



February 24, 2009

Ms. Rebecca Henry  
Program Manager  
Planning and Compliance  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Orlando Airports District Office  
5950 Hazeltine National Drive  
Suite 400  
Orlando, Florida 32822-5024

**RE: Craig Airport (CRG)  
Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and Master Plan Update  
FAA Final Review Comments**

Dear Ms. Henry:

Thank you for providing the final FAA Division comments with regard to the Craig Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan set provide in your January 15, 2009 e-mail. We have incorporated the required changes, and have provided our response to FAA comments and recommendations below.

1. ALP indicates a service road through the Runway 32/GS critical area. This violates the ILS siting criteria; therefore we recommend that the road be relocated behind the GS.

**LPA Response:** The service road was relocated behind the glideslope critical area. The road identified by the FAA was marked for closure and relocation to the new site behind the GS critical area. Additional text has been added to the ALP to clarify the road relocation.

2. Reimbursable projects due to Runway 14/32 Extension: Runway 32 PAPI, Rwy 32 MALSR and Localizer, and Runway 14 PAPI. To accomplish these relocation projects, a reimbursable agreement is required between Jacksonville Aviation Authority/Craig Airport and the FAA. Please contact Angela Freeman, Lead Planner, Planning & Integration Office at 404-305-7054 to discuss the reimbursable process.

**LPA Response:** This information was provided to JAA management who will work with FAA to develop a reimbursable agreement related to the relocation of the listed navigational aids during final planning and design.

3. Line of Sight from the ATCT to existing and future operational surfaces shall be protected. "Shadow Studies" for planned structures and/or parked aircraft shall be

submitted to the FAA for approval. Air Traffic (AT) Division must review and approve the shadow studies.

**LPA Response:** As part of the “notice of proposed construction” associated with new facility development at CRG, “shadow studies” will be performed to determine the potential impact of the development to Air Traffic Control line of sight requirements. However, there is no proposed development that would appear to create any problem with any existing movement areas or impact ATCT Line of Sight on the airport. Notice of Proposed On-Airport Construction with Shadow Studies will be submitted at least six (6) months prior to proposed construction for FAA approval.

4. **\*\*\*NO IFR EFFECT\*\*\*** The Eastern FPO has reviewed this ALP and has the following comments:

- a. Page 2 of 9 – Runway data indicates that Runway 14/32 will be extended and displaced thresholds added sometime in the future. The FPO needs to have a minimum of 12 months (currently 18 months) advanced notice of the construction so that a publication data can be defined to coincide with runway completion date. If this advanced notice is not provided, the airport runs the risk of losing the approach to this runway.

**LPA Response:** Jacksonville Aviation Authority will inform the FAA Airport Districts Office and Flight Planning Office at least 18 months prior to construction of the recommended extension of Runway 32.

- b. The FPO would recommend that the Airport consider requesting RNAV approaches be developed on Runway 5/23 so that the airport will continue to have IFR capability during runway construction. Have the proponent request the approaches from the AVN website <http://avn.faa.gov/>. Request form can be located under the Flight Procedures drop down menu = “so you want an instrument approach”.

**LPA Response:** Both LPA and JAA have reviewed this recommendation. This is a good suggestion that JAA will pursue prior to the extension of Runway 14/32. When the RNAV approach is requested, JAA will modify the ALP at that time.

- c. I would have the displaced runway coordinates for the proposed runway 14/32 extension checked as our calculation show the displaced threshold 439 NM Southeast of the airport.

**LPA Response:** LPA has re-evaluated all runway threshold coordinate calculations, and determined that FAA was correct. The correct runway coordinates have been determined and denoted in both the Data Table and on the

ALP drawings. This information was also correctly identified within the narrative report.

- d. Any new hangar/building construction on the airport needs to be evaluated under its own NRA. Insure that any crane is included in the NRA package.

**LPA Response:** A notice of on-airport proposed construction, including shadow study, will be performed and submitted to FAA Airport District Office and FAA Regional Offices for review prior to any new construction. If a crane is required for construction, its location, hours of operation, and height will also be included in the on-airport notice of proposed construction paperwork.

- e. Once Runway 14/32 is extended and has 600 ft displaced thresholds, the parallel taxiway will extend beyond the displaced runway threshold. Aircraft taxiing for takeoff potentially will penetrate the visibility 34:1 and 20:1 surfaces. Recommend that provisions be made for a hold bar outside the visibility surface be made so that when weather is below 800-2, aircraft have a known hold point.

**LPA Response:** Based upon this recommendation, a hold bar has been added to the Taxiway A, so that aircraft taxiing for takeoff will not penetrate the 34:1 and 20:1 visibility surfaces. This information has also been added to the text of the narrative report.

- f. In the design process for Runway 32 extension/displaced threshold, the airport may want to consider angling the parallel taxiway away from the runway so that it can remain clear of the visibility surface.

**LPA Response:** JAA has taken this recommendation into consideration. However, based upon planned development and associated costs, it was determined that installing a hold bar on Taxiway A would be more cost effective especially since CRG is equipped with an Air Traffic Control Tower.

5. Runway Data Table appears to show the OFZ widths in error. Measurement of the widths is correct. Runway 05/23 shows 250 feet and the standard would be 400 feet for a B-II airport. The airport would be expected to handle as much as a 65,000 lb Fokker F-28. In reality a much larger airplane may very well operate at the airport.

**LPA Response:** The information in the data table has been corrected to match the drawing set (object free zone = 400 feet). Also, it is important to note that the runway pavement strength of all runways and taxiways is 60,000 lbs, so operations of heavier aircraft will be limited due to operating and insurance requirements.

6. Runway 14/32 shows an existing width of 250/300 and the ultimate as No Change. The standard is 400 feet. The length of the OFZ shows 200 feet which is correct except for Runway 32 with the MALSR which extends the OFZ to 200 feet beyond the end of the approach lights which would be 2600 feet from the threshold.

**LPA Response:** The OFZ width and length for Runway 14/32 has been corrected on the Data Table to reflect the ALP drawing set and standard requirements.

7. Page 1 shows Runway 14/32 as 4,004 feet long and page 4 says 3,636 feet. The Airport Facility Directory (A/FD) and the US Terminal Procedures show 4,004 feet. Please correct.

**LPA Response:** This error has been corrected on all sheets. The existing length of Runway 14/32 is 4,004 feet as denoted in the A/FD.

8. This review covers only what the narrative report describes and does not constitute approval of any Modification of Standards which should be submitted separately for study. As described by the Flight Procedures Office (FPO), the POFZ for Runway 32 should be considered.

**LPA Response:** At this time, no existing or future modification to standards were identified or recommended as part of this master plan update. If any modifications are required, JAA will submit those requests separately to the FAA for their review and approval. Also, as noted by the Flight Procedures Office, the POFZ has been correctly labeled and identified on both the ALP and within the Narrative Report. Further, the airport service road was relocated behind the Glideslope Critical Area to limit potential interference with the navigational aid.

Enclosed for your stamp of approval are 12 copies of the Craig Airport Layout Plan set, one GBC bound copy of the final report, and two compact disks containing the electronic files of the report as well as AutoCAD files of the airport layout plan set for your files. Please if you need any additional information or have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us at (813) 889-3892. Thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully,

**THE LPA GROUP INCORPORATED**



Tricia Fantinato  
Manager – Aviation Planning

Enclosures: Craig Final Airport Layout Plan set (12)  
Craig Final Master Plan Narrative Report (1)  
Compact Disks (2)