

**Key West International Airport
Ad-hoc Committee on Airport Noise**

Agenda for Tuesday, December 4th, 2012

Call to Order 2:00 pm Harvey Government Center

Roll Call

- A. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes
 - 1. For October 2nd, 2012
- B. Discussion of Part 150 Study Update -
 - 1. Role of the FAA and the Part 150 Process
 - 2. Section 1, 2, and Forecast Comments
 - 3. Operations Data and Flight Tracks
- C. Other Reports:
 - 1. Noise Hotline and Contact Log
 - 2. Airport Noise Report
- D. Any Other Discussion
- E. Next meeting: February 5th, 2013

2013 Schedule of Meetings

February 5 th	April 2 nd	June 4 th
August 6 th	October 1 st	December 3 rd

**KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise
October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes**

ROLL CALL:

Committee Members in Attendance:

Commissioner Kim Wigington
Dan McMahon
Kay Miller
Sonny Knowles
Robert Padron
Dr. Julie Ann Floyd
Marlene Durazo

Staff and Guests in Attendance:

Peter Horton, KWIA.
Deborah Lagos, URS Corp.
Dan Botto, URS Corp.
R. L. Blazevic, Resident
Brendan Cunningham, City of Key West
Danny Kolhage, Monroe County Clerk of the Court
Robert S. Gold, Resident

Commissioner Wigington (Committee Chair) called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Quorum was present

Before any discussion started, Peter Horton presented Commissioner Wigington a plaque for her years of service as the Chairperson for the Monroe County Ad-Hoc Committee on Aircraft Noise.

In addition, Kay Miller congratulated Peter Horton for EYW being named Commercial Service Airport Manager of the Year.

The Meeting was temporarily recessed for a small celebration of both events.

KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes for the August 7, 2012 Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Commissioner Wigington asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting minutes from August 7, 2012 and if there are any revisions or corrections. The committee indicated there were no changes. Robert Padron motioned that the minutes be accepted as written. Dan McMahon seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Discussion of Part 150 Study Update

Commissioner Wigington began the discussion of the Part 150 Study Update.

Role of the FAA

Dan mentioned that the "Role of the FAA" page in the agenda package, page 3, has two minor changes. The revised page has been provided to all in attendance today. Both of these changes are in the first paragraph of the Noise Compatibility Program section. The FAA wanted to change the first sentence to read "...of the measures (operational, land use, and program management) included in the NCP and, based on that evaluation, either approves or disproves each of the measures in the program." The FAA wanted to make it clear that they can and often do approve or disapprove individual measures recommended in the NCP, as opposed to approving or disapproving the entire program.

Dan explained that the FAA also does not approve the NEMs, they strictly determine if the NEMs are in compliance with the Part 150 requirements, and will issue a Notice of Compliance that will be published in the Federal Register. They will make sure that URS and the Airport are following the rules and regulations that govern the Part 150 Process and that the public was included; additionally, they will provide guidance and instruction as to items that were not covered or covered improperly.

Dan further mentioned that the approval role of the FAA occurs during the Noise Compatibility Program [NCP] where recommendations are made for operational

KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

and/or land use mitigation measures, like the NIP. That is where the FAA will approve or disapprove based on the Part 150 requirements.

Section 1 and 2 of the NEM Documentation

Dan Botto asked if everyone had a chance to review the Sections 1 and 2 that were provided at the previous meeting. Kay Miller asked for a pdf of the sections as she was not at the previous meeting. Dan explained that Section 1 was an introduction to the NEM and the Part 150 process. Section 2 was jurisdiction and land use and would be updated throughout the project as necessary. There were no comments from the Committee.

Forecast of Aircraft Operations

Dan Botto provided the FAA-approved Part 150 Forecast of Aircraft Operations to the Committee. Dan explained that these numbers would be used for the future condition (2018) noise modeling in the NEM. Dan also explained that the forecast would be increased by the addition of Southwest's one daily flight (i.e., 730 operations annually) from Key West to New Orleans. Since this will not significantly increase the number of operations included in the forecast previously approved by the FAA, the FAA would most likely approve the revised forecast.

Dan Botto and Deborah Lagos explained that the existing year (i.e., 2013) has not been completed yet, and is waiting on the radar data to be provided by NASKW. Dan Botto also explained that the documentation in Section 3 has some Navy information that NASKW needs to confirm.

Dan Botto asked that the Committee review and provide comments and questions on the Forecast of Aircraft Operations at any time between now and the December meeting.

Robert Gold asked if the forecast is surprising or in line with what is expected. Deborah Lagos explained that this was not a true forecast. Deborah explained that the FAA provides and develops a Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) for each airport in the country. The TAF begins with operations reported to the FAA from the EYW ATCT. The tower is not open 24 hours per day; therefore the reports to

KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

the FAA do not include any operations occurring when the tower is closed. Deborah continued that this forecast seeks to account for aircraft operations occurring during those hours when the tower is not operational, and the change from the FAA TAF is not a huge increase. Dan Botto explained that the FAA prefers the use of the TAF unless there is concrete documentation for this change. The change requested in this forecast, including the documented new Southwest flight, remains below the FAA percentage increase (i.e., 10%) that would trigger a complete review and possible revision of the TAF. Dan mentioned that the change indicated on page 13 of the Forecast of Aircraft Operations, even including the new SWA flight, would remain less than 10 percent. Dan explained that a larger increase triggers a complete forecast that goes to Washington for approval instead of the regional FAA office.

Danny Kolhage asked if we are required to develop a forecast for the Part 150. Deborah Lagos explained that we could have chosen to use the TAF, without having to obtain special approval. Danny then asked why is it in the best interest of the airport to develop a forecast. Deborah Lagos explained that it better represents what is occurring and what may actually occur in the future. Deborah mentioned that there are certain areas that want to be in the noise contour to take advantage of any noise mitigation programs. Therefore having the most accurate account of aircraft operations provides the best opportunity for this to occur and reduces any questions that may arise if these areas are not in the contour. Robert Gold mentions that this is not a case of "cooking the books" so much as it is a case of using the most accurate data possible. Dan Botto reminded everyone that the TAF is based on EYW tower counts that do not include operations occurring when the tower is closed. This forecast tries to account for these operations in the most logically defensible manner possible.

Robert Gold asked when can we expect this forecast to be approved. Peter Horton mentioned that the forecast had been approved for use in the Part 150 on the previous Friday (Sept. 28, 2012). Peter explained that the FAA TAF is usually very conservative, and if you look at Table 1 in the Forecast of Aircraft Operations you can see how the operations have changed over time, but throughout this period passenger enplanements have gone up. This indicates that fewer operations are occurring, but they are using larger aircraft. Commissioner Wigington mentioned

KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

that these larger aircraft happen to be newer, quieter aircraft. Peter also mentioned that the ATR-72 aircraft is going to be replaced by the EMB140 prior to the future year (i.e., 2018).

Other Reports

Hotline & Contact Log

Dan Botto reported that the hotline had three calls over the last two months; all from a resident of Key West-by-the-Sea. Ms. Durazo explained that when the wind switches, the departures seem to deviate from the runway centerline and drift closer to KWBTS.

Kay Millar asked if URS had contacted Mrs. Sands. Dan Botto explained that we have been in contact with Mrs. Sands and are working with her to determine a solution.

Robert Gold asked if the departure procedures are set by the ATCT. Peter Horton explained that the departure path is at the pilot's discretion. Peter said that if the airport is operating to the east (i.e., 80% of the time), the tower will tell the aircraft to make an immediate left turn to avoid NASKW, but other than that, it is up to the pilot. If departing to the west, the aircraft will make a turn to the north as soon as possible. Robert Gold mentioned that this goes back to his previous discussions that the tower can be more authoritative in terms of flight path immediately before landing and immediately after take-off. If the tower were to tell the aircraft to wait a few seconds before making any turns, it could reduce much of the complaints. A 5 second difference on when the aircraft make their turns could have a huge impact on the noise. Robert said he personally loves the operation in the opposite direction because his biggest impact is when aircraft are arriving over his home, but he understands that it is much worse for KWBTS.

Sonny Knowles explained that if some aircraft were slightly left of the runway centerline on westerly departures, it is most likely due to either an unintentional drift by the pilot or alteration caused by winds. Marlene Durazo mentioned that it does occur occasionally. Peter Horton explained that KWBTS is only 800 feet off the runway centerline, and at that distance it does not take much deviation and/or correction to ease slightly closer to KWBTS.

KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Peter Horton explained that the switch to the EMB 140 will reduce the use of the Garrison Bight approach because they are required to be at a stabilized approach 3 miles out and straight in.

Airport Noise Report

Dan Botto asked if there are any items of interest in the Airport Noise Report (ANR). There were no items from the committee. Dan discussed that most of the items of interest in this batch of the ANR have to deal with the FAA's recently issued Program Guidance Letter (PGL), reiterating their policy on how Noise Insulation Programs are to be conducted. Danny Kolhage indicated that in the ANR, AAAE believes that this is new guidance, while the FAA indicates that this has been the guidance all along, and they are just reiterating those rules.

Deborah Lagos explained that previously a NIP would test 10 to 15 percent of the homes in a program area, taking a wide sample of building types and levels of maintenance, for noise levels prior to and after the construction has been completed to determine the amount of noise reduction achieved by the sound insulation. This PGL is telling us that the primary reason for the noise testing is to determine if the house is qualified to participate in the NIP. Previously, it was assumed that if the house was in the 65 dB noise contour, or in a squared off area for neighborhood equity, it was eligible. Now that is only the first step towards eligibility. The second step is this noise testing that has to show that the house has an interior noise level of 45 dB or above before any work is done. Kay Miller asks if this could lead to one house qualifying and the house next door not being eligible. Deborah Lagos indicated that this could happen.

Danny Kolhage asked in the prior projects at Key West, what would have happened if this guidance had been followed. Deborah Lagos explained that about 50 percent would have qualified. Kay Miller mentioned that her house may not have qualified. Peter Horton mentioned that from a public relations standpoint, that would be suicidal for an airport. Deborah Lagos went on that the NIP would still test up to 30 percent of the houses, based on similar construction types (i.e., wood frame, concrete block, etc.). Previously, we assumed that if KWBTs was in the 65 dB contour in anyway, then the entire complex would be included. But with this

KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

guidance, KWBTs could possibly be separated by buildings and even within the same building there could be qualifying and non-qualifying units.

Commissioner Wigington asked if KWBTs requires voting by all residents for approval of exterior improvements. Robert Padron explained that if the improvements change the esthetics of the property, then it would require voting. Commissioner Wigington then asked if the vote required 70 or 90 percent approval from the residents.

Marlene Durazo then mentioned that the FAA has yet to account for the reverberation noise between the buildings at KWBTs.

Deborah explained that this PGL also indicates that there is a secondary package of noise insulation for homes that do not meet the 45 dB and above interior noise levels, but are within the contour. The secondary package consists of items such as: caulking of windows, storm doors, and possible ventilation. Dan Botto mentioned that this secondary package is only available to 10 percent or a maximum of 20 homes in each phase.

Commissioner Wigington clarified that the first criteria is the home is within the DNL 65 dB noise contour. Commissioner Wigington then asked if an old house with no improvements that had an interior level greater than 45 but was not within the 65 dB contour would not be considered, but a newer house within the 65 may not meet the interior noise standards? Deborah Lagos mentioned that the older house could still qualify if the home was included in an area that has been included for neighborhood equity.

Danny Kolhage asked if there is anyone challenging this PGL. Deborah Lagos mentioned that many of the aviation groups (e.g., ACI, AAAE, ACC) will be challenging the FAA on this.

Peter Horton mentioned that Key West has kind of had to deal with this before when originally Linda Avenue was included in the NIP, then the FAA removed them from the program. The issue was raised with the FAA and Linda Avenue was put back into the program.

Robert Padron asked if this PGL could lead to issues, especially at KWBTs, because you could have one building in the program and the others not in the program.

KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Deborah Lagos asked Dan McMahon about what would happen if half of Building C was eligible. Dan McMahon said perhaps the residents would feel that they should take what they can get, that something is better than nothing. Robert Padron mentioned that it could affect the values. Dan agreed, but depending on how it was presented it could still be approved. Marlene Durazo indicated that is something that should be looked into. Peter Horton said that if the contour does hit KWBT5, that each and every unit should be included in the NIP and let the FAA accept or reject each one.

Marlene Durazo mentioned that KWBT5 was the first condo in Key West. Peter Horton said that at that time, the largest aircraft coming into Key West was probably the DC-3, and the airport has evolved since then.

Dan Botto mentioned that on page 25 of the agenda package, the PGL indicates that if the residences not tested believe that their unit would test different, the resident can request individual testing.

Deborah Lagos explained that in most cases, the residences tested as the representative sample would likely represent the worst case scenario. Marlene Durazo mentioned that the corner units closest to the airport receive a large share of run-up noise. Deborah Lagos further explained that the testing would have to be on multiple floors to determine if the noise levels would be different. Dan McMahon asked if where the PGL talks about different categories, which would include one, two, and three bedroom units, different floors, and different areas that are unique in their own way. Deborah Lagos mentioned that the testing is done with simulated noise, not actual aircraft noise.

Dan McMahon asked if the windows are open or closed when the testing is done. Kay Miller explained that everything is closed.

Deborah Lagos explained that with the clarified guidance, the further outside the actual 65 that a given unit is, the more difficult it will be to qualify. The testing will determine the noise level difference between the outside and the inside. For example, if the noise level reduction between outside to inside is 20 dB, then this is subtracted from the modeled outside noise level to determine inside noise levels. The resultant inside noise level must be DNL 45dB or above.

KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise October 2, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Danny Kolhage asked how long the whole Part 150 Update process is expected to take. Deborah Lagos explained anywhere from 24 to 36 months. Dan Botto explained that the process is presented as a timeline, but in reality many different parts are being developed at the same time.

Deborah Lagos told the committee that they should have the existing and future contours at the February 2013 meeting.

Other

Marlene Durazo asked if we would be submitting the different sections as we complete them. Deborah Lagos mentioned that yes the sections go to the FAA prior to the committee. Marlene Durazo said she would like to review the mitigation recommendations prior to sending them to the FAA. Deborah explained that the recommendations will be those of the committee. The recommendations will be discussed and approved by the committee prior to official documentation is provided to the FAA. Marlene mentioned the previous update did not have recommendations. Deborah explained that the annual contour update does not contain any recommendations; it merely presents updated contours that may or may not trigger an update to the NEM and NCP.

Peter Horton suggested that if this committee wants to continue with the NIP, this committee has the ability to recommend any reasonable measures, including all of KWBTS, and let the FAA accept or reject this. Peter continued that one of the reasons for this Part 150 is to try and include KWBTS due to its proximity to the airport.

Commissioner Wigington asked if there was any other discussion, and there was none.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20 PM.

The Role of the FAA in the Part 150 Process:

Noise Exposure Maps

- Indicates whether they are in compliance with applicable requirements,
- Publishes notice of compliance in the Federal Register, including where and when the maps and related documentation are available for public inspection.

Noise Compatibility Program

The FAA conducts an evaluation of each of the measures (operational, land use, and program management) included in the noise compatibility program and, based on that evaluation, either approves or disapproves each of the measures in the program. The evaluation includes consideration of proposed measures to determine whether they—

- May create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce (including unjust discrimination);
- Are reasonably consistent with obtaining the goal of reducing existing noncompatible land uses and preventing the introduction of additional noncompatible land uses;
- Include the use of new or modified flight procedures to control the operation of aircraft for purposes of noise control, or affect flight procedures in any way;
- The evaluation may also include an evaluation of those proposed measures to determine whether they may adversely affect the exercise of the authority and responsibilities of the Administrator under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended.

The Administrator approves programs under this part, if –

- Program measures to be implemented would not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce and are reasonable consistent with achieving the goals of reducing existing noncompatible land uses around the airport and of preventing the introduction of additional noncompatible land uses;
- The program provides for revision if made necessary by the revision of the noise map;
- Those aspects of programs relating to the use of flight procedures for noise control can be implemented within the period covered by the program and WITHOUT –
 - Reducing the level of aviation safety provided;
 - Derogating the requisite level of protection for aircraft, their occupants, and persons and property on the ground
 - Adversely affecting the efficient use and management of the Navigable Airspace and Air Traffic Control Systems; or
 - Adversely affecting any other powers and responsibilities of the Administrator prescribed by law or any other program, standard, or requirement established in accordance with law.

Source: .Title 14 cfr part 150.

PART 150 PROCESS

NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS

Existing Noise Exposure Map



Future Noise Exposure Map



Public Review

Noise Exposure Maps Report



FAA Review / Comments

FAA Notice of Noise Exposure Map Conformance

NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM

Operational Noise Abatement Alternatives



Land Use Noise Mitigation Alternatives



Public Review

Program Management Alternatives



**Implementation Plan / Noise Benefit Analysis /
Cost Estimate / Roles & Responsibilities**



Preliminary Noise Compatibility Program Report



FAA Review

Final Noise Compatibility Program Report



Public Hearing



FAA Review - 180 Days

FAA Record of Approval



**Key West International Airport
Noise Hotline Log**

Date of call	Time of call	Caller	Contact information	Date rec'd	Message	Response	Date
10/23/2012	3:36 PM	Carl McMacken	KWBTS, 732-581-0682	10/30/2012	A plane just took off, a white private jet louder than any commercial jet ive ever heard take off here. I don't know what it was or what was going on. It took off to the East, it made a left hand turn climbing out heading due North.		

**Key West International Airport
Contact Log**

No Airport Contact Log calls have been received since September 5, 2012.

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 29

September 21, 2012

Helicopters

FAA PROPOSES STAGE 3 NOISE STANDARDS FOR NEW HELICOPTER TYPE DESIGNS

Responding to increasing public complaints about helicopter noise and to demands by some members of Congress that something be done about them, the Federal Aviation Administration on Sept. 18 proposed more stringent Stage 3 noise standards for new helicopter type designs.

The public has until Nov. 19 to comment on the agency's proposal, which would harmonize U.S. helicopter noise standards with those adopted by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in 2002.

FAA's proposed Stage 3 helicopter noise standards would be 3 EPNdB more stringent than Stage 2 standards for takeoff; 4 EPNdB more stringent than Stage 2 standards for flyover; and 1 EPNdB more stringent than Stage 2 standards on approach.

The FAA said its proposal would apply to applications for new helicopter type designs and for supplemental type certificates for those new type designs.

