

Noise Compatibility Program and Noise Exposure Map Checklists

Noise Compatibility Program Checklist

I. IDENTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION OF PROGRAM: **Page Number**

- A. Submission is properly identified:
 - 1. 14 C.F.R Part 150 NCP? Yes, Cover, Fly Sheet, Cover Letter
 - 2. NEM and NCP together? Yes
 - 3. Program revision? Yes, full NCP/NEM Part 150 Study Update

- B. Airport and Airport Operator's name identified? Yes, Cover, Flysheet

- C. NCP transmitted by airport operator cover letter? Yes

II. CONSULTATION:

- A. Documentation includes narrative of public participation and consultation process? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G

- B. Identification of consulted parties:
 - 1. All parties in 150.23(c) consulted? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G
 - 2. Public and planning agencies identified? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G
 - 3. Agencies in 2., above, correspond to those affected by the NEM noise contours? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G

- C. Satisfies 150.23(d) requirements:
 - 1. Documentation shows active and direct participation of parties in B, above? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G
 - 2. Active and direct participation of general public? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G
 - 3. Participation was prior to and during development of NCP and prior to submittal to FAA? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G
 - 4. Indicates adequate opportunity afforded to submit views, data, etc.? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G

- D. Evidence included of notice and opportunity for a public hearing on NCP? Yes, Appendix G
- E. Documentation of comments:
 - 1. Includes summary of public hearing comments, if hearing was held? Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G
 - 2. Includes copy of all written material submitted to operator? Yes, Appendix G
 - 3. Includes operator's responses/disposition of written and verbal comments? Yes, Appendix G
- F. Informal agreement received from FAA on flight procedures? N/A

III. NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS: [150.23, B150.3, B150.35 (f)]

(This section of the checklist is not a substitute for the Noise Exposure Map checklist. It deals with maps in the context of the Noise Compatibility Program submission.)

- A. Inclusion of NEMs and supporting documentation:
 - 1. Map documentation either included or incorporated by reference? Yes, 4.13-4.16, 9.2-9.4
 - 2. Maps previously found in compliance by FAA? Yes
 - 3. Compliance determination still valid? Yes
 - 4. Does 180-day period have to wait for map compliance finding? Yes
- B. Revised NEMs submitted with program:

(Review using NEM checklist if map revisions included in NCP submittal)

 - 1. Revised NEMs included with program? Yes, 4.16, 9.4,
 - 2. Has airport operator requested FAA to make a determination on the NEM(s) when NCP approval is made? Yes
- C. If program analysis used noise modeling:
 - 1. INM or HNM, or FAA-approved equivalent? Yes, 3.27-3.32
 - 2. Monitoring in accordance with A150.5? Yes, 3.27-3.32
- D. Existing condition and 5-year maps clearly identified as the official NEMs? Yes, 4.16, 9.4 and Large-Scale Maps Submitted Separately

IV. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES: [B150.7, 150.23 (e)]

- A. At a minimum, are the alternatives below considered?
- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Land acquisition and interest therein, including air rights, easements, and development rights? | Yes, 6.9 |
| 2. Barriers, acoustical shielding, public building sound proofing | |
| Yes, 6.9 | |
| 3. Preferential runway system | Yes, 6.9 |
| 4. Voluntary Flight procedures | Yes, 7.1-7.55 |
| 5. Restrictions on type/class of aircraft (as least one restriction below must be considered) taking into account applicable legislation (49 U.S.C 47521 et. seq.), powers and duties of the Administrator, and grant assurances. | |
| a. deny use based on Federal standards | Yes, 6.8 |
| b. capacity limits based on noisiness | Yes, 6.8 |
| c. mandatory noise abatement takeoff/approach procedures | Yes, 7.1-7.55 |
| d. landing fees based on noise or time of day | Yes, 6.8 |
| e. nighttime restrictions | Yes, 6.8 |
| 6. Other actions with beneficial impact not listed herein | Yes, 8.1-8.12 |
| 7. Other FAA recommendations (see D, below) | N/A |

B. Responsible implementing authority identified for each considered alternative? Yes

- C. Analysis of alternative measures:
- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Measure clearly described? | Yes, 7.1-7.55, 8.1-8.12 |
| 2. Measures adequately analyzed? | Yes, 7.1-7.55, 8.1-8.12 |
| 3. Adequate reasoning for rejecting alternatives? | Yes, 6.2-6.3, 7.1-7.55, 8.1-8.12 |

D. Other actions recommended by the FAA:
Should other actions be added? N/A

(List separately, or on back, actions and discussions with airport operator to have them included prior to the start of the 180-day cycle. New measures adopted by the airport sponsor must be subject to consultation before they can be submitted to the FAA for action. (See E., below)

V. ALTERNATIVES RECOMMENDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION:

[150.23 (e), B150.7, B150.35 (b), B150.5]

