



**WRITTEN RE-EVALUATION**

**and**

**RECORD OF DECISION**

**for**

**South-Central Florida Metroplex Project  
Proposed Changes to the Final EA Designs**

**August 2021**

## SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) finalized a Finding of No Significant Impact and Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) for the South-Central Florida Metroplex (FL Metroplex) on October 15, 2020.<sup>1</sup> This decision was made on the basis of the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) also published in October 2020. Subsequently, the FAA discovered that safety criteria and other operational considerations require minor changes to some of the designs for proposed procedures analyzed in the Final EA and approved for implementation in the FONSI/ROD. The changes involve procedures used for Boca Raton Airport (BCT), Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport (FXE), Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (FLL), Orlando International Airport (MCO), Miami International Airport (MIA), Miami-Opa locka Executive Airport (OPF), Palm Beach International Airport (PBI), Sarasota Bradenton International Airport (SRQ), Miami Executive Airport (TMB), and Tampa International Airport (TPA) (collectively, the Design Changes).

The Design Changes are described in more detail in Section 2. The FAA does not expect that any of the Design Changes would result in an increase in the volume of air traffic on any of the procedures—as compared to the procedures analyzed in the Final EA—and has carefully considered whether the Final EA must be supplemented before making these changes.<sup>2</sup> The FAA’s analysis and determination are documented in this Written Re-evaluation.<sup>3</sup> On the basis of this determination, the FAA has concluded that no supplement to the October 2020 Final Environmental Assessment is required.

## SECTION 2 – DESCRIPTION OF DESIGN CHANGES

- (1) Slight change in course on the PBI Runway 14 SIDs (MIXAE, OLAKE, TBIRD) due to magnetic variance differences. The original SID departure procedures were built using a standard magnetic variance. This change applies the location-specific variance required for proper navigation
- (2) Change to the MIA GLADZ SID – This procedure will not be used on a west flow for air traffic from MIA. The design of the procedure and airspace did not allow for suitable climb to center altitude without unreasonable coordination or vectoring. The traffic that was proposed for the GLADZ SID will be routed via MHITO and BNGOS SIDs, as currently used today
- (3) Change to the MIA LUUCE STAR – After failing Flight Inspection, it was determined

---

<sup>1</sup> Public FL Metroplex documents are available at

[http://www.metroplexenvironmental.com/fl\\_metroplex/fl\\_introduction.html](http://www.metroplexenvironmental.com/fl_metroplex/fl_introduction.html)

<sup>2</sup> Under FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, § 9-3, an EA must be supplemented only if there are “substantial changes to the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns” or “there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.”

<sup>3</sup> See FAA Order 1050.1F, § 9-2 (a written re-evaluation is “used to determine whether the contents of a previously prepared environmental document [i.e., a draft or final EA or EIS] remain valid or a new or supplemental environmental document is required”).

the MEA did not meet ATC requirements. Therefore, the procedure will not be published. Aircraft traffic will continue to use the existing BLUFI STAR

(4) Change to PBI STOOP STAR –Due to the limitations of existing ground-based navigation systems, the OMN transition on the STOOP STAR will be NOTAMed – Not Available (NA), and all arrivals will utilize the MLB transition until further notice

(5) Miscellaneous, Non-substantive Changes:

The following changes are notational/administrative changes that have nominal to no operational impact on the underlying procedures and do not result in any change to data or analyses contained in the Final EA. These changes are being identified in this Written Re-evaluation for purposes of disclosure only. No re-evaluation or other additional environmental consideration is required.