FAA estimates that, given the complexity and expense in developing new helicopter models, applications for only two new helicopter type designs will be submitted. *(Continued on p. 117)*

GAO

FAA NEEDS TO BETTER ENSURE ELIGIBILITY FOR AIP NOISE GRANTS, GAO TELLS CONGRESS

The Federal Aviation Administration needs to better ensure that airport noise mitigation projects are eligible for Airport Improvement Program (AIP) noise grants, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) told the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee in a report released last week.

GAO identified two areas of concern regarding FAA's enforcement of AIP noise grant project eligibility criteria which it believes may have resulted in AIP noise grants being awarded to ineligible projects:

- FAA has not uniformly enforced the accuracy of noise exposure maps; and
- FAA has inconsistently applied program criteria for interior noise level assessments.

The GAO report, "FAA Needs to Better Ensure Project Eligibility and Improve Strategic Goal and Performance Measures," can be downloaded at <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-890>

With air traffic forecast to increase 20 percent by 2024, the Committee is concerned that, if not mitigated, the noise impact from this increase could diminish the

(Continued on p.118)

In This Issue...

Helicopters ... FAA proposes more stringent Stage 3 noise standards for new helicopter type designs but does not require the retrofit or phaseout of the current Stage 2 helicopter fleet - p. 116

AIP Noise Grants ... GAO tells the Senate Commerce Committee that FAA needs to do a better job ensuring that airport noise mitigation projects meet AIP grant eligibility requirements - p. 116

Green Technology ... Boeing and American Airlines showcase a 737-800 'eco-Demonstrator' airplane at Reagan National Airport to highlight testing of technologies to reduce noise and emissions - p. 117

Noise Grants ... T.F. Green Airport awarded a \$5.5 million AIP grant to acquire homes; City of Chicago awarded a \$4.9 million grant to fund noise mitigation measures in a school near O'Hare; Eastern WV Regional awarded \$72,000 for noise study of C17s - p. 118

Helicopters, from p. 116

mitted to the agency in the next decade. That rate mirrors the development of helicopter type designs in the last decade.

“There has been heightened public awareness of helicopter noise in the United States, and the FAA has determined that the public would benefit from adoption of these more stringent standards,” FAA said in its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

However, the NPRM does not require Stage 2 helicopters to be retrofitted to meet Stage 3 standards or to be phased out of operation – as was required for Stage 2 fixed-wing aircraft over 75,000 lbs. – nor does the NPRM state how much longer Stage 2 helicopters are expected to be operated. So it remains to be seen how much impact the FAA’s Stage 3 proposal will have in stemming helicopter noise complaints.

Also unclear at this point is whether any of the current Stage 2 helicopters already meet the FAA’s proposed Stage 3 noise standards, which are identical to standards adopted by ICAO a decade ago.

NPRM May Complicate East Hampton Effort

FAA’s NPRM could complicate the Town of East Hampton, NY’s, effort to restrict helicopter operations at East Hampton Airport. The town is in the process of deciding whether to try to impose a restriction on helicopter operations under FAA’s Part 161 Regulations on Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions.

Because current helicopters are designated as Stage 2 aircraft, only the notice and comment requirements of the Part 161 regulations apply. However, if the proposed Stage 3 helicopter rules are adopted by the FAA, it could mean that East Hampton’s proposal would then be subject to more onerous provisions of the Part 161 rules that apply to restrictions on Stage 3 aircraft and require that a cost/benefit analysis be done and that FAA approve the restriction.

Attorney Peter Kirsch of Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell, who is advising East Hampton on its possible helicopter restriction, declined to comment specifically on that case.

However, he said FAA’s proposed Stage 3 helicopter noise rule, if adopted, will complicate matters for airports seeking to restrict helicopter operations. But, he stressed, East Hampton is the only airport proprietor seeking to do that at this point.

Comments on the FAA’s proposed Stage 3 helicopter noise standards should reference docket number FAA-2012-0948. They can be submitted to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and follow the on-line instructions for sending comments electronically.

Comments also can be mailed to Docket Operations, M-30; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE, Room W12-140, West Building Ground Floor, Washington, DC 20590-0001.

For technical questions on the proposed rule, contact Sandy Liu in FAA’s Office of Environment and Energy (tel: 202-493-4864; email: sandy.liu@faa.gov).

For legal questions on the proposed rule, contact Karen Petronis in the FAA Office of the Chief Counsel (tel: 202-267-3073; email: karen.petronis@faa.gov).

Technology

GREEN TECHNOLOGY ON ECO-DEMONSTRATOR SHOWCASED

Boeing and American Airlines showcased a Next-Generation 737-800 ‘ecoDemonstrator’ aircraft at Washington, D.C. Reagan National Airport on Sept. 18 to highlight testing of environmentally progressive technologies.

The visit to the nation’s capital follows extensive flight testing in Glasgow, Montana, where the ecoDemonstrator flew a series of missions designed to test and accelerate advanced technologies that increase fuel efficiency and reduce airplane noise, Boeing explained in a news release.

Top officials from Boeing and American Airlines, as well as Deputy Secretary of Transportation John Porcari and Federal Aviation Administration Acting Administrator Michael Huerta, held a joint news conference to highlight innovation and collaboration among government and industry.

“The ecoDemonstrator illustrates how we’re pursuing technologies and advanced materials that make airplanes operate more efficiently and produce fewer emissions and less noise,” said John Tracy, Boeing chief technology officer. “I am proud of the leadership role that Boeing is playing in advancing the science of aerospace and demonstrating the value of these technologies to our airline customers, the flying public, and to society at large.”

American Airlines is loaning a new Next-Generation 737-800 to Boeing to serve as the testbed for these advanced technologies.

The flight testing completed in Glasgow allowed Boeing engineers to gather volumes of data about the viability of each technology. After testing is complete, the airplane will be returned to standard configuration and delivered to American later this year, Boeing said.

“At American Airlines, we are working diligently to improve our carbon footprint. Reducing noise pollution, conserving fuel and waste minimization are just a few of the areas where we are making progress,” said David Campbell, vice president of Safety, Security, and Environment for American Airlines.

“This is why it is so crucial for us to participate in programs like the ecoDemonstrator, so that we can test technologies that will continue to improve not only American’s environmental performance, but our entire industry as well. We remain committed to doing our part to be good stewards for the environment.”

The FAA program known as CLEEN (Continuous Lower Energy, Emissions, and Noise) provided funding for the adaptive trailing edge on the airplane as well as some flight test costs. The adaptive trailing edge is fitted on the wings of the

ecoDemonstrator to improve fuel-saving aerodynamic efficiency and to decrease aircraft noise during approach.

Other technologies on the 2012 ecoDemonstrator airplane include variable area fan nozzles, active engine vibration reduction, a regenerative fuel cell, and testing of flight trajectory optimization to enable more efficient routing for fuel savings. With fuel now the leading operating expenditure for airlines worldwide and increasingly stringent environmental regulations, improving fuel efficiency and reducing carbon and noise emissions is a top priority for the aviation sector.

“Boeing is fully committed to helping airlines operate more efficiently, with reduced environmental impact,” said Tracy. “We are committed because it is the right thing to do, and because meeting the environmental challenges we face will enable our industry to grow and broaden the benefits that aviation provides to global economic growth.”

The 2012 ecoDemonstrator is the first of several test platforms. Boeing plans to have one per year, with each airplane testing a new set of technologies. In 2013, a wide-bodied airplane will serve as the testbed.

The FAA CLEEN program is also participating in the 2013 program, providing cost-share funding for a ceramic matrix composite acoustic engine nozzle and its related flight test costs. Through weight reduction and increased temperature capability, the nozzle could reduce aircraft fuel burn by 1 percent.

Noise Grants

T.F. GREEN, O’HARE, WV AIRPORT AWARDED AIP NOISE GRANTS

The Federal Aviation Administration awarded a \$5 million grant to the Rhode Island Airport Corporation to acquire additional homes in the voluntary home acquisition program for T.F. Green Airport, Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI) announced Sept. 14.

Said Peter Frazier, Interim President & CEO of the Rhode Island Airport Corporation, “The \$5 million grant will help support ongoing mitigation projects for the benefit of our neighbors. We greatly appreciate the efforts of our congressional delegation, but in particular, Senator Jack Reed, who, on our behalf, continues to meet regularly with the FAA in Washington regarding our important airport projects.”

\$4.9 Million Grant to O’Hare

FAA awarded a \$4.9 million AIP grant to the City of Chicago for noise mitigation measures at St. Tarcisius Elementary School near Chicago O’Hare International Airport, Sen. Dick Durbin (D-IL) announced Sept. 12.

The private school is made up of four buildings on the northwest side of Chicago and serves more than 370 students. The grant will fund construction on sound insulation measures, including insulated windows, additional roofing and ceiling insulation, improved doors, HVAC modifications, and

other similar measures.

“Today’s funding will help create a better learning environment for children at St. Tarcisius Elementary School, which is just a few miles away from O’Hare Airport,” Durbin said. “It will ensure that modernizations at O’Hare Airport - which is a critical transportation link for Illinois and the entire Midwest - don’t adversely affect our children or our schools.”

St. Tarcisius Elementary School was tested for noise impact in 2011 and was determined to meet both FAA and City of Chicago aircraft noise metrics in order to be eligible for sound insulation. The Archdiocese of Chicago has recently completed the sound insulation design work.

WVA Airport Grant

FAA awarded a \$72,000 AIP grant to Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport, in Martinsburg WV, to conduct a Part 150 airport noise compatibility study to consider the noise impact of large C-17 military transport aircraft that are scheduled to be based at an Air National Guard Base at the airport in 2014.

GAO, from p. 116

quality of life in communities near airports and constrain the ability of airports to expand.

The Commerce Committee asked the GAO to (1) describe how aircraft noise exposure has changed, (2) to evaluate noise grant results, and (3) to assess potential future demand for noise grants.

Regarding outdated noise exposure maps, GAO said, “FAA does not always require airports to maintain updated and accurate noise exposure maps to define eligible projects areas.”

For example, the report notes, half of airport noise exposure maps, which are generally required to be updated every five years, are from the 1990s or earlier. GAO found that nine airports had received \$87.6 million in AIP noise grants in fiscal years 2010 and 2011 based on noise maps that predate 2000.

Regarding GAO’s second concern - that FAA has inconsistently implemented requirements that limit residential sound insulation projects to homes with interior noise levels above 45 dB DNL - GAO told Congress, “airports have little incentive to update maps and limit residential treatment because doing so might eliminate planned projects expected by the public.”

GAO noted that FAA had recently issued a Program Guidance Letter (PGL) specifying that the 45 dB interior noise level criterion must be met to be eligible for AIP funding. If effectively implemented by FAA, the PGL addresses its concerns, GAO told the Commerce Committee.

But GAO also told the Committee that the results of AIP noise grant projects are not linked to FAA’s strategic noise reduction goal - to reduce the population in the 65 dB DNL contour around airports to less than 300,000 people by 2018-

ANR EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Peter J. Kirsch, Esq.

Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
Denver

Vincent E. Mestre, P.E.

President, Mestre Greve Associates
Laguna Niguel, CA

Steven F. Pflaum, Esq.

Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Chicago

Mary L. Vigilante

President, Synergy Consultants
Seattle

Gregory S. Walden, Esq.

Patton Boggs LLP
Washington, D.C.

and to the approach FAA uses to measure progress toward that goal.

“For example, the goal does not include the results of noise insulation of homes and schools,” GAO said. “As a result, there is insufficient performance information about the effects of noise grants and the extent to which noise exposure remains a constraint on airport growth.”

Since 1982, FAA has provided \$5.8 billion in AIP noise grants to 481 airports, GAO reported, but said there are a number of indicators that point to a decline in future demand for noise grant projects.

There are fewer noise projects being done in the highest noise impact areas, the number of airports planning eligible noise projects is down 16 percent from 2001, fewer airports are developing new noise compatibility programs, and many of the 234 airports with such programs may be completing them, GAO reported.

But it stressed that about one-third of the people living in significantly noise-impacted areas reside near airports that have not completed and may never complete a noise compatibility program, which a necessary step before an airport can use noise grants for residential insulation. “This population, therefore, may never be reached by FAA’s grant program,” GAO told the Senate Commerce Committee.

“Though a number of airports continue to have planned noise mitigation projects, after 30 years of funding noise grants, it is reasonable to question whether the program may remain relevant for only a limited period in the future or needs to be reformed to better target emerging needs,” GAO concluded. “Increased knowledge about the problem and the use of noise grants as a solution should help Congress and FAA chart the most appropriate course for the future of the AIP noise program,” GAO added.

It recommended that FAA do the following:

- Establish a strategic noise reduction goal that aligns with the nature and extent of airport noise and targets the agency’s noise grant program;
- Establish performance measures to assess progress toward this goal that better demonstrate the results of the noise grant program and provide Congress and FAA’s program managers with information to gauge progress and make programmatic decisions.

FAA told the GAO that it would consider its recommendations.

A spokesman for the Senate Commerce Committee told ANR, “We’re currently reviewing the GAO report and will decide what oversight is appropriate.”

An observer familiar with the GAO report commented, “It is yet another nail in the coffin for future sound insulation programs. We suspect the drive to reduce federal spending is behind the PGL and GAO report as the FAA looks for program budgets to cut. Since noise mitigation is a voluntary program, airports would prefer to take cuts to those programs instead of on-airport property programs (i.e. terminals, runways, parking decks, etc.).”

AIRPORT NOISE REPORT

Anne H. Kohut, Publisher

Published 44 times a year at 43978 Urbancrest Ct., Ashburn, Va. 20147; Phone: (703) 729-4867; FAX: (703) 729-4528.
e-mail: editor@airportnoisereport.com; Price \$850.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Aviation Emissions Report, provided that the base fee of US\$1.03 per page per copy is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. USA.

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 30

September 28, 2012

NextGen

FAA LAUNCHES METROPLEX INITIATIVE TO IMPROVE FLORIDA AIRPORTS' EFFICIENCY

On Sept. 20, Acting Federal Aviation Administrator Michael Huerta launched the NextGen Florida Metroplex Initiative, which is intended to increase safety and efficiency of air traffic flow into and out of many of Florida's major airports while reducing aircraft emissions.

This collaborative partnership includes the FAA, the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, JetBlue Airways, American Airlines, US Airways, NetJets, and other aviation stakeholders, including business and general aviation interests.

The Florida Metroplex study area includes six airports: Orlando International, Tampa International, Miami International, Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International, West Palm Beach International, and SW Florida International airports.

Satellite airports in the Metroplex study area include Boca Raton, Daytona Beach, Kissimmee, Marco Island, Naples, Orlando Executive, Orlando Sanford, Sarasota Bradenton, and Stuart (Witham Field).

The FAA estimates that more direct routings and more efficient aircraft descents into the Florida Metroplex will save eight million gallons of fuel annually,
(Continued on p. 121)

NextGen

SEATTLE, QUEENS OFFICIALS WANT MORE INFORMATION ABOUT NEXTGEN PROCEDURES

Local elected officials are telling the Federal Aviation Administration that it needs to do a better job informing communities about more precise NextGen navigation procedures that are being implemented around the country and concentrating flight paths.

For example, the mayor of Seattle recently asked the FAA to more precisely disclose the location of narrowed flight tracks for performance-based navigation procedures that will be put in effect under the NextGen 'Greener Skies over Seattle' Initiative.

He was responding to concerns by South Seattle residents that the flights tracks would be concentrated over them.

And officials of the Borough of Queens, NY, and two members of the state Legislature who represent Queens are angry at the FAA for failing to let them know the agency was conducting a six-month flight test of a NextGen departure procedure out of LaGuardia International Airport that sparked a rash of noise complaints in Queens.

(Continued on p. 122)

In This Issue...

NextGen ... FAA launches a new Metroplex Initiative in Florida to increase safety and efficiency at airports there. The study area includes six major airports and nine smaller ones - p. 120

... Elected officials in Seattle and Queens, NY, tell FAA it needs to better inform the public about when NextGen procedures will be implemented and where tightened flight tracks will be - p. 120

Noise Grants ... FAA awards a \$2.8 million AIP grant to Laredo International Airport for residential noise mitigation efforts - p. 121

MSP Int'l ... A state court judge rules that the impact of noise on property at the end of a runway constitutes the taking of an aviation easement by the MAC that must be compensated - p. 121

News Briefs ... It will take several more weeks for FAA to post answers to questions on its new PGL on SIP funding eligibility - p. 123

Florida, from p. 120

which equates to a reduction in carbon emissions by nearly 80,000 metric tons and an estimated \$23.0 million saved in fuel costs. In addition, the FAA estimates that 5.4 million fewer nautical miles will be flown in and out of Florida based on current flight plan miles filed.

“The NextGen Metroplex initiative demonstrates the progress that can be made when the public and private sectors collaborate to deliver benefits for the flying public, the aviation community and the national economy,” said Huerta. “We’re excited about the improvements NextGen is bringing to Florida. The end result for travelers will be fewer delays, quicker flights and an even safer, greener flying experience.”

A metroplex is a region with several airports serving major metropolitan areas where heavy airport activity and environmental constraints combine to hinder the efficient movement of air traffic. Metroplex initiatives are underway or planned in numerous metropolitan areas across the country and will help airlines improve on-time performance and reduce emissions generated by aircraft.

The Florida Metroplex work teams will explore and develop proposed strategies to streamline airspace to help reduce airspace complexity for air traffic controllers and flight crews. The strategies include:

- Creating separate flight tracks for departures and arrivals to allow aircraft to climb and descend more efficiently;
- Expanding the development of Optimized Profile Descent (OPD) procedures into the airports;
- Shortening flight tracks by making them more direct;
- Designing new satellite-based procedures for reliever airports; and
- Developing routes that will enable general aviation traffic to fly more efficient routes through congested airspace.

Grants

LAREDO INT’L AWARDED \$2.8 M GRANT FOR NOISE MITIGATION

The Federal Aviation Administration awarded Laredo International Airport a \$2.8 million Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant to mitigate airport noise, Rep. Henry Cuellar (D-TX) announced Sept. 25.

“These funds provide necessary assistance to residents in close proximity to the airport, allowing the flow of travelers and goods to continue stimulating our local economy,” Cuellar said. “I thank Laredo Mayor Raul Salinas and Airport Manager Jose Luis Flores for their commitment to homeowners living around the Laredo International Airport area.”

The \$2.8 million grant award adds to a \$1.2 million grant award announced earlier this month that also will fund noise mitigation in residential areas adjacent to the airport.

