

Part 150: Records of Approval

Orlando Sanford International, Florida

Approved on 10/21/02

The approvals listed herein include approvals of actions that the airport recommends be taken by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). It should be noted that these approvals indicate only that the actions would, if implemented, be consistent with the purposes of Part 150. The FAA has provided technical advice and assistance to the airport to ensure that the operational elements are feasible (see 14 CFR 150.23(c)). These approvals do not constitute decisions to implement the actions. Later decisions concerning possible implementation of measures in this ROA will be subject to applicable environmental or other procedures or requirements, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The operational and land use control measures below summarize as closely as possible the airport operator's recommendations in the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) and are cross-referenced to the program. The statements contained within the summarized NCP measures and before the indicated FAA approval, disapproval, or other determination does not represent the opinions or decisions of the FAA.

OPERATIONAL ELEMENTS

1. Maximize East Flow (NCP, pages 9-1, 9-8, Table 9-1, Exhibit 9-1 of Exhibit 7-2, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum) This recommendation is to maximize east flow at the airport between the hours of 6:00 am and 11:00 pm. This procedure reduces noise exposure on areas of higher density residential communities west of the airport and increases noise exposure on predominately compatible vacant/agriculture lands to the east.

FAA Action: Approved as voluntary, when air traffic and airspace safety and efficiency and weather conditions permit. This procedure places departure traffic over the noise-compatible vacant/agricultural land. It is estimated that 78% of the existing air carrier departures are to the east, and this east flow is expected to continue.

2. Maximize Flow at Night To and From the East (NCP, pages 9-2, 9-8, Table 9-2, Exhibit 9-3, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum) When the airport has a 24-hour control tower, between the hours of 11:00 pm to 6:00 am maximize departures to the east and arrivals from the east (when air traffic conditions and weather permit). This procedure reduces noise exposure on areas of higher density residential communities west of the airport and increases noise exposure on predominately compatible vacant/agricultural lands to the east.

FAA Action: Approved as voluntary, when the air traffic control tower is operational 24 hours a day, and air traffic, airspace safety and efficiency, and weather conditions permit.

3. Easterly Departure Path Modifications (NCP, pages 9-4, 9-8, Exhibit 9-4, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum) For jet aircraft departures on Runway 9L, establish a departure turn that would direct northbound aircraft to turn to the northeast, as soon as possible after lift-off. This turn would be

maintained until being directed to turn back to the northwest, north, or northeast. This procedure would place Runway 9L jet departures for northern destinations over conservation land that would not ultimately be developed and avoid the residential area due east of the runway. FAA Air Traffic Control has been involved throughout the study and has indicated that this procedure can be implemented pending final review and establishment of final heading(s). No changes are proposed for jet aircraft departures on Runway 9L for southern destinations.

FAA Action: Approved as voluntary, when air traffic, airspace safety and efficiency, and weather conditions permit.

4. Westerly Departure Path Modifications (NCP, pages 9-4, 9-8, Exhibit 9-4, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum) For jet departures to northern destinations on Runway 27R, establish a northwesterly turn approximately three (3) miles west of the beginning of take-off roll on Runway 27R (a turn immediately west of US 17/92). This procedure reduces overflights of areas of highly dense residential communities to area of compatible uses and significantly fewer residential areas. FAA Air Traffic control has been involved throughout the study and has indicated that this procedure can be implemented pending final review and establishment of final heading(s). No changes are proposed for jet aircraft departures on Runway 27R for southern destinations.

FAA Action: Approved as voluntary, when air traffic, airspace safety and efficiency, and weather conditions permit. An environmental assessment may be required as a result of the change in flight tracks as this procedure may expose additional residents to noise from flights operating below 3,000 feet.

5. Jet ILS Training Traffic Corridors (NCP, pages 9-4, 9-9, Exhibit 9-4, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum) For jet aircraft conducting ILS flight training on Runway 9L-27R direct aircraft to continue along the runway heading to gain altitude beyond the airport boundaries prior to making northerly turns. The turns east and west of the airport should be initiated at the same location as the noise abatement turns identified in 3 and 4 above. This procedure reduces noise exposure on the Midway Community, immediately north of the airport, and does not decrease noise compatibility east and west of the airport.

FAA Action: No action required at this time. This measure relates to flight procedures under section 47504(b) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act. Additional review by FAA is necessary to evaluate the operational safety, feasibility, and environmental effects of this proposal. The FAA will issue a determination when its review is completed.