- TPA DORMR SID – Remove MCF and PIE airports after Flight Inspection
- FLL and MIA SIDs – Remove Ocean Reef Club Airport (07FA) from all FLL and MIA SIDs
- FLL FEALX SID – Remove FL 230 and add “As Assigned by Air Traffic Control”
- FLL FEALX SID – MIDNT waypoint change 4000 to “At Or Above” 4000
- FLL HURCN SID – Remove FL230 and add “As Assigned by Air Traffic Control”
- FLL REGAE SID, SNAPR SID – Remove FL 230 and add “As Assigned by ATC”
- FLL TEEKY STAR – Correction to note “SABEE Transition for TPA Area airports only”
- MCO RIDES STAR – Correction to note: “BERTH Transition ATC Assign Only, AOA FL240”. Correction to runway reference: “then proceed direct to SEEDO, intercept RWY 17L final approach course, conduct approach”
- MIA FROGZ STAR – Correction to note: “SABEE Transition for TPA Area airports only”
- MIA GWAVA SID, KLADA SID – Remove FL230 and add “As Assigned by ATC”
- MIA SNDBR STAR – Correction to note: “TUBEE transition for EYW Area airports only”
- PBI MLB STAR – Correction to note: “Props and Turboprops only”
- PBI SHRVY STAR – Correction to note: “SABEE Transition for TPA Area airports only”
- BCT MYZNR SID: 8000 altitude revision added at JAVAA
- BCT TURPS SID: 2000 altitude revision added at ROTHH
- FLL AARPS SID: Remove FL230 and add “As Assigned by Air Traffic Control” Altitude revision added 8000 and deleted FL190 at AGERS
- FXE GABOW SID: 4000 altitude revision added at MNUDO
- MIA BNGOS SID: Remove FL230 and add “As Assigned by Air Traffic Control” Altitude revision added 8000 and deleted FL190 at MRENO
- MIA FOLZZ SID: Remove FL230 and add “As Assigned by Air Traffic Control” Altitude revision added 5000 and deleted FL190 at MARCK
- OPF HUSIL SID: Altitude revision added 5000 at JAMEX

- PBI CLMNT STAR: Altitude revision on AMILA at 4000, WHILE at 5000, SPNER at 5,000, KIDGE at 4000, WTCAP at 4000, DLMAN at 4000
- PBI CPTAN STAR: Altitude revision on AMILA at 5000, WHILE at 5000, SPNER at 5000, KIDGE at 4000, WTCAP at 4000, DLMAN at 4000
- PBI FEBAD STAR: Altitude revision on HUNIS at 5000, REMOVE RWY TRANS, ADD PBI TO COMM RT. Add note “Props and Turboprops ONLY”
- PBI SLIDZ SID: Change RWY 14 VI/CF, Change Top Altitude to 12000, Altitude revision added 10000 at SLIDZ
- SRQ TEEGN STAR: Altitude revision on PASOE at 3000, MURDO at 3000, COVUM at 11000, BOLTS at 6000
- TMB MELLZ SID: Altitude revision on DAYAK at 5000, add Top Altitude GDPW
- TPA BLFRG STAR: Altitude revision on OXISE at 10000, GUZDA at 5000, CRUUZ at 6000
- TPA DORMR SID: Altitude revision added 3000 at SYKES
- TPA KNOST SID: Altitude revision added 6000 at WOBAD
- FLL BHHIA STAR – CANOA waypoint moved due to agreement between ZMA (Miami ARTCC) and Havana, Cuba
- FLL CUUDA STAR – SERIF waypoint moved 60 feet to the West Southwest from the designed location in the Final EA due to co-location issues with the fix
- MIA MHITO SID – Remove FL230 and add “As Assigned by Air Traffic Control,” Altitude revision on WONLV at 5000, CANOA waypoint moved due to agreement between ZMA (Miami ARTCC) and Havana, Cuba
- MIA VACAY SID – Remove FL230 and add “As Assigned by Air Traffic Control,” Altitude revision added 12000 at FEMTO

### SECTION 3 – IMPACT ANALYSIS APPROACH

The FAA has analyzed the potential environmental effects from the Design Changes, consistent with FAA Order 1050.1F, § 9-2(c)(1) to determine whether these minor changes to the procedures in the Final EA would be “substantial” and “relevant to environmental concerns.” The FAA also considered whether the “[d]ata and analyses contained in the Final EA and FONSI . . . are still substantially valid,” *id.* at § 9-2(c)(2), and whether “[p]ertinent conditions and requirements of the prior approval have been, or will be, met in the current action.” *Id.* at § 9-2(c)(3). Supplementation would only be required if these changes “paint[] a dramatically different picture of impacts compared to the description of impacts in the [Final] EA.” *Id.* at § 9-3. The conclusions in this Written Re-evaluation were reached by comparing the expected environmental impacts of the procedures, as refined in ways described in this document, to the Final EA’s Proposed Action. This Written Re-evaluation considers the same environmental impact categories analyzed in the Final EA, as follows:

- Noise and Noise Compatible Land
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources – Wildlife (Avian and Bat Species) subcategory only, including and Migratory Birds
- Climate

- Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) Resources
- Historic Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources – Historic Properties and Cultural Resources subcategories only
- Natural Resources and Energy Supply - Energy Supply subcategory only (Aircraft Fuel only)
- Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks – Environmental Justice subcategory only
- Visual Effects – Visual Resources/Visual Character subcategory only

As noted above, the Miscellaneous, Non-substantive Changes detailed in category (5) of Section 2 are identified for purposes of disclosure only. These changes do not materially alter the way the underlying procedures are operated nor do they have any effect on the environmental analysis completed in the Final EA. The changes in categories (1)-(4), however slight, are addressed in more detail below with respect to each of the environmental resource categories listed above.