The Laredo International noise mitigation program, which began in 1994, allows the homeowners within the designated

noise contour area to choose between three mitigation measures: airport can acquire the property, purchase an easement (at 8 percent of the appraised value of the property), or insulate the home.

“As our airport continues to grow in service and capacity, it is important that it also be a good neighbor to the surrounding community. The \$2.8 million noise mitigation grant will go a long way to reduce the airport’s impact on the neighborhood, ensuring the quality of life for Laredo residents,” said Laredo Mayor Salinas.

In addition to the \$1.2 million grant awarded earlier this month, the \$2.8 million will assist 416 homeowners, Cuellar said. New noise contours are currently being developed and will determine future funding under the noise program. The updated noise study is projected to be complete in December of this year.

Minneapolis-St. Paul Int’l

MAC TOOK EASEMENT THAT IT MUST PAY FOR, JUDGE RULES

The impact of aircraft noise on property located a mile off the end of a new runway that opened in 2005 at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport constitutes the taking of an aviation easement by the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) that must be compensated, a Hennepin County Court judge ruled Aug. 31.

However, he also held that a zoning change by the City of Bloomington, MN, that expanded the runway safety zones to include that property does not constitute a regulatory taking by the city, as alleged by the plaintiffs.

The MAC is considering whether to appeal the easement portion of the ruling that it lost and it is likely that the property owners will appeal the takings portion of the ruling that they lost in light of a recent state Supreme Court ruling that was favorable to their case.

The plaintiffs in the case, *Hampton K. O’Neill et al. v. City of Bloomington et al* (Court File No. 27CV10-8294), own approximately 60 acres of land in the 70-75 dB DNL contour of MSP International that are subject to 450 overflights a day. The O’Neills inherited the land in a trust and planned to sell it to a developer because of its proximity to the Mall of America, transportation links, and a wildlife refuge.

To be entitled to compensation for the taking of an aviation easement in Minnesota, the landowner must establish (1) “direct and substantial invasion of his property rights of such a magnitude that he is deprived of the practical enjoyment of the property” and (2) that “such invasion results in a definite and measurable diminution of the market value of the property.”

Property owners must prove that the invasions of their property rights are not of an occasional nature but are repeated and aggravated and that there is a reasonable probabil-

ity that they will continue in the future.

Hennepin County District Court Judge Robert A. Blaeser found that the plaintiffs had met that test. He ordered the MAC to begin eminent domain proceedings to determine the compensation owed to the plaintiffs.

The O’Neills’ assert that the noise impact has reduced the value of their property by about \$630,000.

Regulatory Taking Not Found

But Judge Blaeser found that the plaintiffs did not meet their burden of proving a regulatory taking of their property by the City of Bloomington.

The plaintiffs assert that the zoning change bringing their land into an airport runway protection zone reduced the value of the property by just under \$18 million.

The judge found that the plaintiffs failed to meet their burden of proving that the City’s ordinance caused a decrease in the market value of their property that was so substantial that it is “manifestly unfair,” as required by state law.

But in a similar case – involving property added to the runway protection zone at Rochester International Airport through a zoning change – the Minnesota Supreme Court ruled in March 2011 that such action did decrease the property’s value and did constitute a regulatory taking.

That is why the plaintiffs in the O’Neill case at MSP case are expected to appeal the lower court ruling to the state Supreme Court. They expect it to be overturned there.

“Airport authorities around the state of Minnesota will watch the O’Neill case because when airports are built or expanded in the future, property values could be impacted by either noise or the airport zoning regulations, or both,” said Chris Penwell of the Minneapolis law firm Siegel Brill, who represented the O’Neills.

NextGen, from p. 120

Seattle Mayor’s Letter

Seattle Mayor Michael McGinn told FAA NW Mountain Region officials in a Sept. 14 letter, “While it appears that these new [NextGen] procedures could reduce noise overall and narrow flight paths, it is unclear whether or not these changes might direct flights disproportionately over a specific community, that could then experience greater noise impacts as a result.”

Mayor McGinn told FAA that he has been hearing from Seattle residents about the possible noise impact on their neighborhoods ever since the agency opened the public comment period this summer on the draft Environmental Assessment it released on the Greener Skies Initiative (24 ANR 94).

While the maps in the Greener Skies Draft EA indicate generally where the new flight tracks will be, the FAA has not said what specific neighborhoods will get the overflights.

And that is what people in Seattle want to know.

“What they’re doing is actually great. But the way they are going about presenting it to the public is a disaster,”

Robert Bismuth, a resident of the Magnolia neighborhood of Seattle, told the *Seattle Times*.

The *Times* reported that the FAA presented the Draft EA on Greener Skies at two public meetings and at both of them told people with questions on the document to present them to a court reporter, who recorded them.

“And while people could talk individually with experts from the FAA and the Port of Seattle, the FAA shut down any attempts to generate a public discussion around their questions,” the *Times* reported.

At one public meeting on the Draft EA, people wanted to know why the Draft EA showed a noise increase over parts of South Seattle, the Central District, Capitol Hill, and West Seattle, if the NextGen technology is supposed to be making aircraft landings quieter. Was it because flight paths would be more concentrated, people wanted to know.

FAA officials said they would answer questions from the public in the Final EA on the Greener Skies Initiative. But one Seattle resident told the *Times*, “They’re being so evasive, it makes them suspect.”

Mayor McGinn asked the FAA to extend the comment period on the Greener Skies Draft EA and requested a briefing “to better understand the desired goals of the Initiative and how they will be achieved.”

FAA declined to extend the comment period or to provide the briefing the mayor sought. But FAA officials are meeting with Mayor McGinn on Oct. 23 to discuss aircraft noise and air traffic in general.

The FAA’s Draft EA on the Greener Skies Initiative found no significant noise impact on the 3.1 million people in the study area (24 ANR 95).

FAA Regional Administrator Dave Suomi told the *Times* that the greatest noise increase in any study area would be 0.9 dB, which FAA reported just to be transparent.

Suomi believes that the residents of South Seattle are blaming the Greener Skies Initiative for increases in overflights that have nothing to do with it: an expected increase in air traffic at Sea-Tac and the greater use of flight tracks over South Seattle in the summer when weather is good.

FAA provided the following statement to ANR:

Over the last eight months, the FAA has provided opportunities for the public to review and comment on the proposed Greener Skies project. The project’s Draft Environmental Analysis (EA) shows the initiative appears to be able to achieve its objectives, which include improving efficiency in complex airspace while enhancing safety, providing more direct aircraft routing, decreasing the amount of communications between controllers and pilots and increasing flight path predictability and flexibility.

While the Draft EA identified areas where noise levels could increase slightly, the degree of increase is expected to be imperceptible. During public meetings earlier this month, the FAA heard concerns about existing aircraft noise that is unrelated to the Greener Skies initiative. The FAA has committed to meet with affected communities to discuss those concerns and work to identify ways to address them.

ANR EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Peter J. Kirsch, Esq.

Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
Denver

Vincent E. Mestre, P.E.

President, Mestre Greve Associates
Laguna Niguel, CA

Steven F. Pflaum, Esq.

Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Chicago

Mary L. Vigilante

President, Synergy Consultants
Seattle

Gregory S. Walden, Esq.

Patton Boggs LLP
Washington, D.C.

Queens Officials Angry at FAA

Meanwhile, Queens, NY, officials have been highly critical of FAA for failing to let them know the agency was conducting a six-month flight test of a NextGen departure procedure out of LaGuardia.

It's not like people didn't notice.

NY State Sen. Tony Avella (D) and Assemblyman Ed Braunstein (D) held a protest with about 40 Queens residents in late August to protest the increase in aircraft noise.

"What the hell is going on here?" Avella asked.

FAA at that point told elected officials that the agency was evaluating a NextGen departure procedure out of LaGuardia that had tightened existing flight tracks over Queens and that it would accept public comments on it. But the agency never provided information on the test or how to comment on it, the *Queens Examiner* reported.

"Where's the public notification?" Avella asked the *Examiner*. "And how do we plug into this so-called public comment period?"

"I'm very concerned about how this came about without any notice at all to the affected communities or their representatives, and how these changes might affect our quality of life in the long term," Queens Borough President Helen Marshall told FAA officials at a Borough Hall meeting on Sept. 10, the *Times Ledger* reported.

An FAA official at the meeting told Marshall that after an environmental analysis, the FAA believed the flight test would have no adverse impacts and did not anticipate that the community would complain about it. That is why FAA did not inform local officials, the *Times Ledger* reported.

But Sen. Avella questioned who made the decision not to inform the public about the flight test. "It is done by an independent consultant or the FAA?" he asked. "It is easy for them to come to that conclusion so they never have to tell the public," Avella told the *Times Ledger*.

FAA pledged to communicate better with local officials in the future and to share the results of the flight test that caused noise complaints in Queens.

In Brief...

FAA Late with Answers to Questions on PGL

FAA had planned to post answers to questions on its new Program Guidance Letter on funding eligibility for airport sound insulation programs by mid-September but missed that timeframe.

"We are continuing to compile and prepare responses that have been submitted. Our plan is to start posting Questions and Answers on the website in the next couple of weeks," FAA told ANR.

AIRPORT NOISE REPORT

Anne H. Kohut, Publisher

Published 44 times a year at 43978 Urbancrest Ct., Ashburn, Va. 20147; Phone: (703) 729-4867; FAX: (703) 729-4528.
e-mail: editor@airportnoisereport.com; Price \$850.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Aviation Emissions Report, provided that the base fee of US\$1.03 per page per copy is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. USA.

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 31

October 5, 2012

Sound Insulation Programs

FAA ISSUED PGL TO RETAIN CONGRESSIONAL CONFIDENCE IN SIP PROGRAM, BLACK SAYS

The Federal Aviation Administration did not issue its new Program Guidance Letter (PGL) on funding eligibility for airport sound insulation programs as a way to cut program funding, as many people believe, Elliott Black, deputy director of FAA's Office of Airport Planning and Programming, told participants Oct. 1 at the 12 Annual Airport Noise Mitigation Symposium in Buffalo, NY.

The agency's main goal in issuing the PGL was to retain congressional confidence in the program, he stressed. The PGL was issued to address inconsistencies in how the FAA regional offices and airport district offices (ADOs) were administering the program, Black said.

One conference participant told ANR he believes FAA issued the PGL to forestall an audit of the agency's Part 150 airport noise compatibility program by the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

The GAO concluded in a recent report to Congress that the FAA needs to do a better job ensuring that airport noise mitigation projects meet Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant eligibility requirements (24 ANR 116).

(Continued on p. 125)

NextGen

FAA IS STUDYING CONCENTRATION OF FLIGHT TRACKS UNDER NEXTGEN, FAA'S BLACK SAYS

The Federal Aviation Administration is looking at the issue of concentrated flight tracks that result from the implementation of precise satellite-based advanced aircraft navigation procedures, Elliott Black, deputy director of FAA's Office of Airport Planning and Programming, said in response to a question posed Oct. 2 at the 12th Annual Airport Noise Mitigation Symposium in Buffalo, NY.

Jonathan Collette, Noise Abatement Program Manager for Philadelphia International Airport, asked the FAA official if the agency was considering the use of additional noise metrics in cases where NextGen procedures significantly increase noise events over a concentrated area.

Black replied that the agency was looking at concentrated flight tracks – which are a new and growing source of airport noise complaints – but said he knew nothing more about what the FAA was considering.

Clint Morrow of KB Environmental Sciences, Inc., noted that FAA has adopted a framework for addressing aircraft noise issues under its Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program that encompasses the 65 dB DNL contour.

(Continued on p. 127)

In This Issue...

Sound Insulation ... FAA issued its new PGL on SIP funding eligibility to retain congressional confidence in the program; not to cut program funding, FAA's Elliott Black tells conference. He also acknowledges that the agency is studying the concentration of flight tracks occurring with advanced NextGen satellite-based navigation procedures - p. 124

Noise Grants ... FAA awards a \$9.3 million AIP grant to sound insulate two Chicago schools near O'Hare Int'l Airport - p. 126

... Waterbury-Oxford Airport awarded an \$8.2 million AIP grant to relocate residents out of high noise area around the airport - p. 126

Orlando Airports ... ITT Exelis enters into an agreement with the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority to upgrade the noise and flight tracking system for Orlando Int'l Airport and Orlando Executive Airport - p. 126

PGL, from p. 124

One of the main concerns expressed in the GAO report was that the FAA had inconsistently applied the 45 dB DNL interior noise level criteria for sound insulation program funding eligibility.

The Senate Commerce Committee has not yet decided what action it will take in response to the GAO report, which concluded that it is likely that some sound insulation programs that were funded by AIP grants did not meet funding criteria.

If an audit of the FAA's Part 150 program were ordered, the worst outcome for airports would be that they could be required to return any AIP grant funding they had received for sound insulation programs found to be ineligible for such funding.

Twice during the conference, Black said he did not want to see airports subject to the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (Public Law No. 107-300), which greatly expanded federal government efforts to identify and reduce erroneous payments in government programs and activities.

The FAA's new PGL, which did resolve some of the GAO's funding concerns, stresses that the 45 dB DNL interior noise level criteria is a requirement the homes and other structures must meet – in addition to being located in an airport's 65 dB DNL contour – in order to be eligible for sound insulation funded by AIP grants or Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) revenue (24 ANR 98).

Rooting Out Inconsistencies

Now Black's mission is to root out any inconsistencies in the way FAA regional personnel are interpreting the agency's new Program Guidance Letter.

He asked sound insulation program consultants who work on insulation projects around the country to contact him personally if they receive conflicting answers to questions they and airports are posing to FAA regional offices and ADOs regarding the PGL.

Some consultants and airport representatives in the audience told Black that they already have received information from ADOs and regional offices that conflicted with interpretations of the PGL he provided at the conference in response to audience questions.

Black said FAA headquarters personnel are conducting conference calls every week with ADOs and regional offices on PGL issues. "The goal is to ensure that inconsistencies don't happen again," he said.

FAA is aware that airports and consultants have questions on acoustical testing requirements in the PGL and the agency has set up a group in the Airports Office and Office of Environment and Energy to address them, Black said.

Conference participants told him that FAA needs to answer questions regarding the PGL quickly so that airports can move forward with their sound insulation programs.

Black stressed to airports and consultants that any requests they make for additional acoustical testing beyond the

criteria set in the PGL must be justified. "The FAA Inspector General needs a paper trail for program costs. We have to have better documentation," he said.

Corrections to PGL Will Be Issued

Black announced that FAA will correct three errors in the PGL. Two are minor omissions in footnotes. The third clarifies the "Neighborhood Equity" section of Table 4: "Special Circumstances for Noise Insulation in Residences" of Attachment 1 to the PGL.

That section states the following:

"When a few residences that do not meet the interior noise level requirements are scattered among residences that do meet the interior noise level criteria, there will be confusion among the homeowners as to why one home is being insulated and another is not.

"The success of a noise compatibility program in a neighborhood relies on the support of the community. This community support may be lost if there is a sense that some residences are being denied noise insulation.

"To ensure community support, it may be reasonable to include provisions for neighborhood equity in a noise insulation project. In these cases, the Sponsor develops two sets of noise insulation packages. The standard noise insulation package will be prepared for residences that meet the interior noise criteria. A second package will be prepared consisting of other improvements such as caulking, weather stripping, installation of storm doors or ventilation packages for residences that are not experiencing interior noise 45 dB or greater.

"In order for grant funding to be available for the secondary package, participation must be limited by FAA policy to less than 10 percent of the residences in the neighborhood, (as logically bounded by either streets or other geographic delineation), but by FAA policy in no case more than 20 residences total in a phase of the noise insulation program.

"Where there are more than 10 percent or 20 residences proposed for neighborhood equity packages, the costs of this work must be funded with other, non-federal, sources of funds."

Black said the FAA will clarify that airports cannot use AIP, PFC, or any other source of airport revenue to fund the "more than 10 percent or 20 residences" in the neighborhood equity packages.

Asked what type of funding airports could use for neighborhood equity packages exceeding 10 percent or 20 residences, Black replied that airports "can use outside revenue" but did not elaborate.

Asked if a County government that was an airport proprietor could use its non-airport revenue to fund such neighborhood equity packages, Black said he would consult with FAA attorneys and answer that question at a later date.

The Noise Mitigation Symposium was sponsored by the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) in conjunction with the Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority and the Buffalo Niagara International Airport.

Grants

FAA AWARDS \$9.3 M TO INSULATE TWO SCHOOLS NEAR O'HARE

Two elementary schools on the northwest side of Chicago will receive a total of \$9.3 million in grants to sound insulate their buildings from aircraft noise generated at nearby O'Hare International Airport, the O'Hare3 Noise Compatibility Commissions (ONCC) announced Sept. 28.

The grant recipients – Farnsworth Elementary School and St. Tarcissus School – are located about one mile from each other in Chicago's 45th Ward.

The ONCC, an inter-governmental agency committed to reducing aircraft noise in communities near O'Hare, oversees the O'Hare School Sound Insulation Program in cooperation with the Chicago Department of Aviation (CDA). ONCC is comprised of representatives from 28 Cook and DuPage communities, Cook County, and 16 school districts.

The CDA tested and deemed Farnsworth as eligible for sound insulation in 2007. The school received a \$350,000 federal grant for design work in late 2009.

ONCC requested the CDA conduct a noise assessment of St. Tarcissus in August 2011. The school was declared eligible for sound insulation funds, based on last summer's aircraft noise-monitoring results.

"We are grateful for the efforts of Senator Dick Durbin (D-IL) who announced the Department of Transportation grants, and the continued support of the Federal Aviation Administration and the city of Chicago," said Dr. Raymond Kuper, chairman of ONCC's School Sound Insulation Committee.

"We know this sound insulation makes a difference for our children and expect the students and staff at Farnsworth and St. Tarcissus will achieve even greater success in their new, quiet surroundings." Kuper continued.

The Federal Aviation Administration will reimburse the school 80 percent of the cost using Airport Improvement Program funds while the city of Chicago will reimburse the remaining 20 percent using approved airline passenger facility charges. Sound insulation contractors will be selected by the Archdiocese of Chicago for St. Tarcissus and by Chicago Public Schools for Farnsworth.

St. Tarcissus is situated on a four-building campus that serves approximately 355 pre-school through eighth grade students with 35 staff and support personnel. The sound insulation work will include acoustical windows, new heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment, and other modifications.

Farnsworth has 610 students and 55 staff and support personnel. Sound insulation for the 24-classroom school will include acoustical windows and a new HVAC system to create a quieter learning environment.

