d) **Flight Standards:** (no comments)