6. Close-in vs. Distant Departure Procedures (NCP, pages 9-5, 9-9) Maintain the current "close-in" procedure for jet aircraft departures on Runway 27R and implement the "distant" departure procedure for jet aircraft departures on Runway 9L. This procedure reduces noise exposure on communities immediately west of the airport due to lower thrust setting and allows aircraft to the at higher altitudes when passing residential areas east and northeast of the airport.

FAA Action: Approved as voluntary, when air traffic, airspace safety and efficiency, and weather conditions permit.

7. Ease Altitude Hold-Down Requirements (NCP, pages 9-5, 9-9) During west flow (east flow is the preferred configuration at SFB), some aircraft are held at 2,000 feet in altitude to provide separation from crossing aircraft. Recent changes have been made to hold departing air carrier aircraft from SFB at the Runway 27R threshold. These aircraft are held until there is sufficient space to release the aircraft to depart without the 2,000 foot hold altitude restriction. Further improvements to this procedure should be pursued to allow more aircraft to have an unrestricted climb west out of SFB.

FAA Action: Approved as voluntary, when air traffic, airspace safety and efficiency, and weather conditions permit.

8. Runway Length Modifications (NCP, pages 9-6, 9-9) The Sanford Airport Authority has studied in prior master plans, and is reviewing in the current master plan update, a 1,000-foot extension to the eastern end of Runway 9R-27L. This planned extension has been included in the NCP's evaluation of 2006 conditions. For the period after 2006, the current airport master plan recommends, for noise abatement purposes, any extensions to east-west runways should be located on the eastern end of the runway and any extensions to Runway 18-36 should be on the south end of the runway to reduce impacts on more densely populated areas west and north of the airport.

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of part 150. The planned extension of Runway 9R-27L is included in the airport's master plan to enhance capacity. Although the airport proposes to design the extension of Runway 9R-27L to reduce noise impacts, its primary benefit is capacity.

9. Aircraft Maintenance Run-Up Options (NCP, pages 9-6, 9-10; Exhibits 1-3, 7-1, and 9-6) Evaluate the benefits of a noise fence (solid barrier) of sufficient height and length that noise during run-up activity would be directed up or reflected away from residences. The Sanford Airport Authority should also investigate the benefit of hush house options that would result in reduced noise exposure to close-in communities. The benefit of these measures would be determined at the time such studies are completed. The reason for making this item a recommendation as part of this FAR Part 150 is that if future noise barriers are identified to be beneficial, the Airport Authority would want this item to be considered eligible for FAA funding.

FAA Action: Approved for study.

10. Maximize Helicopter Route Altitudes (NCP, pages 9-7, 9-10, Exhibit 9-5) Noise abatement flight corridors have been established at Orlando Sanford International Airport for helicopters arriving and departing the Southwest ramp. Due to the local airspace conditions, operations are advised to occur at or below 500 feet or the appropriate VFR altitude. It is recommended that departing helicopters ascend to and maintain 500 feet as close to the airport property as possible. Arriving helicopters should maintain and descend from 500 feet as close to the airport property as possible. These routes reduce noise exposure by having helicopters overfly roadways (in non-emergency situations) and maintain the highest altitude possible in the immediate vicinity of the airport.

FAA Action: Approved as voluntary, when air traffic, airspace safety and efficiency, and weather conditions permit.

11. Acquire Noise Monitors (NCP pages 9-7, 9-10) Three portable noise monitoring systems should be acquired by the Sanford Airport Authority. These would be used in conducting short term monitoring in communities around the airport, in response to requests for short-term monitoring. It also will assist the SANAC and Authority in their efforts to provide information to the public and consider additional noise abatement measures.

FAA Action: Approved. Eligibility for Federal funding of three portable noise monitors will be determined at the time of application. Monitoring equipment may not be used for enforcement purposes of aircraft in flight by in situ measurement of any present noise thresholds, for reasons of aviation safety.

LAND USE ELEMENTS

A. Modification to the Comprehensive Plans (NCP, pages 10-6 thru 10-8, and Exhibit 10-2, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum). The 2006 60 DNL and greater contours (with the proposed operational noise abatement plan) have been overlaid on the future land use plan as shown on Exhibit 10-2. Comprehensive Plans for both the City and the County should specifically identify that no new residential uses should be allowed in the 60 DNL contour. Presently, this designation of noncompatible land use within the DNL 60 dB is included only in the City's plan. This would protect the long-term noise compatibility with aircraft activity at Orlando Sanford International Airport.