The O'Hare School Sound Insulation Program is the largest and one of the oldest programs in the world, ONCC said. The program has allocated approximately \$332.8 mil-

lion in federal and airport funds to sound-insulate 119 schools near O'Hare with four more schools in process. Ebinger Elementary School, an eligible CPS school, awaits funding to complete the 124-school sound insulation program.

Grants

WATERBURY-OXFORD GETS \$8.2 M GRANT TO RELOCATE RESIDENTS

The Waterbury-Oxford Airport received a \$8,227,754 grant from the Federal Aviation Administration to fund relocation of residents in noise-impacted areas around the airport, Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) announced Sept. 27.

"We applaud FAA's strong commitment to the Middlebury residents who live next to Waterbury-Oxford Airport – the noise pollution that these homeowners have been subjected to for the last several years poses severe health and safety concerns," said Blumenthal and Sen. Joseph Lieberman (I-CT).

"We are glad these homeowners will finally receive the restitution that they deserve – fair compensation for their homes – and that a process that has taken far too long for these residents is one step closer to being over."

The project is being administered by the Connecticut Department of Transportation.

Flight Tracking

ITT EXELIS UPGRADING FLIGHT TRACKING SYSTEM AT ORLANDO

The Greater Orlando Aviation Authority (GOAA) has entered into an agreement with ITT Exelis to upgrade its noise and flight tracking systems with Symphony® EnvironmentalVue Virtual Noise Monitors (VNMs) and a real-time NextGen data feed.

These Exelis products leverage comprehensive noise and surveillance data to help airports track and address aircraft noise levels in the surrounding communities more effectively, GOAA said Oct. 1.

VNMs allow airport operators to use the same prediction model used by the Federal Aviation Administration to calculate aircraft noise over residential areas. They have been added to GOAA's existing Exelis AirScene.com Noise and Operations Monitoring System (NOMS) solution.

Unlike physical noise monitors that capture all sources of noise, including ground traffic, a VNM calculates aircraft-only noise values. The system is helping GOAA to develop procedures to mitigate community noise within safety and operational requirements in the vicinity of Orlando International and Orlando Executive Airports. GOAA is responsible for the operation of both airports.

The NextGen data feed is replacing the single terminal

ANR EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Peter J. Kirsch, Esq.

Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
Denver

Vincent E. Mestre, P.E.

President, Mestre Greve Associates
Laguna Niguel, CA

Steven F. Pflaum, Esq.

Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Chicago

Mary L. Vigilante

President, Synergy Consultants
Seattle

Gregory S. Walden, Esq.

Patton Boggs LLP
Washington, D.C.

radar feed at GOAA. The feed fuses multiple existing FAA surveillance sources with data derived from the U.S. Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) network being deployed by Exelis. The FAA's surveillance sources include terminal and en route radar, Airport Surface Detection Equipment, Model X, (ASDE-X) and wide-area multi-lateration. The NextGen surveillance feed produces geo-referenced flight tracks with higher update rates and fidelity than a single conventional radar.

"These enhancements to our Noise and Operations Monitoring System affirm our commitment to being a good neighbor to the community," said Cyrus T. Callum, GOAA's assistant director of operations. "We will use this tracking data to further enhance our noise abatement procedures for the benefit of the communities that surround our airport system, while promoting the economic benefits of air commerce and tourism to the Orlando area."

NextGen, from p. 124

But NextGen noise issues are different and occur outside 65 DNL, he said, asking Black if FAA plans to revise its Part 150 guidance or use other tools to address these new NextGen noise problems.

Black replied that FAA is working to update its Part 150 Advisory Circular but said "it gets a little dicey" if FAA addresses noise issues outside the 65 dB DNL contour. FAA would have to go through the Federal Inter-agency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) in that case he said, but added that airports can adopt land use compatibility standards below 65 dB DNL if they want to.

Regarding funding, Black said he was concerned about how much funding will be available for Airport Improvement Program (AIP) noise mitigation grants in fiscal year 2013 for two reasons. First, the noise set-aside in the AIP program has been expanded to cover not only air emissions and some land use compatibility projects but also now some water quality projects. So the amount available for noise projects is shrinking and the set-aside has been capped at \$300 million. He said FAA now refers to the noise set-aside as the "environmental set-aside."

Also, airports have been delaying drawing their full Entitlement funding from FAA for the past several years because of the failure of Congress to pass a new FAA reauthorization bill. However, now that the bill has been passed, airports are expected in fy 2013 to ask for the more than \$700 million in Entitlement funding they opted not to take over the past several years. That money will be drawn out of the AIP Discretionary fund where the "environmental set-aside" is located.

AIRPORT NOISE REPORT

Anne H. Kohut, Publisher

Published 44 times a year at 43978 Urbancrest Ct., Ashburn, Va. 20147; Phone: (703) 729-4867; FAX: (703) 729-4528.
e-mail: editor@airportnoisereport.com; Price \$850.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Aviation Emissions Report, provided that the base fee of US\$1.03 per page per copy is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. USA.

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 32

October 12, 2012

Environmental Review

FAA CAN'T FIND WAY TO COMPLY WITH CATEX PROVISION IN FAA BILL; ASKS RTCA FOR HELP

The Federal Aviation Administration has asked the RTCA NextGen Advisory Committee (NAC) for help in determining if it is possible to comply with a provision of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 that seeks to accelerate the introduction of NextGen Performance-based Navigation (PBN) procedures by giving them a Categorical Exclusion (CatEx) from environmental review.

Section 213(c)(2) of the FAA Modernization Act of 2012 states that any PBN procedure that the FAA Administrator determines “*would result in measurable reductions in fuel consumption, carbon dioxide emissions, and noise, on a per flight basis, as compared to aircraft operations that follow existing instrument flight rules procedures in the same airspace, shall be presumed to have no significant affect on the quality of the human environment and the Administrator shall issue and file a categorical exclusion for the new procedure.*”

FAA has not been able to identify a “technically sound approach” to measuring reductions in noise *on a per flight basis* using DNL, the agency’s noise metric for determining compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Act-
(Continued on p. 129)

Noise Monitoring

AIRPORTS ASK FAA FOR WEBINAR TO CLARIFY REVISED POLICY ON ACCESS TO RADAR DATA

Airports have asked the Federal Aviation Administration to hold a webinar in the latter half of October to clarify new agency policy affecting airport access to FAA radar data, a critical input to airport noise and operations monitoring systems (NOMS).

FAA has agreed to the webinar but has not chosen a date yet. ACI-NA has proposed that the webinar be held on Oct. 18 or Oct. 24 at 2 p.m..

The policy change affects airports that have local agreements (Memorandums of Agreement) with their FAA TRACON for the direct transfer of radar data and it makes airports pay for radar data they previously received for free.

The Airports Council International – North America (ACI-NA) estimates that 100 airports are affected by the policy change, which was issued in January in FAA Order 1200.22E, “External Requests for National Airspace System (NAS) Data.”

The new Order revised national policy regarding the distribution data, including radar data. It includes the following new provision:

(Continued on p. 130)

In This Issue...

CatEx ... FAA asks the RTCA NextGen Advisory Committee for help in determining whether it is possible to comply with a provision of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act that gives a CatEx from environmental review to RNAV/RNP procedures to speed up their implementation. FAA says it has not been able to identify “a technically sound approach” to measuring reductions in noise *on a per flight basis* using DNL as required in the act - p. 128

Noise Monitoring ... ACI-NA asks FAA to participate in a webinar within the next few weeks to clarify revised policy on airport access to radar data, a critical input to airport noise and operations monitoring systems - p. 128

Grants ... DOT awards 13 airports \$5.4 million in sustainability planning grants that will enable them to incorporate sustainability strategies, including noise mitigation, into their master planning process - p. 31

CatEx 2, from p. 128

ing FAA Administrator Michael Huerta told RTCA President Margaret Jenny in a Sept. 21 letter.

Huerta asked that the NAC form a Task Group – comprised of representatives of airlines, airports, and community stakeholders – to do the following:

- Review technical analysis done by the FAA;
- Provide suggestions on other possible ways to comply with CatEx2 (FAA’s term for the provision); and
- “To the extent the NAC believes CatEx 2 cannot be implemented effectively and/or even if implemented would not have a desired impact, provide practical and/or legislative recommendations that would help streamline environmental review for PBN procedures.”

Huerta asked that the Task Group provide the FAA with an interim report with a timeline for completing its work, as well as a final report.

The NAC agreed to Huerta’s request at its Oct. 4 meeting in Dayton, Ohio.

“While the plans are still being formulated, a Task Group will be formed that can access the needed expertise,” RTCA Secretary Andy Cebula told ANR. “Because the Taskings come from the FAA, the plans will be coordinated with the FAA.”

Cebula said the Task Group will meet as many times as it takes to develop a recommendation for the NAC’s Feb. 7, 2013, meeting.

Catex Provision Presents Problems

While CatEx 2 may appear straightforward, it presents several issues that FAA must address, Huerta said in his letter to RTCA.

First, legal and technical issues on how to measure noise reduction on a per flight basis must be solved in order to use this legislative CatEx, he stressed.

Second, “for purposes of implementation of Section 213(c)(2), CatEx 2 sets a new requirement for including fuel consumption and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions in the FAA’s determinations of impacts for PBN procedures, while excluding air quality pollutants under the Clean Air Act.

Third, “there is an issue of the practical use of CatEx 2,” Huerta wrote.

“All other CatEx determinations are based on having no extraordinary circumstances [as defined in FAA Order 5050.4B on National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Projects] and no significant impacts; therefore, procedures that would result in increases in impacts are still eligible for a CatEx as long as the increases do not reach significant levels and there are no extraordinary circumstances.”

But CatEx 2 “sets a more demanding standard of ‘measurable reductions’ that may restrict its use compared to other CatExes that are available for PBN procedures,” Huerta explained.

Legal and Technical Issues Linked

Huerta said the legal and technical issues FAA must address in trying to comply with CatEx 2 “are linked and merit more discussion.”

A new statute, such as the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, is interpreted to be consistent with existing statutes that apply to the same subject area, Huerta explained in his letter. In the case of the FAA Modernization Act, the other relevant statutes are the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act (ASNA).

Huerta’s letter continues:

“DNL is the metric that FAA adopted over 20 years ago to measure noise in its regulations implementing ASNA and its policies and procedures implementing NEPA.

“FAA spent substantial effort analyzing how to interpret Section 213(c)(2) to use DNL. The FAA to date has not been able to identify a technically sound approach to measure reductions in noise on a per flight basis with DNL.

“DNL, which captures both the loudness and number of aircraft operations, is calculated at thousands of points on the ground to determine noise impacts on people. There is no total DNL number for an airspace study area, and logarithmic DNL calculations cannot be divided by the number of aircraft to produce ‘noise per flight’ values.

“Hence, there appears to be a conflict between the requirement to measure ‘noise, on a per flight basis, as compared to aircraft operations that follow existing instrument flight rules procedures in the same airspace’ under Section 213(c)(2) and to measure noise in terms of ‘surveyed reactions of people to noise’ and ‘exposure of individuals to noise’ under ASNA.

“Similarly, interpreting Section 213(c)(2) to measure noise without the ability to correlate noise with effects on people that DNL provides could be interpreted to be at odds with even a very broad definition of ‘effects’ under NEPA, as interpreted by the [White House Council on Environmental Quality] CEQ regulations.

“If these provisions cannot be reconciled, and no other interpretation is possible to give meaning to Section 213(c)(2), then it may be interpreted to measure noise changes attributable to PBN without regard to reactions of people on the ground.”

Single Event Metrics Don’t Solve Problems

In the next step in its analysis, FAA considered a way to give effect to the new statute by using single event noise metrics. But the agency concluded that single event metrics do not resolve the technical problems with compliance with CatEx 2.

FAA supplements DNL on a case-by-case basis with single event noise metrics but there is no scientific correlation between single event noise metrics and how people react to them, Huerta noted in his letter to RTCA.

“A single aircraft produces different amounts of noise during the course of its arrival or departure. Determinations

of the amount of noise depend on varying noise levels at the aircraft source and the relative position of the aircraft with respect to noise sensitive receivers on the ground,” Huerta wrote. “The same aircraft will result in different amounts of noise at the thousands of points on the ground comprising an airspace study area.”

There are technical issues, he said, “in trying to compare thousands of noise values, some lower and some higher than existing procedures, to determine measurable reductions of noise per flight. The entire flight could not be used to support such a determination because the highest noise levels nearest the runway would dominate the calculation, washing out the difference in noise between procedures.”

Look Only at Source Noise

Another option FAA considered for complying with CatEx 2 – and presumably the NAC Task Group will consider – is to disregard receivers on the ground and only look at the source noise of the PBN procedure compared to the source noise of an existing procedure.

“By separating the source from the receiver, one is able to simplify the issue by removing two technically complicated dimensions – the amount of noise on the ground and the impact of noise on people – and concentrate solely on the engine state of the aircraft,” Huerta explained.

“If it can be shown that the engine is in a state of lower thrust throughout the entire procedure, then one can assume a lower noise emanating from the aircraft.”

“Variations in source noise during arrival and departure would still need to be determined via some sort of screening analyses in comparing procedures,” Huerta noted.

But he stressed, “While arguably consistent with the requirements of Section 213(c)(2), this approach differs from the traditional analysis in that it does not focus on the receiver on the ground which is where the sound energy is converted into noise by the human ear.”

‘Marked Departure’ from Current Practice

The Acting FAA Administrator told the RTCA “a determination of a noise reduction divorced from the hearer would be a marked departure from noise impact determinations done to date and that would continue to be done for FAA actions not covered by this provision.”

Huerta stressed that such an approach would be sustainable as a matter of statutory interpretation “only if the conflicts between Section 213(c)(2) and ASNA and NEPA are reconciled” and he told the RTCA that “public review and comment issues need to be considered both as to the new metric and the interpretations.”

Radar Data, from p. 128

All costs of data access and transmission are the responsibility of the data recipient. Data should be accessed over approved, secure and controlled connections (e.g., Internet Enterprise gateways or similar) consistent with the latest National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) standards. All current NAS data connections releasing data to non-FAA entities should be transitioned as soon as possible to gateways. Requests for direct connections for NAS data (outside IE gateways or similar) will not be authorized unless specifically approved by the Vice President, System Operations Services.

“Over the summer, the FAA began informing vendors of NOMS systems and limited numbers of airports that this provision meant that existing direct transfers of radar data between local TRACONs and airports would need to be transitioned to ‘approved’ data sources,” ACI-NA explained in an information alert sent to airports.

“Approved sources appear to include (1) air traffic surveillance data available from ITT/Exelis and (2) Aircraft Situation Display for Industry (ASDI) data available directly from the FAA. Both options entail costs to airport operators.”

ACI-NA noted that over the summer “there appears to have been some degree of miscommunication regarding the deadlines for transition, or to put it another way, the dates when existing direct access to FAA radar data will be disconnected.”

ACI-NA said it recently discussed this confusion with Dr. Woody Davis, the Director of NAS Data Management at FAA Headquarters.

Davis told ACI-NA:

- There is no hard date for termination of existing radar data services to airports.
- FAA intends to transition to the distribution of radar data via secure data gateways as soon as possible, but will work with each airport to develop a concrete plan for transitioning in a reasonable time and manner.
- FAA will work with all airports to make sure they have access to accurate, complete radar data they need.

“Despite these positive developments, ACI-NA believes that additional clarifications are needed regarding what FAA’s intentions, timelines, and expectations are for the data transition process as well as assessments of how the transition will impact airport operators,” the airport trade group’s alert said.

“To this end, ACI-NA –together with the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) – has proposed to facilitate a webinar during which Dr. Davis and his staff can provide specific details concerning the data transition and how the FAA will work with airports to address their site-specific concerns.”

ANR EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Peter J. Kirsch, Esq.

Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
Denver

Vincent E. Mestre, P.E.

President, Mestre Greve Associates
Laguna Niguel, CA

Steven F. Pflaum, Esq.

Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Chicago

Mary L. Vigilante

President, Synergy Consultants
Seattle

Gregory S. Walden, Esq.

Patton Boggs LLP
Washington, D.C.

Grants

13 AIRPORTS GET \$5.4 MILLION IN SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING GRANTS

U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood on Oct. 1 announced \$5.4 million in Federal Aviation Administration sustainability planning grants for 13 airports nationwide that are taking innovative steps to reduce their impact on the environment.

The grants will enable airports to incorporate sustainability strategies into their master planning process.

“We support our nation’s airports in their efforts to protect the environment in the communities they serve,” said Secretary LaHood. “These grants will help airports to operate more efficiently and be more environmentally friendly.”

Across the country, airports can improve sustainability in a number of ways including reducing noise in the surrounding communities and improving water and air quality, LaHood explained.

Funding through the FAA’s Airport Improvement Program (AIP) enables airports to study, plan, and develop sustainability initiatives to be incorporated into existing and future airport projects.

Some of the sustainable initiatives include reducing energy consumption through the use of alternative fuels for vehicles, installing light sensors to automatically turn off lights and reduce energy use, using environmentally friendly “green” products at airport facilities, and promoting land uses that attract businesses and industries that can benefit from being near an airport.

“Airport sponsors want to protect the environment and serve the traveling public while maintaining a high level of safety,” said Acting FAA Administrator Michael Huerta. “These grants will help us achieve these objectives.”

Airports selected for sustainability planning dollars includes:

- Bert Mooney (Butte, Mont.) \$247,500;
- State Airports (Colo.) \$500,000;
- Dallas/Fort Worth International (Texas) \$600,000;
- Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International (Fla.) \$356,250;
- Gulfport-Biloxi International (Miss.) \$135,000;
- James M. Cox Dayton International (Ohio) \$315,000;
- Logan International (Mass.) \$750,000;
- Monterey (Calif.) \$189,930;
- Northwest Arkansas Regional (Ark.) \$270,000;
- Salt Lake City International (Utah) \$500,000;
- Seattle-Tacoma International (Wash.) \$750,000;
- Tampa International (Fla.) \$607,500;
- University Park (Penn.) \$217,800.

AIRPORT NOISE REPORT

Anne H. Kohut, Publisher

Published 44 times a year at 43978 Urbancrest Ct., Ashburn, Va. 20147; Phone: (703) 729-4867; FAX: (703) 729-4528.
e-mail: editor@airportnoisereport.com; Price \$850.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Aviation Emissions Report, provided that the base fee of US\$1.03 per page per copy is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. USA.

