

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION  
EASTERN REGION

---

*FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
AND RECORD OF DECISION*

---

**Extend Runway 6 to 5,500 feet,  
Construct Partial Parallel Taxiway, Obstruction Removal,  
Security Fencing and Land Acquisition**

Virginia Highlands Airport  
Abingdon, Washington County, Virginia



November 4, 2024

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/  
RECORD OF DECISION**

**Extend Runway 6 to 5,500 feet, Construct Partial Parallel Taxiway,  
Obstruction Removal, Security Fencing and Land Acquisition**

**Virginia Highlands Airport  
Abingdon, Washington County, Virginia**

**I. Introduction:**

This document serves as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Record of Decision (ROD) for the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) proposed federal action of unconditional approval of the portion of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts the Runway 6 extension, partial parallel taxiway construction, land acquisition, obstruction removal, relocation of airport and Commonwealth of Virginia owned navigational aids, T-hangar development and security fence installation for Virginia Highlands Airport (VJI). The airport is owned and operated by the Virginia Highlands Airport Authority (VHAA).

The project was originally analyzed in an Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared in 2010 and approved via a FONSI/ROD signed August 18, 2010. A change in parcel acquisition associated with two parcels adjacent to the airport resulted in a Supplemental EA, dated June 2015, to analyze any changes to the environmental impacts depicted in the 2010. A FONSI/ROD was issued for the Supplemental EA on August 18, 2015.

This FONSI/ROD is based on the August 2010 EA prepared by the VHAA. During the original environmental effort, it was determined that the proposed undertaking would have an adverse effect on the St. John House (Virginia Department of Historic Resources [VDHR] #095- 5264), a private residence on a 2.8± acre parcel of land surrounded by airport property. The St. John House was determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) by the FAA, with VDHR's concurrence in December 2006. Based on eligibility of the St. John House for inclusion in the NRHP, and subsequent adverse effect determination associated with anticipated project impacts, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was executed between the VHAA, FAA and the VDHR to mitigate the adverse effect. The adverse effect determination also resulted in preparation of a United States Department of Transportation Section 4(f) Statement. The Section 4(f) Statement evaluated the development alternatives analyzed in the 2010 EA, including a No Action alternative, and determined that there are no prudent and feasible alternatives that meet the

purpose and need of the project, while avoiding impacts to the St. John property. The Section 4(f) Statement evaluated seven mitigation alternatives associated with the adverse effect determination with the mitigation plan included in the MOA listed first, including tree plantings, and demolition of the house listed last.

This Supplemental EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) as defined in FAA Orders 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*, 1050.1 F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures* and *Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions* based on changes to project mitigation identified in the executed MOA and Section 4(f) Statement.

This FONSI/ROD describes the purpose and need of the project, actions to be taken by the FAA, alternatives examined in the Final EA, environmental effects of the preferred alternative, committed mitigation and the FAA's decision. The nature and extent of the FAA's decision is clearly stated in this FONSI/ROD, which is a decision document.

## **II. Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project:**

The purpose of the proposed project, as stated in the 2010 EA, is to provide airfield infrastructure to support the current and future critical aircraft design which meet FAA Airport Design Standards for future Airport Reference Code (ARC) B-11 (large), accommodating large business jets, and meet enhanced safety, enhanced operational utility/efficiency, and sustained/enhanced economic benefit. The proposed project will be designed in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 50/5300-13, *Airport Design*. This project is part of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), which is planned to provide public airport facilities conforming to minimum design standards.

Obstruction removal includes the removal of existing trees within the protected airspace for Runway 6/24 and the elimination of obstructions to the Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace* surfaces. Property interest acquisition is necessary to gain control of property needed for construction of runway and taxiway pavements, the Runway Protection Zones (RPZ), Object Free Areas (OFA), approach slopes and to facilitate obstruction removal and the relocation of State Road 611.