FAA Action: Approved. The recommendation also was included in the 1994 Noise Compatibility Program and has been partially implemented by the affected land use jurisdictions.

B. Modifications to the Land Development Code (NCP, page 10-8, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum). The Land Development Codes for both the City and County should identify that no new residential uses should be allowed in the 60 DNL. This protects the long-term noise compatibility with aircraft activity at Orlando Sanford International Airport.

FAA Action: Approved. This is within the authority of the local land use jurisdictions.

C. Residential Use Limitations in Areas East and South of the Airport (NCP, page 10-8; Exhibit 6-5, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum). Due to the planned southerly extension to Runway 18-36 and the amount of aircraft touch-and-go training activity south and east of the airport, it is preferred that no new residential uses be allowed east or south of the airport's new runway system to the Conservation area adjacent to Lake Jesup. If, due to other reasons, residential use must be permitted, no mobile homes or home ownership should be permitted. This option, however, would allow the development of rental properties. This protects the long-term noise compatibility with aircraft activity at Orlando Sanford International Airport.

FAA Action: Approved. This action is within the authority of the local land use jurisdictions.

D. Limitation on Public Education Facilities Location (NCP, page 10-9, Exhibit 6-5, 9/25/02 Sponsor Addendum). No new public educational facilities should be allowed in areas east and south of the Airport (within the limits described in C above). This protects the long-term noise compatibility with aircraft activity at Orlando Sanford International Airport.

FAA Action: Approved. This action is within the authority of the local land use jurisdictions.

E. Use of Avigation Easements (NCP, page 10-9). If a restriction on all future residential uses can not be implemented for the entire area south and east of the airport, then, it is recommended that notification of noise exposure and overflight activity be required in the form of avigation easements for all new residential development in this area. This option assures that the future residents would have the knowledge of such noise condition prior to acquiring residential property in the area.

FAA Action: Approved. This action is within the authority of the local land use jurisdictions and the Airport Authority may wish to purchase easements without noise set-aside funding. FAA's policy published in 1998 (63 FR 16409) states that no Federal funding will be made available for mitigation of future noncompatible development on currently undeveloped land if it is located within the airport's published NEM contours.

F. Use of Overlay Zoning as a Tool for Implementation (NCP, page 10-9, Exhibits 7-1 and 9-6; Exhibits in chapter 6). One option for implementing additional limitations on residential use and requirements for aviation easements is through the use of overlay zoning. The overlay zone could include the property south of SR 46 and east of the currently zoned industrial areas located south of Runway 18-36 (east of Brisson Avenue South) to the Lake Jesup Conservation area. The overlay zone would allow all permitted uses and development approval procedures instituted by the City and County but would identify additional residential use limitations and aviation requirements associated with the overlay zone.

FAA Action: Approved. This action is within the authority of the local land use jurisdictions. FAA's policy published in 1998 (63 FR 16409) states that no Federal funding will be made available for mitigation of future noncompatible development on currently undeveloped land if it is located within the airport's published NEM contours.

G. Future Coordination on Planning and Zoning Modifications in the Airport's Vicinity (NCP, pages 10-7 and 10-9). Airport staff should be notified of requests for modifications and related hearing dates for applications for planning and zoning modifications (comprehensive plan changes, land development code changes, site plan approval requests, rezoning, subdivision applications, etc.). An individual at the County, the City and the Airport staff should be designated with the responsibility for this coordination. This coordination would better ensure that the Airport Authority can provide input on applications for changes in planning and zoning designations within flight corridors and high noise areas.

FAA Action: Approved. This action is within the authority of the local land use jurisdictions.

H. Land Acquisition (NCP, pages 10-10, 11-1 thru 11-2, 12-1 thru 12-3, 13-2) The airport authority has been in the process of acquiring property to the east and south of the airport over recent years and is proposing additional acquisition for noise abatement purposes. The airport proposes to offer to acquire incompatible property located in whole or in part within the DNL 65 dB noise contour of the official NEMs. The majority of the property would be east of the airport, although a few parcels are to the west and north within the DNL 65 dB noise contour.

FAA Action: Approved. Acquisitions are limited to existing non-compatible land uses located within the 65 DNL noise contour of the official NEM (2001 DNL Noise Contours), and consistent with FAA's 1998 remedial mitigation policy (63 FR 16409).