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 33

October 19, 2012

FAA

FAA FORMING NEW CENTER OF EXCELLENCE IN FY 2013 TO REPLACE, RENEW PARTNER

During fiscal year 2013, the Federal Aviation Administration will form a new Center of Excellence (CoE) for Environment and Energy, which will renew and replace the current Partnership for Air Transportation Noise and Emissions Reduction (PARTNER) Center of Excellence.

“The PARTNER CoE is nearing the end of its ten-year cycle so we are holding a new competition,” FAA told ANR. “The new CoE for Environment and Energy is required in FAA’s reauthorization. The new CoE will include research conducted by PARTNER [on aircraft noise and emissions] as well as research on alternative jet fuels.”

The new CoE will be a consortium of the FAA, university partners, and private industry affiliates selected by the FAA Administrator to work collectively on business and operational issues of mutual interest and concern, FAA explained in an Oct. 12 Pre-solicitation Notice published in FedBizOpps.

The FAA said it “anticipates the COE will attract interest from other organizations such as the airline industry, other industrial groups, airport authorities, and
(Continued on p. 133)

Special Report

SAN DIEGO INT’L COMPLETES ACTION PLAN FOR INFORMING RESIDENTS ABOUT NEW PGL

[FAA’s new Program Guidance Letter on funding eligibility for airport sound insulation programs makes airports responsible for informing the communities around them about the changes the PGL makes in homeowner eligibility to receive sound insulation.

The action plan developed and put into effect by San Diego International Airport to meet this obligation could serve as a model for other airports to follow.]

By Dan Frazee,
Director, Airport Noise Mitigation, San Diego International Airport

Because San Diego International Airport is located in an urban setting on approximately 660 acres of property, aircraft noise is a constant irritant to the close-in communities, numbering about 38,000 residents within the 60dB CNEL noise contour. Approximately 520 daily predominately air carrier and air cargo arrivals and departures result in noise impacts to surrounding communities quantified by our

(Continued on p. 134)

In This Issue...

Research ... FAA announces that it is forming a new Center of Excellence for Environment and Energy, which will replace the PARTNER research consortium. The agency will hold a meeting in Washington, DC, on Nov. 15-16 to discuss the technical requirements for joining the new CoE, which will conduct a broad range of research, including NextGen noise issues - p. 132

PGL ... In a Special Report, Dan Frazee, Director of Airport Noise Mitigation at San Diego Int’l Airport, describes the action plan put into effect at SAN to inform communities about the requirements of FAA’s new Program Guidance Letter on SIP funding. It could serve as a model for other airports - p. 132

T.F. Green Airport ... FAA commits to provide \$30.2 million to mitigate the noise impact of a runway extension through home buyouts and sound insulation. RIAC will provide an additional \$7.55 million - p. 134

COE, from p. 132

other governmental entities to solve various unique and difficult aviation problems related to environment and energy. These organizations may be considered as affiliate members by the COE core universities and may contribute to and receive funding from the COE.”

PARTNER is comprised of 12 universities and approximately 50 Advisory Board members representing aerospace manufacturers, airlines, airports, national, state and local government, professional and trade associations, non-governmental organizations and community groups. It is unclear at this point whether the current PARTNER Advisory Board will carry over to the new CoE or a new Advisory Board will be formed for it.

FAA will hold a public meeting to discuss the new COE and the technical requirements for joining it on Nov. 15 and 16 in Washington, DC. Potential applicants are encouraged but not required to attend this meeting. The time and location of the meeting have not been announced yet.

For further information on the COE program, contact Patricia.Watts@faa.gov. To register for the meeting or to receive additional information, contact Jessica.shaw@faa.gov. They are located at the FAA's W.J. Hughes Technical Center in Atlantic City, NJ.

The FedBizOpps announcement on the new COE is available at https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=8ded323f2ddf7e955d9a1553aa98da9a&tab=core&_cview=0

Research Areas

FAA said it intends for the participants in the new COE on Environment and Energy to conduct a broad range of research to include, but not be limited to, the following areas:

- Aircraft noise and impacts characterization;
- Aircraft emissions and impacts characterization;
- Aircraft technology assessment ;
- Compatible land use management;
- Alternative jet fuels research;
- Environmentally and energy efficient gate-to-gate aircraft operations;
- Aviation environmental modeling and analysis; and
- Aviation environmental policy.

The new COE also will address new noise issues arising from the implementation of NextGen Performance-based Navigation Procedures, such as concentrated flight paths and noise impact beyond 65 DNL contour, ANR was told.

The exact projects the new COE will undertake have not been determined yet.

Selection Criteria

Participants in the COE will be selected on their ability to meet the following criteria:

- The extent to which the needs of the State in which the applicant is located are representative of the needs of the region for improved air transportation services and facilities;

- The demonstrated research and extension resources available to the applicant for carrying out the intent of the legislation;
- The capability of the applicant to provide leadership in making national and regional contributions to the solution of both long-range and immediate air transportation problems;
- The extent to which the applicant has an established air transportation program;
- The demonstrated ability of the applicant to disseminate results of air transportation research and educational programs through a statewide or region-wide continuing education program;
- The research projects that the applicant proposes to carry out under the grant.

Specific projects to be conducted by the new COE on Environment and Energy will be defined, evaluated, and funded throughout the life of the Center, FAA said.

The new COE will address NextGen issues related to environment and energy. However, the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 allows FAA to establish a Center of Excellence for the research and development of NextGen technologies. That would be a separate endeavor.

The FAA Administrator will announce the final selection of members of the Center of Excellence for Environment & Energy in fiscal year 2013.

Noise Research Roadmap

In April, FAA canceled its Second Annual Meeting of the Aviation Noise Impacts Research Roadmap and said it would reschedule it for the "late summer or early fall." No new date for the meeting has been announced.

The Roadmap process is being undertaken by FAA to systematically define gaps in current capabilities to analyze aircraft noise impacts and to point the agency in the direction of research areas that need to be explored.

ANR asked FAA if the Noise Research Roadmap effort will now be rolled into the new COE on Environment and Energy and whether FAA still plans to hold the Second Annual Meeting of the Noise Impacts Research Roadmap this year.

FAA replied that it “continues to discuss noise research among federal agencies. At this time, FAA is undertaking an effort to update our own noise research roadmap. Once we have completed that task, we will work with FICAN [Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise] to determine the best time to hold another interagency meeting. When we again bring the research community together, we want to be able to fully take advantage of the information we gain from the meeting.”

FAA said the research roadmap “will not be rolled into a COE. Research is done by a number of participants, not all of which are affiliated with a COE.”

*T.F. Green Airport***FAA TO PROVIDE \$110 MILLION FOR UPGRADES, \$30.2 M FOR NOISE**

Rhode Island officials announced Oct. 16 that, over the next five years, the Federal Aviation Administration plans to invest approximately \$110 million in upgrading T.F. Green Airport. This includes \$50 million in grants to extend the main runway to allow non-stop flights to the West Coast and Europe, \$30 million for runway safety, and an estimated \$30.2 million for noise mitigation.

The Rhode Island Airport Commission (RIAC), proprietor of the airport, will add an additional \$7.55 million for noise mitigation efforts in a 20 percent match to the FAA's contribution. That brings the total amount for noise mitigation to \$37.75 million over the next five years.

That money will go to fund buyouts of 84 homes in the airport's 70 dB DNL contour and sound insulation of 444 eligible homes by 2017 when the runway extension is completed, according to Peter Frazier, Interim President, CEO, and General Counsel of RIAC.

He said RIAC has issued an RFP seeking a firm to manage its sound insulation program and will conduct a pilot program with 10 homes.

Frazier said RIAC is currently discussing with FAA whether it will be subject to the 45 dB DNL interior noise level criterion more firmly imposed in FAA's new Program Guidance Letter on sound insulation program funding.

FAA committed to sound insulation of communities around T.F. Green in its Record of Decision approving the runway extension, which predates its issuance of the PGL. Frazier said RIAC will abide by whatever decision FAA makes on the matter and stressed that the homes around T.F. Green are very old and likely meet the 45 DNL criterion.

In November 2011, the City of Warwick challenged the FAA's Record of Decision approving the runway extension. However, in May the City and RIAC entered a Memorandum of Agreement resolving the lawsuit. In the MOA, RIAC defined timelines for completing home buyouts and to continue state-required air monitoring until 2017.

Frazier was joined at an airport press conference by Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI), Rhode Island Gov. Lincoln Chafee, and City of Warwick Mayor Scott Avedisian in announcing FAA's funding commitment.

"After more than 12 years of discussion about expansion possibilities at T.F. Green Airport, it is exciting finally to be at this point," said Warwick Mayor Scott Avedisian. "Although this has been a very long process, I think the plan that was ultimately approved for the airport is one that takes into consideration the many, varied concerns of our community. I am certainly grateful to the City Council and to those city employees who invested thousands of hours of work over more than a decade to ensure that the City's concerns were heard."

Sen. Reed added, "Modernizing T.F. Green and expanding the runway will help attract new business and jobs to

Rhode Island. This is a significant investment in boosting economic growth throughout the state and improving the quality of our nation's aviation system as a whole. I am pleased the FAA and Obama Administration recognize the need for robust federal support for this project."

"RIAC is elated that the FAA has recognized the critical role that T. F. Green plays in the national and regional system of airports and the service and capacity benefits these airport improvement projects will yield," Frazier said. "We would like to thank Senator Reed and our entire congressional delegation for helping to emphasize our role in the airport system and securing sufficient funding to ensure these vital programs will proceed."

Last September, the FAA approved plans to extend T.F. Green's main runway and make safety improvements to the airport's crosswind runway. This summer, local and state officials approved plans to move the improvement project forward after Congress passed an FAA reauthorization bill in February that, for the first time in several years, gives airports nationwide the ability to use federal resources to plan and commit to long-term projects.

San Diego, from p. 132

flight tracking and noise monitoring system.

The consequence of single runway operations at an airport with significant airspace management restrictions acts to project aircraft noise into the same communities day in and day out.

We recognize the adverse noise impact on our surrounding communities and have addressed the issue in three ways:

- Prohibiting late night and early morning operations;
- Maintaining a robust residential sound insulation program; and

- Administering an aggressive noise information and community relations program with the areas most impacted by aircraft noise.

In early 2011, information became available that suggested the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) was in the process of producing a "clarifying" document, called a Program Guidance Letter (PGL), that looked to have significant negative impact on residential sound insulation programs throughout the nation. At San Diego, that program is locally called the Quieter Home Program (QHP).

SAN's QHP is the largest single sound insulation program in the United States. It is the singular most visible commitment by the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority to mitigate aircraft noise and positively affect our noise-impacted communities' quality of life.

Initiated in 1998, it has successfully insulated over 2,300 residences in the most noise-impacted areas. There are still approximately 8,200 homes within the airport's FAA-accepted 65dB CNEL noise contour.

Historically, FAA has provided SAN with AIP funding under the auspices of an approved FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) for a "... voluntary program for

ANR EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Peter J. Kirsch, Esq.

Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
Denver

Vincent E. Mestre, P.E.

President, Mestre Greve Associates
Laguna Niguel, CA

Steven F. Pflaum, Esq.

Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Chicago

Mary L. Vigilante

President, Synergy Consultants
Seattle

Gregory S. Walden, Esq.

Patton Boggs LLP
Washington, D.C.

residences within the (SAN) 65,70, and 75-dB CNEL noise contour...”

In response to preliminary information about the PGL discovered by C&S Engineers, many airports, including San Diego, provided input to FAA on the developing document through Airports Council International – North America (ACI-NA).

Because FAA was not forthcoming about how the clarification would affect current programs, SAN, in the summer of 2012, produced an action plan to accomplish several goals:

- Communicate the facts about the final document to inform affected neighbors, elected officials, community leaders, and the media; and
- Demonstrate the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority’s commitment to work with the FAA on the San Diego program and to complete the maximum number of residences possible, based on eligibility criteria and available funding.

To further these goals, the airport staff did the following:

- Produced a Frequently Asked Questions document;
- Contacted local, state, and federal elected officials to schedule briefings to inform them of changes in the event they are contacted by constituents, and to encourage them to query FAA on the background behind the PGL document;
- Drafted an article to lead a special edition of the airport’s Noise Matters newsletter, which is mailed to 38,000 residences in the airport’s noise impact area;
- Drafted a letter to residents already participating in the program confirming that their residence would be completed;
- Drafted a letter to residents on the current waiting list informing that their application is on hold pending FAA eligibility clarification;
- Drafted a letter to all affected community planning organizations offering a briefing on the PGL at their next scheduled meeting;
- Scheduled a presentation at the next scheduled Airport Noise Advisory Committee meeting;
- Produced an additional page on the Authority’s website to briefly explain the issue and include links to the final documents and any other relevant documentation available (FAQs, GAO Report) Go to http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport_initiatives/qhp/faa_letter.aspx;
- Set up a dedicated hotline and email site for inquiries.

Since release of the final PGL on Aug. 17, SAN has completed all the steps noted above.

The Airport Authority is concerned that the PGL clarification excluding residences from AIP-funded sound insulation based on the “two-step” process could adversely affect some noise-impacted neighbors.

We will continue to work with our community and the FAA to ensure that the testing criteria submitted to FAA for approval of projects after September 2015 allows us to include as many of the remaining 8,000+ homes as possible in the Quieter Home Program.

AIRPORT NOISE REPORT

Anne H. Kohut, Publisher

Published 44 times a year at 43978 Urbancrest Ct., Ashburn, Va. 20147; Phone: (703) 729-4867; FAX: (703) 729-4528.
e-mail: editor@airportnoisereport.com; Price \$850.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Aviation Emissions Report, provided that the base fee of US\$1.03 per page per copy is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. USA.

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 34, 35

October 26, 2012

PFCs

\$3.23 BILLION OF TOTAL PFC REVENUE DEVOTED TO NOISE MITIGATION PROJECTS

At the end of the fiscal year 2012, some \$3.23 billion (4 percent) of the \$83.35 billion in Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) that the Federal Aviation Administration has approved for collection and use since 1992 is being designated for airport noise mitigation projects, according to data provided by the agency.

The total PFC revenue being earmarked for airport noise mitigation projects as of Sept. 30, was \$3,235,935,617, an increase of \$26.9 million over the end of fiscal 2011 noise project total (23 ANR 133).

The FAA subdivides noise mitigation projects into six categories. Following is the total amount airports plan to collect for each category, as of Oct. 1, 2012, as well as the percentage that category represents of the total PFCs for noise mitigation being collected:

- \$1.36 billion (42.2 percent) for soundproofing projects;
- \$1.32 billion (41.0 percent) for multi-phase projects;
- \$492.4 million (15.2 percent) to purchase land;
- \$18.9 million (0.6 percent) for noise monitoring systems;
- \$15.6 million (0.5 percent) for planning; and
- \$15.5 million (0.5 percent) for miscellaneous projects.

106 Airports Using PFCs for Noise Mitigation

A total of 106 airports were using PFCs for noise mitigation projects at the end of fiscal 2012. Manhattan (KS) Regional Airport and Great Falls (MT) International Airport were the only new airports to use PFCs for noise mitigation projects in fiscal 2012.

The top 20 airports targeting PFC revenue for noise mitigation projects as of Oct. 1, 2012, are: Los Angeles International (\$822.5 million); Chicago O'Hare International (\$546.4 million); Chicago Midway (\$260.9 million); Minneapolis-St. Paul International (\$182.9 million); Phoenix Sky Harbor International (\$173.6 million); Seattle-Tacoma International (\$124.2 million); San Jose International (\$117.8 million); Bob Hope Airport (\$95.8 million); Ontario International (\$84.7 million); Cleveland Hopkins International (\$73.9 million); Charlotte-Douglas International (\$59.2 million); Louisville International (\$59.1 million); Lambert-St. Louis International (\$54.8 million); Las Vegas International (\$51.7 million); Milwaukee General Mitchell International (\$49.7 million); Detroit Metropolitan International (\$49.4 million); San Diego International (\$46.3 million); Indianapolis International (\$43.1 million); Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International (\$42.4 million); and Ft. Lauderdale International (\$39.1 million).

PFCs are only one source of revenue that airports use to fund noise mitigation projects. The other funding stream is the FAA's Airport Improvement Program. Data on AIP grants for noise mitigation projects will be reported in an upcoming issue of ANR.

In This Issue...

PFCs ... This special issue of ANR provides data obtained from the FAA on airports that are collecting Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) to support various noise mitigation projects.

The data show that 106 airports, two more than in FY 2011, imposed PFCs to address noise in FY 2012.

Approximately \$3.23 billion in PFCs has been imposed by airports for noise mitigation projects as of the end of fiscal year 2012, up \$26.9 million compared to the end of fiscal 2011.

Los Angeles International remains far ahead of other airports in using PFCs for noise mitigation projects (\$822.5 million), followed by Chicago O'Hare International (\$546.4 million).

Table 1, showing a breakdown of all airport projects being supported by PFCs, begins on p. 137.

Table 2, showing PFCs being collected by project type, begins on p. 138.

Table 3, showing PFCs being collected by individual airports, begins on p. 145.