## **SECTION 4 – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

### **Noise & Compatible Land Use**

Design Changes in category (1) were developed to better align the SID procedures with the magnetic variance course on Runway 14 at PBI. The SID procedures for Runway 14 proposed in the Final EA were designed using a standard magnetic variance. The change in course for this runway applies the location specific variance required for proper navigation of aircrafts and represents no more than a one degree shift that will have no impact on the noise analysis in the Final EA.

Design Changes in categories (2) and (3) will route traffic via existing procedures as currently used today. These changes will not alter the existing noise profile and do not require additional noise screening.

The Design Change in category (4) will route all arrivals on the MLB transition until further notice. The OMN transition will be Notam’d – Not Available (NA) due to the limitations of existing ground-based navigation systems.

The proposed changes to the Final EA designs do not have the potential for “reportable” or “significant” noise increases. The proposed procedures conform to those for which the Final EA was prepared, and no substantial changes relevant to environmental concerns will be made. The FAA concludes that the noise analysis in the Final Environmental Assessment remains valid, and the procedures meet all pertinent conditions and requirements of the prior approval. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address noise impacts.

### **Air Quality**

As stated above, the FAA does not expect that the Design Changes would result in an increase in air traffic flying any of the procedures, compared to the Final EA designs. As a result, the Design

Changes would not measurably alter the findings of the Final EA regarding potential air quality effects. With respect to air quality, the proposed procedures conform to those for which the Final EA was prepared, and no substantial changes relevant to environmental concerns will be made. The FAA concludes that the air quality analysis in the Final Environmental Assessment remains valid, and the procedures meet all pertinent conditions and requirements of the prior approval. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address air quality impacts.

### **Biological Resources – Wildlife (Avian and Bat Species) subcategory only, including Migratory Birds**

The expected number of aircraft operations under the Design Changes would be the same as those analyzed in the Final EA. The design changes to the PBI Runway 14 Departure procedures would be minor shifts to the Final EA designs, which are not expected to have any impacts on wildlife species beyond those previously analyzed. These changes occur over the ocean outside the area where impacts might be expected to species of concern discussed in the Final EA. The other proposed design changes would not change the location of aircraft and do not alter the findings in the Final EA regarding avian or bat species. With respect to biological resources, the proposed procedures conform to those for which the Final EA was prepared, and no substantial changes relevant to environmental concerns will be made. The FAA concludes that the wildlife impact analysis in the Final Environmental Assessment remains valid, and the procedures meet all pertinent conditions and requirements of the prior approval. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address impacts on biological resources.

### **Climate**

The FAA does not expect that the Design Changes would result in an increase in air traffic flying any of the proposed procedures when compared to the Final EA designs. As a result, the Design Changes would not measurably alter the FAA's calculations for greenhouse gas emissions in the Final EA. With respect to climate, the proposed procedures conform to those for which the Final EA was prepared, and no substantial changes relevant to environmental concerns will be made. The FAA concludes that the air quality analysis and discussion of climate impacts in the Final Environmental Assessment remains valid, and the procedures meet all pertinent conditions and requirements of the prior approval. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address climate impacts.

### **Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) Resources**

As with the Final EA designs, the nature of the Design Changes (flight procedures only) would not involve the physical use of Section 4(f) resources. The Design Changes do not have the potential for "reportable" or "significant" noise increases, and the FAA does not expect that the Design Changes would result in an increase in air traffic flying the procedures when compared to the Final EA designs. Therefore, the Design Changes would not result in constructive use of Section 4(f) resources. With respect to Section 4(f) properties, the proposed procedures conform to those for which the Final EA was prepared, and no substantial changes relevant to environmental concerns will be made. The FAA concludes that the Section 4(f) analysis in the Final Environmental Assessment remains valid, and the procedures meet all pertinent conditions

and requirements of the prior approval. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address impacts on Section 4(f) resources.