The Federal actions identified in the 2010 EA requiring review pursuant to the NEPA are listed below in Section III of this FONSI/ROD. They include unconditional approval of the portion of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts the proposed Runway 6 extension, partial parallel taxiway construction, land acquisition, obstruction removal, relocation of navigational aids, T-hangar development, and security fence installation.

The following is a description of the 2010 Proposed Project:

- Extend Runway 6 from 4,471 feet to 5,500 feet.
- Relocate Runway 24 threshold 470 feet to the west.
- Construct partial parallel taxiway 35 feet by 3,060 feet.
- Borrow site/ grading area.
- Acquire approximately 46 acres of fee-simple land and 23 acres of avigation easement.
- Remove obstructions for Runway 6 to the 20:1 approach surface, 21 acres.
- Relocate Navigational Aids (NAVAIDs) to include; Localizer, Automated Weather Observation System (AWOS), Omni-Directional Approach Lighting System (ODALS), Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs), and Runway End Identifier Lighting (REILS).
- Construct 10-unit T-hangar and associated apron
- Install security fence.
- Relocate State Road 611
- Stream modification.
- Demolish barn on airport property.
- Relocate cemetery.
- Construction of retaining wall and possible purchase of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible St. John's property (2.8 acres) for mitigation purposes

During the subsequent land acquisition process, it was determined that additional fee simple acquisition was necessary for two off airport parcels which increased the proposed land acquisition in fee from approximately 46 acres to approximately 56 acres resulting in preparation of the 2015 Supplemental EA and FONSI/ROD

The following is a description of the changes to the Proposed Project addressed in this second Supplemental EA:

- Removal of the commitment that a retaining wall and associated plantings be built as a mitigation measure for potential impacts to the St. John House property, which would also remove the construction of the retaining wall from the Proposed Action.

### **III. Agency Action:**

The FAA actions involved in the implementation of the Proposed Project include the following:

- 1) Unconditional approval of the portion of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that depicts the proposed runway extension and associated improvements submitted by the Virginia Highlands Airport Authority for the Virginia Highlands Airport pursuant to 49 U.S.C. §§ 40103(b) and 47107(a)(16). The ALP, depicting the proposed improvements, has been reviewed by the FAA to determine conformance with FAA design criteria and implications for Federal grant agreements (refer to 14 CFR Parts 77 and 157);

- 2) Determination under 49 U.S.C. §§40101 (d)(1) and 47105(b)(3) whether the proposed project meets applicable design and engineering standards set forth in FAA Advisory Circulars;
- 3) Determination and actions, through the aeronautical study process, of the effects of the proposed projects upon the safe and efficient utilization of navigable airspace pursuant to 14 CFR Parts 77 and 157 and 49 U.S.C. §44718;
- 4) Determination under 49 U.S.C. § 44502(b) that the airport development is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense;
- 5) Installation of the following visual aid equipment: Runway End Identifier Lighting (REIL) and runway and taxiway edge lighting. This equipment is necessary to enhance the safety of air navigation for aircraft operations at VJI; and
- 6) Eligibility for Federal funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) under 49 U.S.C. §§ 47106 and 47107.

#### **IV. Alternatives Analysis**

The alternatives analysis in Chapter 2 of the 2010 EA identified the range of reasonable alternatives including the Proposed Project, as required by 40 C.F.R. 1502.14. The EA considered but did not carry forward alternatives that involved an extension to the Runway 24 end, instead of Runway 6 end, and the use of Tri-Cities Regional Airport.