APPROVED PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES BY CATEGORIES
(as of Oct. 1, 2012)

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>PROJECT TYPE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
<u>AIRSIDE</u> (18% w/o DIA)(18% w DIA)			
	RUNWAYS	\$ 6,775,881,274	45.6
	TAXIWAYS	\$ 2,399,568,175	16.1
	APRONS	\$ 1,589,021,137	10.7
	LAND	\$ 535,609,676	3.6
	EQUIPMENT	\$ 1,366,216,467	9.2
	PLANNING	\$ 621,392,688	4.2
	LIGHTING	\$ 353,522,909	2.4
	OTHER	\$ 1,228,351,710	8.3
	TOTAL	\$14,869,564,036	100
<u>LANDSIDE</u> (36% w/o DIA)(34% w DIA)			
	TERMINAL	\$25,185,992,726	87.3
	LAND	\$ 1,299,853,521	4.5
	SECURITY	\$ 2,353,604,310	8.2
	TOTAL	\$28,839,450,557	100
<u>NOISE</u> (4% w/o DIA)(4% w DIA)			
	LAND	\$ 492,477,928	15.2
	MULTI-PHASE	\$ 1,326,985,600	41.0
	SOUNDPROOFING	\$ 1,366,427,219	42.2
	MONITORING	\$ 18,909,831	0.6
	PLANNING	\$ 15,620,652	0.5
	OTHER	\$ 15,514,387	0.5
	TOTAL	\$ 3,235,935,617	100
<u>ACCESS</u> (7% w/o DIA)(6% w DIA)			
	ROADS	\$ 2,186,671,757	40.0
	RAIL	\$ 3,200,383,364	58.5
	LAND	\$ 11,664,185	0.2
	PLANNING	\$ 71,060,162	1.3
	TOTAL	\$ 5,469,779,468	
<u>INTEREST</u> (35%)(34% w/DIA)		\$28,798,819,314	100
SUBTOTAL		\$81,213,548,992	
DENVER (4%)		\$ 3,137,099,200	
PFC TOTAL		\$83,350,648,192	

SOURCE: FAA (PFC BRANCH)

PFC FUNDED NOISE PROJECTS (BY WORK CODE)
(as of Sept. 30, 2012)

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Birmingham	AL	Land	\$3,173,639	\$4.50	7/2/08	7/2/08	\$492,477,928
Birmingham	AL	Land	\$1,958,877	\$4.50	3-31-10	3-31-10	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$4,211,697	\$3.00	3/6/92	6/28/94	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$791,507	\$3.00	3/6/92	11/22/95	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$265,804	\$3.00	3/6/92	5/28/97	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$68,954	\$3.00	10/19/98	10/19/98	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$154,239	\$4.50	10/30/02	10/30/02	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$421,383	\$3.00	2/22/02	2/22/02	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$126,333	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$140,993	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$230,906	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$103,394	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$232,192	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Juneau	AK	Land	\$21,931	\$4.50	5/30/01	5/30/01	
Phoenix	AZ	Land	\$27,327,877	\$3.00	6/5/02	6/5/02	
Tucson	AZ	Land	\$3,288,473	\$4.50	11/19/97	11/19/97	
Tucson	AZ	Land	\$396,888	\$4.50	11/19/97	11/19/97	
Fort Smith	AR	Land	\$90,756	\$3.00	5/8/94	7/24/97	
Little Rock	AR	Land	\$3,314,737	\$4.50	1/31/06	1/31/06	
Little Rock	AR	Land	\$1,421,452	\$4.50	1/15/10	1/15/10	
Burbank	CA	Land	\$27,829,178	\$3.00	6/17/94	2/5/97	
Fort Lauderdale	FL	Land	\$3,500,000	\$3.00	4/30/98	4/23/01	
Gainesville	FL	Land	\$144,869	\$4.50	8/29/02	8/29/02	
Jacksonville	FL	Land	\$6,000,000	\$3.00	9/6/06	9/6/06	
Pensacola	FL	Land	\$597,708	\$3.00	11/23/92	11/23/92	
Pensacola	FL	Land	\$69,480	\$3.00	11/23/92	8/10/95	
Sarasota	FL	Land	\$1,474,904	\$3.00	6/29/92	1/31/95	
Sarasota	FL	Land	\$3,063,506	\$3.00	6/29/92	12/15/95	
Tallahassee	FL	Land	\$3,128,225	\$3.00	3/3/98	3/3/98	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$1,000,000	\$3.00	1/26/94	8/29/96	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$2,302,300	\$3.00	1/26/94	8/29/96	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$374,616	\$3.00	1/26/94	6/11/97	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$1,387,548	\$3.00	1/26/94	6/11/97	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$5,000,000	\$3.00	1/26/94	6/11/97	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$2,000,000	\$3.00	8/22/00	12/13/02	
Atlanta	GA	Land	\$7,280,374	\$4.50	11/29/07	11/29/07	
Bloomington	IL	Land	\$35,000	\$3.00	12/5/97	12/5/97	
Moline	IL	Land	\$335,915	\$4.50	9/29/94	9/29/94	
Moline	IL	Land	\$365,084	\$4.50	3/12/98	3/12/98	
Peoria	IL	Land	\$382,426	\$3.00	9/8/94	9/8/94	
Peoria	IL	Land	\$145,441	\$4.50	2/3/00	2/3/00	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$24,740	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$12,275	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$24,897	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$14,721	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$551	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$88,167	\$3.00	11/24/93	3/11/97	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Indianapolis	IN	Land	\$42,532,859	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Louisville	KY	Land	\$58,800,000	\$3.00	1/29/97	1/29/97	
Minneapolis	MN	Land	\$21,500,000	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	
Minneapolis	MN	Land	\$20,500,000	\$4.50	5/5/05	5/5/05	
Kansas City	MO	Land	\$10,766,850	\$3.00	12/21/95	12/21/95	
St. Louis	MO	Land	\$22,177,178	\$3.00	9/30/92	9/30/92	
St. Louis	MO	Land	\$31,962,604	\$3.00	1/31/96	1/8/98	
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$10,654,182	\$4.50	2/24/92	3/15/95	
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$7,991,645	\$4.50	2/24/92	2/24/92	
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$5,250,000	\$3.00	2/24/92	6/7/93	
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$26,250,000	\$4.50	2/24/92	6/7/93	
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$1,440,492	\$4.50	2/24/92	6/7/93	
Charlotte	NC	Land	\$52,270,000	\$3.00	8/23/04	8/23/04	
New Bern	NC	Land	\$30,293	\$4.50	5/11/06	5/11/06	
Fargo	ND	Land	\$361,548	\$4.50	10/11/06	10/11/06	
Akron	OH	Land	\$19,210	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Land	\$14,635	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Land	\$5,293	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Land	\$21,334	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Land	\$12,911	\$4.50	4/4/02	4/4/02	
Cleveland	OH	Land	\$7,137,600	\$3.00	9/1/92	2/2/94	
Cleveland	OH	Land	\$25,282,298	\$3.00	4/25/97	4/25/97	
Columbus	OH	Land	\$119,600	\$3.00	7/14/92	3/27/96	
Columbus	OH	Land	\$379,070	\$3.00	7/14/92	3/27/96	
Columbus	OH	Land	\$519,723	\$3.00	7/14/92	3/27/96	
Dayton	OH	Land	\$309,206	\$4.50	7/25/94	7/25/94	
Allentown	PA	Land	\$244,387	\$4.50	3/26/01	3/26/01	
Allentown	PA	Land	\$220,475	\$4.50	3/26/01	3/26/01	
Allentown	PA	Land	\$91,944	\$4.50	6/6/03	6/6/03	
Erie	PA	Land	\$242,373	\$4.50	5/13/03	5/13/03	
Providence	RI	Land	\$10,382,213	\$4.50	11/27/00	11/27/00	
Providence	RI	Land	\$12,658,400	\$4.50	11/13/09	11/13/09	
Chattanooga	TN	Land	\$100,000	\$3.00	4/25/97	4/25/97	
Chattanooga	TN	Land	\$15,000	\$4.50	11/22/00	11/22/00	
Brownsville	TX	Land	\$181,860	\$4.50	5/7/07	5/7/07	
Harlingen	TX	Land	\$96,630	\$3.00	7/9/98	7/9/98	
Salt Lake City	UT	Land	\$465,488	\$3.00	10/1/94	10/1/94	
Salt Lake City	UT	Land	\$331,072	\$4.50	4/30/01	4/30/01	
Salt Lake City	UT	Land	\$524,408	\$4.50	2/28/02	2/28/02	
Lynchburg	VA	Land	\$17,762	\$3.00	4/14/95	4/14/95	
Roanoke	VA	Land	\$145,000	\$4.50	11/24/04	11/24/04	
Bellingham	WA	Land	\$166,000	\$3.00	4/29/93	4/29/93	
Bellingham	WA	Land	\$732,000	\$3.00	10/5/94	10/5/94	
Bellingham	WA	Land	\$454,350	\$3.00	12/11/96	12/11/96	
Appleton	WI	Land	\$14,502	\$3.00	4/25/94	4/25/94	
Milwaukee	WI	Land	\$3,099,197	\$3.00	2/24/95	2/24/95	
Milwaukee	WI	Land	\$1,425,187	\$3.00	2/24/95	2/24/95	
Milwaukee	WI	Land	\$156,000	\$3.00	12/31/09	12/31/09	
Cheyenne	WY	Land	\$81,192	\$4.50	3/28/01	3/28/01	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Carlsbad	CA	Misc	\$18,226	\$4.50	11/24/08	11/24/08	\$15,514,387
Pensacola	FL	Misc	\$65,076	\$3.00	11/23/92	8/10/95	
Tampa	FL	Misc	\$1,692,110	\$4.50	5/16/03	5/16/03	
Chicago Midway	IL	Misc	\$11,493	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago Midway	IL	Misc	\$297,707	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago Midway	IL	Misc	\$2,057,107	\$3.00	2/22/00	2/22/00	
Chicago Midway	IL	Misc	\$2,500,000	\$3.00	4/18/02	4/18/02	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Misc	\$42,389	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Misc	\$2,993,028	\$4.50	6/28/96	6/28/96	
Indianapolis	IN	Misc	\$498,684	\$4.50	12/20/96	12/20/96	
Detroit	MI	Misc	\$225,000	\$3.00	9/21/92	9/21/92	
Columbus	OH	Misc	\$61,752	\$3.00	7/19/93	3/27/96	
Columbus	OH	Misc.	\$489,894	\$4.50	1/28/11	1/28/11	
Milwaukee	WI	Misc	\$50,000	\$3.00	3/8/01	3/8/01	
Milwaukee	WI	Misc	\$4,382,162	\$3.00	7/9/02	7/9/02	
Cheyenne	WY	Misc	\$129,759	\$4.50	3/28/01	3/28/01	
Fort Smith	AR	Monitoring	\$20,555	\$3.00	5/8/94	7/24/97	\$18,909,831
Burbank	CA	Monitoring	\$64,836	\$3.00	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	C	Monitoring	\$1,000,000	\$3.00	9/28/09	9/28/09	
Los Angeles	CA	Monitoring	\$3,450,000	\$3.00	9/23/05	9/23/05	
Oakland	CA	Monitoring	\$436,267	\$3.00	6/26/92	6/26/92	
Oakland	CA	Monitoring	\$200,000	\$3.00	10/23/09	10/23/09	
Sacramento	CA	Monitoring	\$662,000	\$3.00	4/26/96	4/26/96	
San Diego	CA	Monitoring	\$1,224,000	\$3.00	5/20/03	5/20/03	
San Jose	CA	Monitoring	\$183,775	\$3.00	6/11/92	6/11/92	
San Jose	CA	Monitoring	\$76,684	\$3.00	11/24/99	11/24/99	
San Jose	CA	Monitoring	\$221,000	\$3.00	12/15/00	12/15/00	
Fort Lauderdale	FL	Monitoring	\$658,000	\$3.00	11/1/94	4/30/98	
Chicago Midway	IL	Monitoring	\$325,000	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Monitoring	\$3,900,000	\$3.00	6/28/93	9/16/94	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Monitoring	\$1,000,000	\$3.00	8/17/06	8/17/06	
Covington	KY	Monitoring	\$140,000	\$3.00	3/30/94	3/30/94	
Covington	KY	Monitoring	\$387,000	\$3.00	7/26/02	7/26/02	
Louisville	KY	Monitoring	\$125,000	\$3.00	3/27/01	3/27/01	
Baltimore	MD	Monitoring	\$1,578,000	\$3.00	8/26/10	8/26/10	
Minneapolis	MN	Monitoring	\$230,273	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	
St. Louis	MO	Monitoring	\$100,000	\$3.00	11/24/08	11/24/08	
Charlotte	NC	Monitoring	\$225,403	\$3.00	9/15/11	9/15/11	
Columbus	OH	Monitoring	\$16,509	\$3.00	7/14/92	10/27/93	
Columbus	OH	Monitoring	\$33,000	\$3.00	1/28/11	1/28/11	
Portland	OR	Monitoring	\$715,750	\$3.00	12/7/05	12/7/05	
Allentown	PA	Monitoring	\$30,556	\$4.50	3/26/01	3/26/01	
Nashville	TN	Monitoring	\$120,375	\$3.00	5/10/07	5/10/07	
Dallas/Ft. Worth	TX	Monitoring	\$1,266,151	\$3.00	11/7/96	11/7/96	
San Antonio	TX	Monitoring	\$245,153	\$3.00	2/22/05	2/22/05	
Milwaukee	WI	Monitoring	\$40,956	\$3.00	2/24/95	2/24/95	
Milwaukee	WI	Monitoring	\$160,000	\$3.00	12/31/09	12/31/09	
Jackson	WY	Monitoring	\$47,272	\$4.50	2/9/04	2/9/04	
Jackson	WY	Monitoring	\$26,316	\$4.50	4/8/08	4/8/08	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$75,000,000	\$4.50	12/6/04	12/6/04	\$1,326,985,600
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$25,900,000	\$4.50	9/27/07	9/27/07	
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$6,400,000	\$4.50	4/30/09	4/30/09	
Los Angeles	CA	Multi-phase	\$700,000,000	\$4.50	11/28/97	11/28/97	
Los Angeles	CA	Multi-phase	\$50,000,000	\$4.50	10/23/07	10/23/07	
Ontario	CA	Multi-phase	\$84,774,000	\$3.00	4/28/98	4/28/98	
Orlando	FL	Multi-phase	\$688,000	\$3.00	7/12/05	7/12/05	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Multi-phase	\$586,857	\$4.50	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Des Moines	IA	Multi-phase	\$945,178	\$4.50	8/16/05	8/16/05	
Covington	KY	Multi-phase	\$21,317,000	\$3.00	3/30/94	3/30/94	
Covington	KY	Multi-phase	\$6,444,000	\$3.00	11/29/95	11/29/95	
Covington	KY	Multi-phase	\$8,448,000	\$3.00	3/28/01	3/28/01	
Lexington	KY	Multi-phase	\$45,544	\$4.50	8/31/93	4/21/95	
Lexington	KY	Multi-phase	\$111,360	\$4.50	8/31/93	9/27/96	
Baton Rouge	LA	Multi-phase	\$1,315,124	\$3.00	9/28/92	4/23/93	
New Orleans	LA	Multi-phase	\$3,750,000	\$4.50	8/26/04	8/26/04	
Detroit	MI	Multi-phase	\$48,871,000	\$3.00	9/21/92	9/21/92	
Minneapolis	MN	Multi-phase	\$103,237,546	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	
Manchester	NH	Multi-phase	\$1,400,000	\$3.00	10/13/92	3/4/96	
Buffalo	NY	Multi-phase	\$1,997,550	\$4.50	5/25/07	5/25/07	
Islip	NY	Multi-phase	\$671,891	\$3.00	9/23/94	9/23/94	
Charlotte	NC	Multi-phase	\$1,264,209	\$3.00	8/23/04	8/23/04	
Charlotte	NC	Multi-phase	\$3,941,093	\$3.00	8/23/04	8/23/04	
Toledo	OH	Multi-phase	\$1,676,083	\$4.50	1/16/98	1/16/98	
Tulsa	OK	Multi-phase	\$8,400,000	\$3.00	4/27/00	4/27/00	
Erie	PA	Multi-phase	\$118,518	\$3.00	7/21/92	7/21/92	
Knoxville	TN	Multi-phase	\$528,431	\$3.00	10/6/93	10/6/93	
Nashville	TN	Multi-phase	\$24,065,949	\$3.00	2/26/04	2/26/04	
Dallas Love	TX	Multi-phase	\$1,913,478	\$3.00	12/20/07	12/20/07	
Roanoke	VA	Multi-phase	\$240,850	\$4.50	5/16/11	5/16/11	
Seattle	WA	Multi-phase	\$14,939,111	\$3.00	8/13/92	8/13/92	
Seattle	WA	Multi-phase	\$43,000,000	\$3.00	12/29/95	12/29/95	
Seattle	WA	Multi-phase	\$50,000,000	\$3.00	6/24/98	10/16/01	
Milwaukee	WI	Multi-phase	\$34,994,828	\$3.00	12/21/95	12/21/95	
Mobile	AL	Planning	\$116,804	\$3.00	2/22/02	2/22/02	\$15,620,652
Mesa	AZ	Planning	\$11,175	\$4.50	9/25/08	9/25/08	
Burbank	CA	Planning	\$282,440	\$3.00	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Planning	\$116,460	\$3.00	6/16/06	6/16/06	
Modesto	CA	Planning	\$15,750	\$4.50	6/6/08	6/6/08	
Monterey	CA	Planning	\$50,130	\$3.00	7/14/98	7/14/98	
Monterey	CA	Planning	\$15,000	\$4.50	2/7/08	2/7/08	
San Diego	CA	Planning	\$241,555	\$3.00	6/27/08	6/27/08	
Pueblo	CO	Planning	\$21,500	\$3.00	4/11/96	4/11/96	
New Haven	CT	Planning	\$5,431	\$4.50	8/18/11	8/18/11	
Fort Myers	FL	Planning	\$132,000	\$3.00	8/31/92	8/31/92	
Key West	FL	Planning	\$1,980	\$4.50	1/10/03	1/10/03	
Key West	FL	Planning	\$1,980	\$4.50	4/14/04	4/14/04	
Key West	FL	Planning	\$1,159	\$4.50	11/5/04	11/5/04	
Orlando	FL	Planning	\$21,919	\$3.00	8/28/95	8/28/95	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Sanford	FL	Planning	\$23,048	\$1.00	12/27/00	12/27/00	
Tallahassee	FL	Planning	\$129,330	\$3.00	3/3/98	3/3/98	
Chicago Midway	IL	Planning	\$1,425,000	\$3.00	7/5/95	7/5/95	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Planning	\$5,700,000	\$3.00	6/28/96	6/28/96	
Rockford	IL	Planning	\$16,088	\$3.00	7/24/92	9/2/93	
Indianapolis	IN	Planning	\$75,000	\$3.00	12/20/96	12/20/96	
Manhattan	KS	Planning	\$16,036	\$3.00	3/8/12	3/8/12	
Covington	KY	Planning	\$337,000	\$3.00	3/30/94	3/30/94	
Covington	KY	Planning	\$344,215	\$3.00	3/31/98	3/31/98	
Covington	KY	Planning	\$1,501,000	\$3.00	11/8/01	11/8/01	
Detroit	MI	Planning	\$386,156	\$3.00	9/28/04	9/28/04	
Traverse City	MI	Planning	\$7,238	\$4.50	3/2/06	3/2/06	
Duluth	MN	Planning	\$17,255	\$3.00	7/1/94	7/1/94	
St. Louis	MO	Planning	\$600,000	\$3.00	11/24/08	11/24/08	
Missoula	MT	Planning	\$20,670	\$4.50	7/22/05	7/22/05	
Las Vegas	NV	Planning	\$167,495	\$3.00	2/24/92	2/24/92	
Reno	NV	Planning	\$339,994	\$3.00	5/31/01	5/31/01	
Albany	NY	Planning	\$45,000	\$3.00	9/27/96	9/27/96	
Charlotte	NC	Planning	\$1,250,000	\$3.00	8/23/04	8/23/04	
Charlotte	NC	Planning	\$294,500	\$3.00	9/15/11	9/15/11	
Akron	OH	Planning	\$4,146	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Planning	\$27,001	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Planning	\$2,722	\$3.00	10/18/99	10/18/99	
Cleveland	OH	Planning	\$584,570	\$3.00	4/25/97	4/25/97	
Columbus	OH	Planning	\$13,822	\$3.00	5/29/98	5/29/98	
Dayton	OH	Planning	\$700,000	\$4.50	5/9/02	5/9/02	
Allentown	PA	Planning	\$33,334	\$4.50	3/26/01	3/26/01	
State College	PA	Planning	\$10,000	\$3.00	5/26/99	5/26/99	
Nashville	TN	Planning	\$106,272	\$3.00	2/23/01	2/23/01	
Brownsville	TX	Planning	\$108,702	\$4.50	2/7/03	2/7/03	
Laredo	TX	Planning	\$15,786	\$3.00	7/23/93	12/31/96	
Richmond	VA	Planning	\$15,931	\$3.00	7/3/97	7/3/97	
Roanoke	VA	Planning	\$2,458	\$4.50	11/24/04	11/24/04	
Milwaukee	WI	Planning	\$230,000	\$3.00	7/9/02	7/9/02	
Milwaukee	WI	Planning	\$35,600	\$3.00	9/8/11	9/8/11	
Phoenix	AZ	Soundproofing	\$4,996,000	\$3.00	1/26/96	1/26/96	\$1,366,427,219
Phoenix	AZ	Soundproofing	\$34,048,279	\$4.50	6/5/02	6/5/02	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$43,525,109	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$730,774	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$437,200	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$770,931	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$429,490	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$16,000,000	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,570,000	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$113,000	\$4.50	5/27/04	5/27/04	
Fresno	CA	Soundproofing	\$444,400	\$3.00	9/18/96	9/18/96	
Long Beach	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,600,000	\$4.50	9/2/10	9/2/10	
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$35,000,000	\$4.50	10/23/07	10/23/07	
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$27,800,572	\$3.00	5/2/11	5/2/11	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$6,288,486	\$3.00	5/2/11		
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$824,321	\$3.00	10/8/93	10/31/94	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$322,715	\$3.00	7/27/01	7/27/01	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$211,022	\$3.00	5/30/02	5/30/02	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$80,026	\$4.50	3/16/06	3/16/06	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$97,679	\$4.50	3/16/06	3/16/06	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$196,008	\$4.50	2/7/08	2/7/08	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$67,829	\$4.50	4/23/09	4/23/09	
Oakland	CA	Soundproofing	\$240,000	\$3.00	4/30/97	4/30/97	
Oakland	CA	Soundproofing	\$6,199,070	\$3.00	6/18/99	6/18/99	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$2,418,000	\$3.00	7/26/95	7/26/95	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$1,122,000	\$3.00	7/24/98	7/24/98	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,626,000	\$4.50	5/20/03	5/20/03	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$5,132,960	\$4.50	11/22/05	11/22/05	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,512,915	\$4.50	6/27/08	6/27/08	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$9,612,376	\$4.50	9/30/09	9/30/09	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$17,469,000	\$4.50	7/3/12	7/3/12	
San Jose	CA	Soundproofing	\$47,984,474	\$3.00	6/11/92	6/11/92	
San Jose	CA	Soundproofing	\$3,284,264	\$4.50	11/24/99	11/24/99	
San Jose	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,500,000	\$4.50	4/20/01	4/20/01	
San Jose	CA	Soundproofing	\$61,589,000	\$4.50	3/1/02	3/1/02	
Windsor Locks	CT	Soundproofing	\$1,450,000	\$4.50	11/3/08	11/3/08	
Windsor Locks	CT	Soundproofing	\$625,000	\$4.50	7/26/10	7/26/10	
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	Soundproofing	\$35,000,000	\$4.50	12/22/08	12/22/08	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$350,000	\$3.00	8/31/99	8/31/99	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$81,138	\$4.50	1/10/03	1/10/03	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$70,715	\$4.50	1/10/03	1/10/03	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$63,316	\$4.50	4/14/04	4/14/04	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$200,239	\$4.50	11/5/04	11/5/04	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$191,661	\$4.50	4/5/05	4/5/05	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$56,536	\$4.50	2/10/10	2/10/10	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$219,603	\$4.50	2/10/10	2/10/10	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$33,038	\$4.50	2/20/20	2/10/10	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$131,407	\$4.50	2/10/10	2/10/10	
Altanta	GA	Soundproofing	\$23,800,000	\$4.50	3/12/10	3/12/10	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$4,900,000	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$1,140,000	\$3.00	7/5/95	7/5/95	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$8,000,000	\$4.50	11/15/96	11/15/96	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$28,400,000	\$4.50	11/15/96	11/15/96	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$10,000,000	\$4.50	2/22/00	2/22/00	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$20,000,000	\$4.50	7/7/00	7/7/00	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$50,000,000	\$4.50	4/18/02	4/18/02	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$127,542,000	\$4.50	1/21/09	1/21/09	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$4,303,049	\$4.50	1/21/09	1/21/09	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$35,300,000	\$4.50	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$113,271,731	\$4.50	6/28/96	6/28/96	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$52,000,000	\$4.50	6/28/96	6/28/96	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$20,000,000	\$4.50	3/16/98	3/16/98	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$61,000,000	\$4.50	4/16/01	4/16/01	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$30,000,000	\$4.50	4/16/01	4/16/01	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$27,200,000	\$4.50	4/16/01	4/16/01	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$4,000,000	\$4.50	12/28/05	12/28/05	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$16,060,000	\$4.50	6/17/04	6/17/04	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$2,440,000	\$4.50	6/17/04	6/17/04	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$24,327,000	\$4.50	8/17/06	8/17/06	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$13,875,325	\$4.50	8/17/06	8/17/06	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$130,412,160	\$4.50	12/23/09	12/23/09	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$2,317,696	\$4.50	12/7/10	12/7/10	
Peoria	IL	Soundproofing	\$289,013	\$3.00	9/8/94	9/8/94	
Covington	KY	Soundproofing	\$3,560,000	\$3.00	8/3/05	8/3/05	
Louisville	KY	Soundproofing	\$250,000	\$4.50	2/2/11	2/2/11	
Boston	MA	Soundproofing	\$15,323,217	\$4.50	8/24/93	1/27/97	
Boston	MA	Soundproofing	\$8,590,000	\$4.50	4/20/06	4/20/06	
Boston	MA	Soundproofing	\$5,200,000	\$4.50	4/20/06	4/20/06	
Saipan	MP	Soundproofing	\$80,648	\$4.50	10/15/04	10/15/04	
Rota	MP	Soundproofing	\$4,480	\$4.50	10/15/04	10/15/04	
Tinian	MP	Soundproofing	\$4,480	\$4.50	10/15/04	10/15/04	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$2,617,279	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$450,537	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$19,768,494	\$4.50	12/11/98	12/11/98	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$9,695,410	\$4.50	1/24/03	1/24/03	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$5,000,000	\$4.50	5/5/05	5/5/05	
Great Falls	MT	Soundproofing	\$431,271	\$4.50	4/12/12	4/12/12	
Reno	NV	Soundproofing	\$155,744	\$3.00	10/29/93	10/29/93	
Manchester	NH	Soundproofing	\$3,250,000	\$3.00	4/1/03	4/1/03	
Buffalo	NY	Soundproofing	\$3,058,930	\$4.50	12/17/09	12/17/09	
Syracuse	NY	Soundproofing	\$1,354,899	\$4.50	8/22/05	8/22/05	
Cleveland	OH	Soundproofing	\$22,362,400	\$3.00	9/1/92	9/1/92	
Cleveland	OH	Soundproofing	\$8,595,641	\$3.00	4/25/97	4/25/97	
Cleveland	OH	Soundproofing	\$10,000,000	\$3.00	5/28/99	5/28/99	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$20,323	\$3.00	7/14/92	10/27/93	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$71,974	\$3.00	7/14/92	10/27/93	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$60,547	\$3.00	7/14/92	10/27/93	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$269,810	\$3.00	7/19/93	3/27/96	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$906,369	\$4.50	5/29/98	5/29/98	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$963,915	\$4.50	1/28/11	1/28/11	
Allentown	PA	Soundproofing	\$100,000	\$4.50	6/6/03	6/6/03	
Allentown	PA	Soundproofing	\$500,000	\$4.50	6/6/03	6/6/03	
Pittsburgh	PA	Soundproofing	\$700,541	\$4.50	7/27/01	7/27/01	
Pittsburgh	PA	Soundproofing	\$1,050,207	\$4.50	1/7/05	1/7/05	
San Antonio	TX	Soundproofing	\$21,302,247	\$4.50	8/29/01	12/1/04	
Seattle	WA	Soundproofing	\$16,134,627	\$3.00	10/25/93	10/25/93	
Seattle	WA	Soundproofing	\$153,212	\$3.00	10/25/93	10/25/93	
Milwaukee	WI	Soundproofing	\$2,290,230	\$3.00	12/21/95	12/21/95	
Milwaukee	WI	Soundproofing	\$2,855,260	\$3.00	12/31/09	12/31/09	
Total:							\$3,235,935,617