- A. Document clearly indicates:
1. Alternatives recommended for implementation? Yes, 9.1-9.28
 2. Final recommendations are airport operator's, not those of consultant or third party? Yes, Cover Letter
- B. Do all program recommendations:
1. Relate directly or indirectly to reduction of noise and non-compatible land uses? Yes, 9.1-9.28
(Note: All program recommendations, regardless of whether previously approved by the FAA in an earlier Part 150 study, must demonstrate a noise benefit if the airport sponsor wants FAA to consider the measure for approval in a program update. See E., below)
 2. Contain description of contribution to overall effectiveness of program? Yes, 9.1-9.28
 3. Noise/land use benefits quantified to extent possible? Yes, 9.1-9.28
 4. Include actual/anticipated effect on reducing noise exposure within noncompatible area shown on NEM? Yes, 7.1-7.55
 5. Effects based on relevant and reasonable expressed assumptions? Yes, 9.1-9.28
 6. Have adequate supporting data to support its contribution to noise/land use compatibility? Yes, 9.1-9.28
- C. Analysis appears to support program standards set forth in 150.35 (b) and B150.5? Yes, 9.1-9.28
- D. When use restrictions are recommended:
1. Does (or could) the restriction affect Stage 2 or Stage 3 aircraft operations (regardless of whether they presently operate at the airport)? (If restriction affects Stage 2 helicopters, Part 161 also applies.) N/A
If the answer to 1. is yes, has the airport operator completed the Part 161 process and received FAA Part 161 approval for a restriction affecting Stage 3 aircraft? For restrictions affecting only Stage 2 analysis and consultation process required by Part 161? N/A
 3. Are non-restrictive alternatives with potentially significant noise/compatible land use benefits thoroughly analyzed so that appropriate comparisons and conclusions can be made? N/A

4. Did the FAA regional or ADO reviewer coordinate the use restriction with APP-600 prior to making determination on start of 180-days? N/A
- E. Do the following also meet Part 150 analytical standards:
- 1. Formal recommendations which continue existing practices? Yes, 9.1-9.28
 - 2. New recommendations or changes proposed at end of Part 150 process? Yes, 9.1-9.28
- F. Documentation indicates how recommendations may change previously adopted plans? Yes, 9.1-9.28
- G. Documentation also:
- 1. Identifies agencies which are responsible for implementing each recommendation Yes, 9.1-9.28
 - 2. Indicates whether those agencies have agreed to implement? N/A
 - 3. Indicates essential government actions necessary to implement recommendations? Yes, 9.1-9.28
- H. Time Frame:
- 1. Includes agreed-upon schedule to implement alternatives? Yes, 9.1-9.28
 - 2. Indicates period covered by the program? Yes, Cover Letter
- I. Funding/Costs:
- 1. Includes costs to implement alternatives? Yes, 9.1-9.28
 - 2. Includes anticipated funding source? Yes, if applicable, 9.1-9.28

VI. PROGRAM REVISION: [150.23 (e) (9)]

- Supporting documentation includes provision for revision? Yes, 9.26

Noise Exposure Map Checklist

I. IDENTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION OF MAP DOCUMENT: Page Number

- | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|
| A. | Is this submittal appropriately identified as one of the following, submitted under 14 CFR Part 150: | Cover, Cover Letter |
| 1. | A NEM only | N/A |
| 2. | A NEM and NCP | Yes |
| 3. | A revision to NEMs which have previously been determined by FAA to be in compliance with Part 150? | Yes |
| B. | Is the airport name and the qualified airport operator identified? | Yes, Cover, Cover Letter |
| C. | Is there a dated cover letter from the airport operator which indicates the documents are submitted under Part 150 for appropriate FAA determination? | Yes |

II. CONSULTATION: [150.21 (b), A150.(a)]

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| A. | Is there a narrative description of the consultation accomplished, including opportunities for public review and comment during map development? | Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G |
| B. | Identification: | |
| 1. | Are the consulted parties identified? | Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G |
| 2. | Do they include all those required by 150.21 (b) and A150.105 (a)? | Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G |
| C. | Does the documentation include the airport operator's certification, and evidence to support it, that interested persons have been afforded adequate opportunity to submit their view, data, and comments during map development and in accordance with 150.21 (b)? | Yes, Cover Letter, Large-scale Maps, Fly Sheet, Appendix G |
| D. | Does the document indicate whether written comments were received during consultation and, if there were comments, that they are on file with the FAA region? | Yes, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G |

III. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS: [150.21]

- A. Are there two maps, each clearly labeled on the face with year (existing condition year and 5-year)?
 Yes, 4.16, 9.4, Large-scale maps submitted separately
- B. Map currency:
1. Does the existing condition map year match the year on the airport operator's submittal letter? No¹, 4.16
 2. Is the 5-year map based on reasonable forecasts and other planning assumptions and is it for the fifth calendar year after the year of submission? Yes, 9.4
 3. If the answer to 1 and 2 above is no, has the airport operator verified in writing that data in the documentation are representative of existing condition and 5-year forecast conditions as of the date of submission? Yes, Cover Letter
- C. If the NEM and NCP are submitted together:
1. Has the airport operator indicated whether the 5-year map is based on 5-year contours without the program vs. contours if the program is implemented? Yes, 9.1
 2. If the 5-year map is based on program implementation:
 - a. are the specific program measures which are reflected on the map identified? N/A
 - b. does the documentation specifically describe how these measures affect land use compatibilities depicted on the map? N/A
 3. If the 5-year NEM does not incorporate program implementation, has the airport operator included an additional NEM for FAA determination after the program is approved which show program implementation conditions and which is intended to replace the 5-year NEM as the new official 5-year map? Yes, 9.5

¹ Note: The base case year (2014) was used because it was the last full year of operations when the project started. Therefore, it was considered to be the best year for the base case NEM.