The EA did not carry forward alternatives that included an extension to the Runway 24 end, because any extension to Runway 24 was determined to be undesirable due to the terrain and impacts to the development beyond the runway end which includes the following:

- Relocation of State Route 11 (Lee Highway), Jerry Lane, and Skyking Lane – necessary to accommodate runway extension, parallel taxiway and associated safety areas;
- Placement of two Omni-directional Approach Lighting System lights within the Forest Memorial Garden;
- Terrain - Substantial fill and grading would be required to meet safety area regulations and to address obstructions to the 34:1 approach surface, thus impacting the church and memorial garden properties;
- Noise - Runway 24 extension would bring the runway end closer to the Town of Abingdon;
- Avigation Easement - required to clear FAA Part 77 obstructions; and
- Fee Simple Land Acquisition - 14 properties impacted
  - Three business relocations
  - Nine residential properties

- Relocation of Emanuel Baptist Church (would fall within Runway 24 Runway Protection Zone (RPZ))
- Fee simple acquisition of a portion of Forest Memorial Garden (would fall within Runway 24 RPZ)

The VHAA also spent several years obtaining easements on the Runway 24 end to support a 34:1 approach. Extension on the 24 end would require additional easements and acquisition of properties. Based upon the impacts detailed, it was determined that an extension on the Runway 24 end was not feasible.

The use of Tri-Cities Regional Airport was also discussed as an alternative to the proposed runway expansion and associated projects at VJI. However, as Tri-Cities Regional Airport is located approximately 45 minutes away from VJI, outside of the FAA's NPIAS 30-minute service area; it is not considered practical or desirable for airport users as defined by NPIAS.

Due to the impracticality of extending the Runway 24 end and the inability of Tri-Cities Regional Airport to accommodate the project's purpose and need it was found that there is no prudent and feasible alternative for this project that does not involve the extension of Runway 6.

The Final EA also considered the following three alternatives;

Alternative 1: No Action; no build Alternative

Alternative 2: Develop the airport as a B-11 (large) with an extension of Runway 6 and associated development, the approach to Runway 6 would be changed from the existing 20: 1 visual to a 34: 1 non-precision approach;

Alternative 3 (Proposed Project): Develop the airport as a B-11 (large) with an extension of Runway 6 and associated development, the approach to Runway 6 would remain a 20:1 visual approach.

These three alternatives were retained for further analysis, pursuant to FAA Order 1050.1 E and 40 CFR 1502.14(d).

#### **V. Environmental Impacts and Possible Adverse Effects:**

The Final Supplemental EA received from the VHAA included analysis and review of changes to the Proposed Project (Alternative 3) and Alternative 2. The Supplemental EA has satisfied FAA guidelines identified in FAA Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1 F for the preparation of an EA.

The Final Supplemental EA addresses the effect of the changes to the proposed project on the quality of the human and natural environment and is made a part of this FONSI/ROD. The following impact analysis highlights the analysis presented in the Final Supplemental EA prepared in September 2024. Only those environmental impact categories whose impact or description may have changed are discussed in this Supplemental EA. These are: Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f), and

Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources. The remaining environmental categories addressed in the 2010 EA and 2015 Supplemental EA have no change and are therefore not analyzed in this Supplemental EA.

**1. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT, SECTION 4(f).** The 4(f) property (St. John House) is a private residence currently listed in the NRHP as described by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer, and is further described in Section 2 (Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources) below. The Section 4(f) Statement and MOA, between VHAA, FAA, and VDHR describing the proposed treatment of the St. John House are attached to this FONSI/ROD. As discussed in the original Section 4(f) Statement, and in the Alternatives discussion above, there were no prudent and feasible alternatives for this project other than the extension of Runway 6. Further, as the extension of Runway 6 necessitates impacts to the St. John Property, there are no prudent and feasible alternatives that avoid impacting the St. John property; however, through the MOA, a mitigation plan was developed to mitigate the projects effects on the St. John property to the greatest extent possible.