PFC FUNDED NOISE PROJECTS (BY LOCATION)
(as of Sept. 30, 2012)

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
Birmingham	AL	Land	\$3,173,639	\$4.50	7/2/08	7/2/08	\$5,132,516
Birmingham	AL	Land	\$1,958,877	\$4.50	3/31/10	3/31/10	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$4,211,697	\$3.00	3/6/92	6/28/94	\$5,492,201
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$791,507	\$3.00	3/6/92	11/22/95	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$265,804	\$3.00	3/6/92	5/28/97	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$68,954	\$3.00	10/19/98	10/19/98	
Huntsville	AL	Land	\$154,239	\$4.50	10/30/02	10/30/02	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$421,383	\$3.00	2/22/02	2/22/02	\$1,372,005
Mobile	AL	Land	\$126,333	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$140,993	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$230,906	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$103,394	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Land	\$232,192	\$3.00	3/1/06	3/1/06	
Mobile	AL	Planning	\$116,804	\$3.00	2/22/02	2/22/02	
Juneau	AK	Land	\$21,931	\$4.50	5/30/01	5/30/01	\$21,931
Mesa	AZ	Planning	\$11,175	\$4.50	9/25/08	9/25/08	\$11,175
Phoenix	AZ	Land	\$27,327,877	\$3.00	6/5/02	6/5/02	\$173,672,156
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$75,000,000	\$4.50	12/6/04	12/6/04	
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$25,900,000	\$4.50	9/27/07	9/27/07	
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$6,400,000	\$4.50	4/30/09	4/30/09	
Phoenix	AZ	Soundproofing	\$4,996,000	\$3.00	1/26/96	1/26/96	
Phoenix	AZ	Soundproofing	\$34,048,279	\$4.50	6/5/02	6/5/02	
Tucson	AZ	Land	\$3,288,473	\$4.50	11/19/97	11/19/97	\$3,685,361
Tucson	AZ	Land	\$396,888	\$4.50	11/19/97	11/19/97	
Fort Smith	AR	Land	\$90,756	\$3.00	5/8/94	7/24/97	\$111,311
Fort Smith	AR	Monitoring	\$20,555	\$3.00	5/8/94	7/24/97	
Little Rock	AR	Land	\$3,314,737	\$4.50	1/31/06	1/31/06	\$4,736,189
Little Rock	AR	Land	\$1,421,452	\$4.50	1/15/10	1/15/10	
Burbank	CA	Land	\$27,829,178	\$3.00	6/17/94	2/5/97	\$95,869,418
Burbank	CA	Monitoring	\$64,836	\$3.00	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Monitoring	\$1,000,000	\$3.00	9/28/09	9/28/09	
Burbank	CA	Planning	\$282,440	\$3.00	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Planning	\$116,460	\$3.00	6/16/06	6/16/06	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$43,525,109	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$730,774	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$437,200	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$770,931	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$429,490	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$16,000,000	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,570,000	\$4.50	4/2/01	4/2/01	
Burbank	CA	Soundproofing	\$113,000	\$4.50	5/27/04	5/27/04	
Carlsbad	CA	Misc	\$18,226	\$4.50	11/24/08	11/24/08	\$18,226
Fresno	CA	Soundproofing	\$444,400	\$3.00	9/18/96	9/18/96	\$444,400
Long Beach	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,600,000	\$4.50	9/2/19	9/2/10	\$4,600,000
Los Angeles	CA	Monitoring	\$3,450,000	\$3.00	9/23/05	9/23/05	\$822,539,058
Los Angeles	CA	Multi-phase	\$700,000,000	\$4.50	11/28/97	11/28/97	
Los Angeles	CA	Multi-phase	\$50,000,000	\$4.50	10/23/07	10/23/07	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$35,000,000	\$4.50	10/23/07	10/23/07	
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$27,800,572	\$3.00	5/2/11	5/2/11	
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$6,288,486	\$3.00	5/2/11		
Modesto	CA	Planning	\$15,750	\$4.50	6/6/08	6/6/08	\$15,750
Monterey	CA	Planning	\$50,130	\$3.00	7/14/98	7/14/98	\$1,864,730
Monterey	CA	Planning	\$15,000	\$4.50	2/7/08	2/7/08	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$824,321	\$3.00	10/8/93	10/31/94	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$322,715	\$3.00	7/27/01	7/27/01	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$211,022	\$3.00	5/30/02	5/30/02	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$80,026	\$4.50	3/16/06	3/16/06	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$97,679	\$4.50	3/16/06	3/16/06	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$196,008	\$4.50	2/7/08	2/7/08	
Monterey	CA	Soundproofing	\$67,829	\$4.50	4/23/09	4/23/09	
Oakland	CA	Monitoring	\$436,267	\$3.00	6/26/92	6/26/92	\$7,075,337
Oakland	CA	Soundproofing	\$200,000	\$3.00	10/23/09	10/23/09	
Oakland	CA	Soundproofing	\$240,000	\$3.00	4/30/97	4/30/97	
Oakland	CA	Soundproofing	\$6,199,070	\$3.00	6/18/99	6/18/99	
Ontario	CA	Multi-phase	\$84,774,000	\$3.00	4/28/98	4/28/98	\$84,774,000
Sacramento	CA	Monitoring	\$662,000	\$3.00	4/26/96	4/26/96	\$662,000
San Diego	CA	Monitoring	\$1,224,000	\$3.00	5/20/03	5/20/03	\$46,358,806
San Diego	CA	Planning	\$241,555	\$3.00	6/27/08	6/27/08	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$2,418,000	\$3.00	7/26/95	7/26/95	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$1,122,000	\$3.00	7/24/98	7/24/98	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,626,000	\$4.50	5/20/03	5/20/03	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$5,132,960	\$4.50	11/22/05	11/22/05	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,512,915	\$4.50	6/27/08	6/27/08	
San Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$9,612,376	\$4.50	9/30/09	9/30/09	
San Jose	CA	Monitoring	\$183,775	\$3.00	6/11/92	6/11/92	\$117,839,197
San Jose	CA	Monitoring	\$76,684	\$3.00	11/24/99	11/24/99	
San Jose	CA	Monitoring	\$221,000	\$3.00	12/15/00	12/15/00	
San Jose	CA	Soundproofing	\$47,984,474	\$3.00	6/11/92	6/11/92	
San Jose	CA	Soundproofing	\$3,284,264	\$4.50	11/24/99	11/24/99	
San Jose	CA	Soundproofing	\$4,500,000	\$4.50	4/20/01	4/20/01	
San Jose	CA	Soundproofing	\$61,589,000	\$4.50	3/1/02	3/1/02	
Pueblo	CO	Planning	\$21,500	\$3.00	4/11/96	4/11/96	\$21,500
New Haven	CT	Planning	\$5,431	\$4.50	8/18/11	8/18/11	\$5,431
Windsor Locks	CT	Soundproofing	\$1,450,000	\$4.50	11/3/08	11/3/08	\$2,075,000
Windsor Locks	CT	Soundproofing	\$625,000	\$4.50	7/26/10	7/26/10	
Fort Lauderdale	FL	Land	\$3,500,000	\$3.00	4/30/98	4/23/01	\$39,158,000
Fort Lauderdale	FL	Monitoring	\$658,000	\$3.00	11/1/94	4/30/98	
Fort Lauderdale	FL	Soundproofing	\$35,000,000	\$4.50	12/22/08	12/22/08	
Fort Myers	FL	Planning	\$132,000	\$3.00	8/31/92	8/31/92	\$132,000
Gainesville	FL	Land	\$144,869	\$4.50	8/29/02	8/29/02	\$144,869
Jacksonville	FL	Land	\$6,000,000	\$3.00	9/6/06	9/6/06	\$6,000,000
Key West	FL	Planning	\$1,980	\$4.50	1/10/03	1/10/03	\$1,402,772
Key West	FL	Planning	\$1,980	\$4.50	4/14/04	4/14/04	
Key West	FL	Planning	\$1,159	\$4.50	11/5/04	11/5/04	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$350,000	\$3.00	8/31/99	8/31/99	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$81,138	\$4.50	1/10/03	1/10/03	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$70,715	\$4.50	1/10/03	1/10/03	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$63,316	\$4.50	4/14/04	4/14/04	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$200,239	\$4.50	11/5/04	11/5/04	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$191,661	\$4.50	4/5/05	4/5/05	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$56,536	\$4.50	2/10/10	2/10/10	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$219,603	\$4.50	2/10/10	2/10/10	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$33,038	\$4.50	2/10/10	2/10/10	
Key West	FL	Soundproofing	\$131,407	\$4.50	2/10/10	2/10/10	
Orlando	FL	Planning	\$21,919	\$3.00	8/28/95	8/28/95	\$709,919
Orlando	FL	Multi-phase	\$688,000	\$3.00	7/12/05	7/12/05	
Pensacola	FL	Land	\$597,708	\$3.00	11/23/92	11/23/92	\$732,264
Pensacola	FL	Land	\$69,480	\$3.00	11/23/92	8/10/95	
Pensacola	FL	Misc	\$65,076	\$3.00	11/23/92	8/10/95	
Sanford	FL	Planning	\$23,048	\$1.00	12/27/00	12/27/00	\$23,048
Sarasota	FL	Multi-phase	\$1,474,904	\$3.00	6/29/92	1/31/95	\$4,538,410
Sarasota	FL	Land	\$3,063,506	\$3.00	6/29/92	12/15/95	
Tallahassee	FL	Land	\$3,128,225	\$3.00	3/3/98	3/3/98	\$3,257,555
Tallahassee	FL	Planning	\$129,330	\$3.00	3/3/98	3/3/98	
Tampa	FL	Misc	\$1,692,110	\$4.50	5/16/03	5/16/03	\$1,692,110
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$1,000,000	\$3.00	1/26/94	8/29/96	\$12,064,464
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$2,302,300	\$3.00	1/26/94	8/29/96	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$374,616	\$3.00	1/26/94	6/11/97	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$1,387,548	\$3.00	1/26/94	6/11/97	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$5,000,000	\$3.00	1/26/94	6/11/97	
West Palm Beach	FL	Land	\$2,000,000	\$3.00	8/22/00	12/31/02	
Atlanta	GA	Land	\$7,280,374	\$4.50	11/29/07	11/29/07	\$31,080,374
Atlanta	GA	Soundproofing	\$23,800,000	\$4.50	3/12/10	3/12/10	
Bloomington	IL	Land	\$35,000	\$3.00	12/5/97	12/5/97	\$35,000
Chicago Midway	IL	Misc	\$11,493	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	\$260,901,356
Chicago Midway	IL	Misc	\$297,707	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago Midway	IL	Misc	\$2,057,107	\$3.00	2/22/00	2/22/00	
Chicago Midway	IL	Misc	\$2,500,000	\$3.00	4/18/02	4/18/02	
Chicago Midway	IL	Monitoring	\$325,000	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago Midway	IL	Planning	\$1,425,000	\$3.00	7/5/95	7/5/95	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$4,900,000	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$1,140,000	\$3.00	7/5/95	7/5/95	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$8,000,000	\$4.50	11/15/96	11/15/96	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$28,400,000	\$4.50	11/15/96	11/15/96	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$10,000,000	\$4.50	2/22/00	2/22/00	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$20,000,000	\$4.50	7/7/00	7/7/00	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$50,000,000	\$4.50	4/18/02	4/18/02	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$127,542,000	\$4.50	1/21/09	1/21/09	
Chicago Midway	IL	Soundproofing	\$4,303,049	\$4.50	1/21/09	1/21/09	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Misc	\$42,389	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	\$546,426,186
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Misc	\$2,993,028	\$4.50	6/28/96	6/28/96	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Monitoring	\$3,900,000	\$3.00	6/28/93	9/16/94	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Monitoring	\$1,000,000	\$3.00	8/17/06	8/17/06	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Multi-phase	\$586,857	\$4.50	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Planning	\$5,700,000	\$3.00	6/28/96	6/28/96	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$35,300,000	\$4.50	6/28/93	6/28/93	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$113,271,731	\$450	6/28/96	6/28/96	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$52,000,000	\$450	6/28/96	6/28/96	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$20,000,000	\$450	3/16/98	3/16/98	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$61,000,000	\$4.50	4/16/01	4/16/01	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$30,000,000	\$4.50	4/16/01	4/16/01	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$27,200,000	\$4.50	4/16/01	4/16/01	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$4,000,000	\$4.50	12/28/05	12/28/05	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$16,060,000	\$4.50	6/17/04	6/17/04	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$2,440,000	\$4.50	6/17/04	6/17/04	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$24,327,000	\$4.50	8/17/06	8/17/06	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$13,875,325	\$4.50	8/17/06	8/17/06	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$130,412,160	\$4.50	12/23/09	12/23/09	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$2,317,696	\$4.50	12/7/10	12/7/10	
Moline	IL	Land	\$335,915	\$4.50	9/29/94	9/29/94	\$700,999
Moline	IL	Land	\$365,084	\$4.50	3/12/98	3/12/98	
Peoria	IL	Land	\$382,426	\$3.00	9/8/94	9/8/94	\$816,880
Peoria	IL	Land	\$145,411	\$4.50	2/3/00	2/3/00	
Peoria	IL	Soundproofing	\$289,013	\$3.00	9/8/94	9/8/94	
Rockford	IL	Planning	\$16,088	\$3.00	7/24/92	9/2/93	\$16,088
Springfield	IL	Land	\$24,740	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	\$165,351
Springfield	IL	Land	\$12,275	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$24,897	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$14,721	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$551	\$3.00	3/27/92	4/28/93	
Springfield	IL	Land	\$88,167	\$3.00	11/24/93	3/11/97	
Indianapolis	IN	Land	\$42,532,859	\$3.00	6/28/93	6/28/93	\$43,106,543
Indianapolis	IN	Misc	\$498,684	\$4.50	12/20/96	12/20/96	
Indianapolis	IN	Planning	\$75,000	\$3.00	12/20/96	12/20/96	
Des Moines	IA	Multi-phase	\$945,178	\$4.50	8/16/05	8/16/05	\$945,178
Manhattan	KS	Planning	\$16,036	\$4.50	3/8/12	3/8/12	\$16,036
Covington	KY	Monitoring	\$140,000	\$3.00	3/30/94	3/30/94	\$42,478,215
Covington	KY	Monitoring	\$387,000	\$3.00	7/26/02	7/26/02	
Covington	KY	Multi-phase	\$21,317,000	\$3.00	3/30/94	3/30/94	
Covington	KY	Multi-phase	\$6,444,000	\$3.00	11/29/95	11/29/95	
Covington	KY	Multi-phase	\$8,448,000	\$3.00	3/28/01	3/28/01	
Covington	KY	Planning	\$337,000	\$3.00	11/8/01	11/8/01	
Covington	KY	Planning	\$344,215	\$3.00	3/31/98	3/31/98	
Covington	KY	Planning	\$1,501,000	\$3.00	11/8/01	11/8/01	
Covington	KY	Soundproofing	\$3,560,000	\$3.00	8/3/05	8/3/05	
Lexington	KY	Multi-phase	\$45,544	\$4.50	8/31/93	4/21/95	\$156,904
Lexington	KY	Multi-phase	\$111,360	\$4.50	8/31/93	9/27/96	
Louisville	KY	Land	\$58,800,000	\$3.00	1/29/97	1/29/97	\$59,175,000
Louisville	KY	Monitoring	\$125,000	\$3.00	3/27/01	3/27/01	
Louisville	KY	Soundproofing	\$250,000	\$4.50	2/2/11	2/2/11	
Baton Rouge	LA	Multi-phase	\$1,315,124	\$3.00	9/28/92	4/23/93	\$1,315,124
New Orleans	LA	Multi-phase	\$3,750,000	\$4.50	8/26/04	8/26/04	\$3,750,000
Baltimore	MD	Monitoring	\$1,578,000	\$3.00	8/26/10	8/26/10	\$1,578,000
Boston	MA	Soundproofing	\$8,590,000	\$4.50	4/20/06	4/20/06	\$29,113,217
Boston	MA	Soundproofing	\$5,200,000	\$4.50	4/20/06	4/20/06	
Boston	MA	Soundproofing	\$15,323,217	\$4.50	8/24/93	1/27/97	
Detroit	MI	Misc	\$225,000	\$3.00	9/21/92	9/21/92	\$49,482,156