IV. MAP SCALE, GRAPHICS, AND DATA REQUIREMENTS:

[A150.101, A150.105, 150.21 (a)]

- A. Are the maps of sufficient scale to be clear and readable (they must not be less than 1" to 2,000') and is the scale indicated on the maps?

Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately

- B. Is the quality of the graphics such that required information is clear and readable?

Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately

- C. Depiction of the airport and its environs.
 - 1. Is the following graphically depicted to scale on both the existing condition and 5-year maps:
 - a. Airport boundaries

Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately
 - b. Runway configurations with runway end numbers

Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately
 - 2. Does the depiction of the off-airport data include:
 - a. A land use base map depicting streets and other identifiable geographic features

Yes
 - b. The area within the 65 Ldn (or beyond, at local discretion)

Yes
 - c. Clear delineation of geographic boundaries and the names of all jurisdictions with the 65 Ldn (or beyond, at local discretion)

Yes

- D.
 - 1. Continuous contours for at least the Ldn 65, 70, and 75?

Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately
 - 2. Based on current airport and operational data for the existing condition year NEM, and forecast data for the 5-year NEM?

Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately

- E. Flight tracks for the existing condition and 5-year forecast time frames (these may be on supplemental graphics which must use the same land use base map as the existing conditioned and 5-year NEM, which are numbered to correspond to accompanying narrative?
Yes, 4.13-4.14, same existing and future
- F. Locations of any noise monitoring sites (these may be on supplemental graphics which must use the same land use base map as the official NEMs)
Yes, 3.30-3.31
- G. Noncompatible land use identification:
1. Are noncompatible land uses within at least the 65 Ldn depicted on the maps?
Yes, 4.14, 9.4, Large-scale maps submitted separately
 2. Are noise sensitive public buildings identified?
N/A
 3. Are the noncompatible uses and noise sensitive public buildings readily identifiable and explained on the map legend?
Yes
 4. Are compatible land uses, which would normally be considered noncompatible, explained in the accompanying narrative?
N/A

V. NARRATIVE SUPPORT OF MAP DATA:

[150.21 (a), A150.1, A150.103]

- A. 1. Are the technical data, including data sources, on which the NEMs are based adequately described in the narrative?
Yes, 2.1-2.16, 4.1-4.21
2. Are the underlying technical data and planning assumptions reasonable?
Yes, 2.1-2.16, 4.1-4.21
- B. Calculation of Noise Contours:
1. Is the methodology indicated?
Yes, Cover Letter, 4.1-4.21
 - a. Is it FAA approved?
Yes
 - b. Was the same model used for both maps?
Yes
 - c. Has AEE approval been obtained for use of a model other than those which have previous blanket FAA approval?
N/A
 2. Correct use of noise models:

- a. Does the documentation indicate the airport operator has adjusted or calibrated FAA-approved noise models or substituted one aircraft type for another? No
- b. If so, does this have written approval from AEE? N/A
- 3. If noise monitoring was used, does the narrative indicate that Part 150 guidelines were followed? Yes, 3.27-3.32
- 4. For noise contours below 65 Ldn, does the supporting documentation include explanation of local reasons? (Narrative explanation is highly desirable but not required by the Rule.) Yes, Appendix D, Use Agreement

C. Noncompatible Land Use Information:

- 1. Does the narrative give estimates of the number of people residing in each of the contours (Ldn 65, 70 and 75, at a minimum) for both the existing condition and 5-year maps? Yes, 5.1-5.4, 9.3
- 2. Does the documentation indicate whether Table 1 of Part 150 was used by the airport operator? 3.22
 - a. If a local variation to Table 1 was used:
 - (1) does the narrative clearly indicate which adjustments were made and the local reasons for doing so? N/A
 - (2) does the narrative include the airport operator's complete substitution for Table 1? N/A
- 3. Does the narrative include information of self-generated or ambient noise where compatible/noncompatible land use identifications consider non-airport/aircraft sources? N/A
- 4. Where normally noncompatible land uses are not depicted as such on the NEMs, does the narrative satisfactorily explain why, with reference to the specific geographic areas? N/A
- 5. Does the narrative describe how forecasts will affect land use compatibility? 5.1-5.4, 9.3

VI. MAP CERTIFICATIONS: [150.21 (b), 150.21 (e)]

- A. Has the operator certified in writing that interested persons have been afforded adequate opportunity to submit views, data, and comments concerning the correctness and adequacy of the draft maps and forecasts? Yes, Cover Letter, 10.1-10.2, Appendix G
- B. Has the operator certified in writing that each map and description of consultation and opportunity for public comment are true and complete? Yes, Cover Letter, Large-scale maps submitted separately