The proposed Section 4(f) mitigation action included the airport offering a negotiated purchase of the property (with no threat of condemnation). If the owner and VHAA reached an agreement on the purchase, the purchase of the property would constitute a physical use of the property under 4(f). If the purchase occurred, the property would be listed in the NRHP and re-sold with an easement to protect the property. If VHAA and the current owner did not reach an agreement on the purchase, the owner would have retained ownership. Regardless of whether or not the owners of the St. John's house voluntarily agree to sell the property, for mitigation purposes, a retaining wall was to be constructed on existing airport property, south of the St. John House. The construction of the retaining wall would not have resulted in direct physical impacts to the historic property; however, the setting of the historic property would have been impacted. It was determined that construction of the wall would result in the fewest impacts to the site. No grading or construction would take place on the property and visual impacts would be mitigated by landscaping the area between the wall and St. John property to block the southern view to the extent possible. If the purchase of the property did not occur, these visual impacts associated with the construction of the retaining wall would have resulted in a constructive use of the St. John's property under Section 4(f). Regardless of whether the owners of the St. John House voluntarily agreed to sell the property the proposed project would not have resulted in a significant adverse impact to properties protected by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act.

On April 21, 2010, in accordance with Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act and 49 U.S.C. 303, policy on lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites, the FAA developed a Section 4(f) Statement describing the MOA for the treatment of St. John House and submitted it to the Department of Interior (DOI) for review and comment. On June 14, 2010 the FAA received concurrence from the DOI that there is no prudent and feasible alternative to the project and measures to minimize harm to the St. John House must be explicitly consistent as outlined within the MOA.

Based on subsequent planning efforts, the MOA was amended in May 2015. As part of the First Amendment to the MOA, Stipulation I.A.7 was amended to allow VHAA to conduct grading, clearing and construction impacts on the property to be mitigated by using Best Management Practices and installing plantings to shield visual impacts of the runway extension project. The stipulation retained the requirement to construct a retaining wall.

More accurate survey data obtained during the project's design phase, and ultimate construction of the Runway Extension project, confirmed that grading would avoid the St. John property and the MOA was amended for a second time. The Second Amendment to the MOA, executed in October 2024, removed the commitment to construct a retaining wall and associated plantings as a mitigation measure for potential impacts to the St. John property, while all other Stipulations included in the MOA and First Amendment to the MOA were met, including listing the property in the NRHP and VHAA purchase and resell of the property with protective covenants.

The Section 4(f) Statement was also updated to remove the mitigation requirement to construct a retaining wall and associated tree plantings. Even without the construction of the retaining wall, physical impacts to the St. John House property were avoided during the design phase; therefore, this selected mitigation alternative continues to mitigate impacts to the greatest extent possible.

VDHR concurred with the Second Amendment to the MOA on August 5, 2024. The DOI was provided the updated Section 4(f) Statement as well as VDHR's concurrence with the Second Amendment to the MOA. The DOI concurred with the updated Section 4(f) evaluation on August 28, 2024 stating that all possible planning was done to minimize harm and mitigate adverse effects to Section 4(f) resources. Based on VDHR concurrence with the Second Amendment to the MOA and DOI concurrence with the Updated Section 4(f) Statement, no significant impacts resulted from implementation of the Proposed Action.

## **2. HISTORIC, ARCHITECTURAL, ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL**

**RESOURCES.** The Proposed Project and Alternative 2 will impact the St John House. As stated in the 2010 FONSI/ROD, the St. John House was built in 1860 and embodies the distinctive Greek Revival style of the mid-nineteenth century. The integrity of the exterior is able to convey the architectural context of this period and style of architecture and maintains the integrity necessary to be recommended as potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C. The Area of Potential Effect is defined as the current tax parcel which is approximately 2.8 acres.

The VDHR, in a letter dated September 18, 2006, concurred with the FAA's determination of adverse effects to the St. John House on September 12, 2008. Pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Part 800.6, a MOA was prepared. The MOA was executed by VHAA, VDHR, and the FAA on April 13, 2010. On April 26, 2010 the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) confirmed receipt and filing of the MOA, and



acknowledged completion of the requirements of Section 106 upon execution of the MOA terms. The MOA describes the steps required for the treatment of the St. John House to mitigate impacts from the proposed project to include the construction of a retaining wall and VHAA offering a negotiated purchase of the property. No significant adverse impact was expected to occur.