### **Historic Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources – Historic Properties and Cultural Resources subcategories only**

The Design Changes would not introduce any new visual, atmospheric, or audible elements. The changes to the Final EA designs do not have the potential for “reportable” or “significant” noise increases. The FAA does not expect that the Design Changes would result in an increase in air traffic flying the procedures when compared to the Final EA designs. Therefore, the Design Changes would not change the Area of Potential Effects described in the Final EA, and the FAA’s finding of “no adverse effect” on historic properties under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) remains valid. With respect to historic properties, the proposed procedures conform to those for which the Final EA was prepared, and no substantial changes relevant to environmental concerns will be made. The FAA concludes that the analysis of historic properties and cultural resources in the Final Environmental Assessment remains valid, and the procedures meet all pertinent conditions and requirements of the prior approval. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address impacts on historic properties or cultural resources.

### **Natural Resources and Energy Supply - Energy Supply subcategory only (aircraft fuel only)**

The FAA does not expect an increase in air traffic flying the changed procedures as a result of the Design Changes. Therefore, the Design Changes would not measurably alter the amount of fuel burned when compared to the Final EA designs. With respect to energy supply, the proposed procedures conform to those for which the Final EA was prepared, and no substantial changes relevant to environmental concerns will be made. The FAA concludes that the natural resources and energy supply analysis in the Final Environmental Assessment remains valid, and the procedures meet all pertinent conditions and requirements of the prior approval. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address impacts on energy supply.

### **Environmental Justice**

The proposed changes to the Final EA designs do not have the potential for “reportable” or “significant” noise increases, and the FAA does not expect that the Design Changes would result in any increase in air traffic flying the procedures when compared to the Final EA designs. Furthermore, the three proposed design changes discussed in Section 2 are not over inhabited areas and will therefore not have a disproportionate impact on communities where environmental justice is a concern. The Design Changes would not have the potential to lead to a disproportionately high and adverse impact to an environmental justice population as described in the Final EA. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address environmental justice impacts.

### **Visual Effects (Visual Resources / Visual Character subcategory only)**

The Design Changes would not result in visual impacts beyond those previously disclosed in the Final EA. As with the Final EA designs, implementation of the Design Changes would not be expected to have significant visual impacts. There would be no increase in the number of aircraft operations at the study airports when compared with the Final EA Proposed Action. The changes in aircraft traffic patterns under the Design Changes would not affect the nature of the visual character of the area, contrast with the visual resources and/or visual character of the area, or block or obstruct the views of visual resources. The Final EA does not require supplementation to address impacts on visual resources/visual character.

### **Cumulative Effects**

Research conducted for the Final EA did not reveal any present or reasonably foreseeable actions with the potential for direct or indirect effects on aircraft flight patterns within the General Study Area. Therefore, as was the case with the Final EA designs, no cumulative impacts would be expected for the Design Changes when compared to the Final EA's Proposed Action

### **SECTION 5 – FINDINGS**

Based on the analysis described in this Written Re-evaluation/ROD: (1) The Design Changes conform to plans or projects for which the EA and FONSI were issued and are not a substantial change in the FAA's proposed action, as analyzed in the Final EA and approved in the FONSI/ROD, that are relevant to environmental concerns; (2) the data and analyses contained in the Final EA and FONSI/ROD are still substantially valid and there are no significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the Design Changes or their impacts; and (3) pertinent conditions and requirements of the FONSI/ROD have been, or will be, met in the current action. Therefore, in accordance 40 CFR § 1502.9 and FAA Order 1050.1F, paragraphs 9-2.c and 9-3, a new or supplemental EA is not required.

### **SECTION 6 – DECISION AND ORDER**

I have carefully and thoroughly considered the information contained in the Final EA, the FONSI/ROD, and this Written Re-evaluation/ROD. Based on that information, I have decided not to prepare a supplement to the Final EA for the Design Changes. I find that the Design Changes are consistent with existing National environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of National Environmental Policy Act. Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator of the FAA, I approve the Design Changes and direct that actions be taken that will enable their implementation.



Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Angela McCullough  
Vice President, Mission Support Services  
Air Traffic Organization  
Federal Aviation Administration

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

**RIGHT OF APPEAL**

This Written Re-evaluation/ROD constitutes a final order of the FAA Administrator and is subject to exclusive judicial review under 49 U.S.C. § 46110 by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person contesting the decision resides or has its principal place of business. Any party having substantial interest in this order may apply for review of the decision by filing a petition for review in the appropriate U.S. Court of Appeals no later than 60 days after the order is issued in accordance with the provisions of 49 U.S.C. § 46110. Any party seeking to stay implementation of this order must file an application with the FAA prior to seeking