As stated above, the MOA was amended in 2015 to allow grading, clearing and construction impacts on the property to be mitigated by using Best Management Practices and installing plantings to shield visual impacts of the runway extension project. The stipulation retained the requirement to construct a retaining wall. The MOA was amended for a second time in 2024 to remove the commitment to construct a retaining wall as well as the associated plantings based on final design and construction of the Runway Extension, which avoided impacts to the property. VDHR concurred with the Second Amendment to the MOA on August 5, 2024. All other Stipulations included in the MOA and First Amendment to the MOA, including listing the property in the NRHP and VHAA purchase and resell of the property with protective covenants, were met. Based on VDHR concurrence with the Second Amendment to the MOA, no significant impacts resulted from implementation of the Proposed Action.

## VI. MITIGATION

**REQUIRED MITIGATION MEASURES:** In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 1505.3, the FAA will take appropriate steps, through Federal funding grant assurances and conditions, Airport Layout Plan approvals, and contract plans and specifications, to ensure that the mitigation action is implemented. The approvals contained in this FONSI/ROD are specifically conditioned upon full implementation of these mitigation measures.

**Cultural and Department of Transportation Section 4(f) Resources.** The Proposed Project will have an adverse effect to the St. John House. VHAA ensured stipulations set forth in the executed MOA between the VHAA, VDHR and FAA were met as required, including the amendments to the MOA. See attached Second Amendment to the MOA and updated DOT Section 4(f) Statement.

## VII. AGENCY FINDINGS

In accordance with all applicable laws, the FAA makes the following findings for the Proposed Action based on all appropriate information and analyses contained in the Final Supplemental EA.

- a) **The proposed action is reasonably consistent with existing plans of public agencies for development of the area (49 U.S.C. § 47106(a)(1)).** Virginia Highlands Airport is situated entirely on land owned and controlled by the Virginia Highlands Airport Commission. The Proposed Project is located entirely on airport property. The land surrounding the airport to the north is zoned general agricultural, areas between Route 11 and 1-81 are designated for general

business uses and areas south of 1-81 are zoned residential. The Proposed Project is consistent with the plans, goals and policies for the area.

- b) **The Secretary is satisfied the interests of communities in or near the project location have been given fair consideration (49 U.S.C. § 47106(b)(2)).** Throughout the Supplemental EA preparation process, government officials, agencies, organizations, and residents of nearby communities have been consulted, or have participated in activities that have contributed to the preparation of the Final Supplemental EA. Attachment 5 of the Final Supplemental EA contains correspondence from the agencies that were consulted and the public participation comments. Public review of the Draft Supplemental EA was from August 17, 2024 to September 17, 2024 (See Attachment 5 of the Final Supplemental EA) Comments were received from the Virginia Department of Aviation approving the requested project change.
- c) **To the extent reasonable, the airport sponsor has taken or will take actions to restrict land uses in the airport vicinity, including the adoption of zoning laws, to ensure that uses are compatible with airport operations (49 U.S.C. § 47107(a)(10)).** The Virginia Highlands Airport is compatible with the surrounding land uses and the general agricultural and general business uses.
- d) **The FAA has given this proposal the independent and objective evaluation required by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR § 1506.5).** The FAA's review and ultimate decision-making process included the FAA's rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of reasonable alternatives and probable environmental consequences, regulatory agency consultations, as required, and public involvement. FAA furnished guidance and participated in the preparation of the Final Supplemental EA by providing input, advice, and expertise throughout the planning and technical analyses, along with administrative direction and legal review. FAA has independently evaluated the Final Supplemental EA and takes responsibility for its scope and content.
- e) **The Proposed Action includes a physical use of a resource protected under 49 U.S.C. § 303(c) (Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act).** The Proposed Action would result in physical use of the St. John House, a Section 106 historic site. In evaluating the Proposed Action and Alternatives considered under the Supplemental EA, there is not a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative. All possible planning to minimize harm was considered and applied as part of the MOA and subsequent amendments to the MOA with the Officials with Jurisdiction. An Updated Department of Transportation Section 4(f) Statement was prepared and is hereby incorporated by reference.
- f) **An adverse impact to historic properties would result from the Proposed Action (Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) regulations (36 CFR Part 800)).** The Proposed Action will result in an adverse effect to the St. John House. To mitigate the adverse effect, the FAA entered into a MOA with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) and the

Airport Sponsor. The MOA a subsequent amendments to the MOA are hereby incorporated by reference.

- g) **Determination that the airport development is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense pursuant to (49 U.S.C. § 44502(b)).** The FAA has determined that the Proposed Project described in the Final EA would improve the safety and efficiency of the airport. FAA has determined the proposed runway extension and partial parallel taxiway can be operated safely. The Airport Layout Plan was evaluated under airspace case number 2004-AEA-423-NRA.

## VIII. Decision and Order

The FAA recognizes its responsibilities under NEPA and the CEQ implementing regulations (40 C.F.R Parts 1500-1508), and FAA's own directives and guidance. Recognizing these responsibilities, I have carefully considered the FAA's goals and objectives in relation to the various aspects of the *Final Second Supplement To The 2010 Environmental Assessment (EA) For Extension Of Runway 6-24*. I have used the environmental process to make a more informed decision. The review included the purposes and needs to be served by this Proposed Action and alternative means to achieve them. This review has also included consideration of the environmental impacts of any alternative that passed the screening criteria and was carried forward for further analysis, and the mitigation and conditions necessary to preserve and enhance the human environment. This decision is based on a comparative examination of environmental impacts, operational factors, and economic factors for each of the alternatives. The Final Supplemental EA provides a fair and full discussion of the impacts of the Proposed Action. The NEPA process included appropriate planning and design for avoidance and minimization of impacts, as required by NEPA, the CEQ regulations, other special purpose environmental laws, and appropriate FAA environmental directives and guidance.

The FAA has determined that environmental and other relevant concerns presented by interested agencies and the general public have been addressed in the Final Supplemental EA. The FAA believes that with respect to the Proposed Action, there are no outstanding environmental issues within FAA's jurisdiction to be studied. Further, it is the determination of the FAA that, with respect to the Proposed Action, the requirements of NEPA and all other applicable federal environmental requirements and Executive Orders have been met. In making this determination, the FAA must decide whether to approve the federal actions necessary for the Proposed Action implementation. FAA approval signifies that applicable federal requirements relating to airport development planning have been met and permits the airport Sponsor to proceed with development and possibly receive funds or any other relevant federal approvals for eligible items. Not approving these actions would prevent the Sponsor from proceeding with the development.

This decision does not constitute a commitment of funds under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP); however, it does fulfill the environmental prerequisites for future AIP funding determinations associated with AIP-eligible project components (49 U.S.C. § 47107).

I have carefully and thoroughly considered the alternatives, including the proposed Federal Actions, contained in the Final EA. Based on that information, I find the proposed Federal Actions are consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives of Section 101(a) of the NEPA and other applicable environmental requirements. I also find that all practicable means to avoid or minimize harm from the selected alternative have been adopted, and the proposed Federal Actions as presented in the Final EA will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any condition requiring any consultation pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA.

**DAVID A FISH** Digitally signed by DAVID A FISH  
Date: 2024.11.04 09:23:06 -05'00'

**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Airports Division  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Eastern Region

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**DISAPPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Airports Division  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Eastern Region

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **Right of Appeal**

This Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) presents the Federal Aviation Administration's findings and final decision and approvals for the actions identified, including those taken under the provisions of Title 49 of the United States Code, Subtitle VII, Parts A and B.

Any party having a substantial interest may appeal this order to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person resides or has its principal place of business, upon petition filed within 60 days after entry of this order in accordance with 49 U.S.C. § 46110.

Any party seeking to stay the implementation of this ROD must file an application with the FAA prior to seeking judicial relief, as provided in rule 18(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

**Attachments**  
**Memorandum of Agreement &**  
**Section 4(f) Statement**