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
Detroit	MI	Multi-phase	\$48,871,000	\$3.00	9/21/92	9/21/92	
Detroit	MI	Planning	\$386,156	\$3.00	9/28/04	9/28/04	
Traverse City	MI	Planning	\$7,238	\$4.50	3/2/06	3/2/06	\$7,238
Duluth	MN	Planning	\$17,255	\$3.00	7/1/94	7/1/94	\$17,255
Minneapolis	MN	Land	\$21,500,000	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	\$182,999,539
Minneapolis	MN	Land	\$20,500,000	\$3.00	5/5/05	5/5/05	
Minneapolis	MN	Monitoring	\$230,273	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	
Minneapolis	MN	Multi-phase	\$103,237,546	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$2,617,279	\$3.00	5/13/94	5/13/94	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$450,537	\$4.50	5/13/94	5/13/94	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$19,768,494	\$4.50	12/11/98	12/11/98	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$9,695,410	\$4.50	1/24/03	1/24/03	
Minneapolis	MN	Soundproofing	\$5,000,000	\$4.50	5/5/05	5/5/05	
Rota	MP	Soundproofing	\$4,480	\$4.50	10/15/04	10/15/04	\$4,480
Saipan	MP	Soundproofing	\$80,648	\$4.50	10/15/04	10/15/04	\$80,648
Tinian	MP	Soundproofing	\$4,480	\$4.50	10/15/04	10/15/04	\$4,480
Kansas City	MO	Land	\$10,766,850	\$3.00	12/21/95	12/21/95	\$10,766,850
St. Louis	MO	Land	\$22,177,178	\$3.00	9/30/92	9/30/92	\$54,839,782
St. Louis	MO	Land	\$31,962,604	\$3.00	1/31/96	1/8/98	
St. Louis	MO	Monitoring	\$100,000	\$3.00	11/24/08	11/24/08	
St. Louis	MO	Planning	\$600,000	\$3.00	11/24/08	11/24/08	
Great Falls	MT	Soundproofing	\$431,271	\$4.50	4/12/12/	4/12/12	\$431,271
Missoula	MT	Planning	\$20,670	\$4.50	7/22/05	7/22/05	\$20,670
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$10,654,182	\$4.50	2/24/92	3/15/95	\$51,753,814
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$7,991,645	\$4.50	2/24/92	2/24/92	
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$5,250,000	\$3.00	2/24/92	6/7/93	
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$26,250,000	\$4.50	2/24/92	6/7/93	
Las Vegas	NV	Land	\$1,440,492	\$4.50	2/24/92	6/7/93	
Las Vegas	NV	Planning	\$167,495	\$3.00	2/24/92	2/24/92	
Reno	NV	Planning	\$339,994	\$3.00	5/3/01	5/3/01	\$495,738
Reno	NV	Soundproofing	\$155,744	\$3.00	10/29/93	10/29/93	
Manchester	NH	Multi-phase	\$1,400,000	\$3.00	10/13/92	3/4/96	\$4,650,000
Manchester	NH	Soundproofing	\$3,250,000	\$3.00	4/1/03	4/1/03	
Albany	NY	Planning	\$45,000	\$3.00	9/27/96	9/27/96	\$45,000
Buffalo	NY	Multi-phase	\$1,997,550	\$4.50	5/25/07	5/25/07	\$5,056,480
Buffalo	NY	Soundproofing	\$3,058,930	\$4.50	12/17/09	12/17/09	
Islip	NY	Multi-phase	\$671,891	\$3.00	9/23/94	9/23/94	\$671,891
Syracuse	NY	Soundproofing	\$1,354,899	\$4.50	8/22/05	8/22/05	\$1,354,899
Charlotte	NC	Land	\$52,270,000	\$3.00	8/23/04	8/23/04	\$59,245,205
Charlotte	NC	Monitoring	\$225,403	\$3.00	9/15/11	9/15/11	
Charlotte	NC	Multi-phase	\$1,264,209	\$3.00	8/23/04	8/23/04	
Charlotte	NC	Multi-phase	\$3,941,093	\$3.00	8/23/04	8/23/04	
Charlotte	NC	Planning	\$1,250,000	\$3.00	8/23/04	8/23/04	
Charlotte	NC	Planning	\$294,500	\$3.00	9/15/11	9/15/11	
New Bern	NC	Land	\$30,293	\$4.50	5/11/06	5/11/06	\$30,293
Fargo	ND	Land	\$361,548	\$4.50	10/11/06	10/11/06	\$361,548
Akron	OH	Land	\$19,210	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	\$107,252
Akron	OH	Land	\$14,635	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Land	\$5,293	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Land	\$21,334	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
Akron	OH	Land	\$12,911	\$4.50	4/4/02	4/4/02	
Akron	OH	Planning	\$4,146	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Planning	\$27,001	\$3.00	10/21/96	10/21/96	
Akron	OH	Planning	\$2,722	\$3.00	10/18/99	10/18/99	
Cleveland	OH	Land	\$7,137,600	\$3.00	9/1/92	2/2/94	\$73,962,509
Cleveland	OH	Land	\$25,282,298	\$3.00	4/25/97	4/25/97	
Cleveland	OH	Planning	\$584,570	\$3.00	4/25/97	4/25/97	
Cleveland	OH	Soundproofing	\$22,362,400	\$3.00	9/1/92	9/1/92	
Cleveland	OH	Soundproofing	\$8,595,641	\$3.00	4/25/97	4/25/97	
Cleveland	OH	Soundproofing	\$10,000,000	\$3.00	5/28/99	5/28/99	
Columbus	OH	Land	\$119,600	\$3.00	7/14/92	3/27/96	\$3,926,308
Columbus	OH	Land	\$379,070	\$3.00	7/14/92	3/27/96	
Columbus	OH	Land	\$519,723	\$3.00	7/14/92	3/27/96	
Columbus	OH	Misc	\$61,752	\$3.00	7/19/93	3/27/96	
Columbus	OH	Misc.	\$489,894	\$4.50	1/28/11	1/28/11	
Columbus	OH	Monitoring	\$16,509	\$3.00	7/14/92	10/27/93	
Columbus	OH	Monitoring	\$33,000	\$3.00	1/28/11	1/28/11	
Columbus	OH	Planning	\$13,822	\$3.00	5/29/98	5/29/98	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$20,323	\$3.00	7/14/92	10/27/93	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$71,974	\$3.00	7/14/92	10/27/93	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$60,547	\$3.00	7/14/92	10/27/93	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$269,810	\$3.00	7/19/93	3/27/96	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$906,369	\$4.50	5/29/98	5/29/98	
Columbus	OH	Soundproofing	\$963,915	\$4.50	1/28/11	1/28/11	
Dayton	OH	Land	\$309,206	\$4.50	7/25/94	7/25/94	\$1,009,206
Dayton	OH	Planning	\$700,000	\$4.50	5/9/02	5/9/02	
Toledo	OH	Multi-phase	\$1,676,083	\$4.50	1/16/98	1/16/98	\$1,676,083
Tulsa	OK	Multi-phase	\$8,400,000	\$3.00	4/27/00	4/27/00	\$8,400,000
Portland	OR	Monitoring	\$715,750	\$3.00	12/7/05	12/7/05	\$715,750
Allentown	PA	Land	\$244,387	\$4.50	3/26/01	3/26/01	\$1,220,696
Allentown	PA	Land	\$220,475	\$4.50	3/26/01	3/26/01	
Allentown	PA	Land	\$91,944	\$4.50	6/6/03	6/6/03	
Allentown	PA	Monitoring	\$30,556	\$4.50	3/26/01	3/26/01	
Allentown	PA	Planning	\$33,334	\$4.50	3/26/01	3/26/01	
Allentown	PA	Soundproofing	\$100,000	\$4.50	6/6/03	6/6/03	
Allentown	PA	Soundproofing	\$500,000	\$4.50	6/6/03	6/6/03	
Erie	PA	Land	\$242,373	\$4.50	5/13/03	5/13/03	\$360,891
Erie	PA	Multi-phase	\$118,518	\$3.00	7/21/92	7/21/92	
Pittsburgh	PA	Soundproofing	\$700,541	\$4.50	7/27/01	7/27/01	\$1,750,748
Pittsburgh	PA	Soundproofing	\$1,050,207	\$4.50	1/7/05	1/7/05	
State College	PA	Planning	\$10,000	\$3.00	5/26/99	5/26/99	\$10,000
Providence	RI	Land	\$10,382,213	\$4.50	11/30/09	11/30/09	\$23,040,613
Providence	RI	Land	\$12,658,400	\$4.50	11/13/09	11/13/09	
Chattanooga	TN	Land	\$100,000	\$3.00	4/25/97	4/25/97	\$115,000
Chattanooga	TN	Land	\$15,000	\$4.50	11/22/00	11/22/00	
Knoxville	TN	Multi-phase	\$528,431	\$3.00	10/6/93	10/6/93	\$528,431
Nashville	TN	Monitoring	\$120,375	\$3.00	5/10/07	5/10/07	\$24,292,596
Nashville	TN	Multi-phase	\$24,065,949	\$3.00	2/26/04	2/26/04	
Nashville	TN	Planning	\$106,272	\$3.00	2/23/01	2/23/01	
Brownsville	TX	Land	\$81,860	\$4.50	5/7/07	5/7/07	\$290,562

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
Brownsville	TX	Planning	\$108,702	\$4.50	2/7/03	2/7/03	
Dallas Love	TX	Multi-phase	\$1,913,478	\$3.00	12/20/07	12/20/07	\$1,913,478
Dallas/Ft. Worth	TX	Monitoring	\$1,266,151	\$3.00	11/7/96	11/7/96	\$1,266,151
Harlingen	TX	Land	\$96,630	\$3.00	7/9/98	7/9/98	\$96,630
Laredo	TX	Planning	\$15,786	\$3.00	7/23/93	12/31/96	\$15,786
San Antonio	TX	Monitoirng	\$245,153	\$3.00	2/22/05	2/22/05	\$21,547,400
San Antonio	TX	Soundproofing	\$21,302,247	\$4.50	8/29/01	12/1/04	
Salt Lake City	UT	Land	\$465,488	\$3.00	10/1/94	10/1/94	\$1,320,968
Salt Lake City	UT	Land	\$331,072	\$4.50	4/30/01	4/30/01	
Salt Lake City	UT	Land	\$524,408	\$4.50	2/28/02	2/28/02	
Lynchburg	VA	Land	\$17,762	\$3.00	4/14/95	4/14/95	\$17,762
Richmond	VA	Planning	\$15,931	\$3.00	7/3/97	7/3/97	\$15,931
Roanoke	VA	Land	\$145,000	\$4.50	11/24/04	11/24/04	\$388,308
Roanoke	VA	Multi-phase	\$240,850	\$4.50	5/16/11	5/16/11	
Roanoke	VA	Planning	\$2,458	\$4.50	11/24/04	11/24/04	
Bellingham	WA	Land	\$166,000	\$3.00	4/29/93	4/29/93	\$1,352,350
Bellingham	WA	Land	\$732,000	\$3.00	10/5/94	10/5/94	
Bellingham	WA	Land	\$454,350	\$3.00	12/11/96	12/11/96	
Seattle	WA	Multi-phase	\$14,939,111	\$3.00	8/13/92	8/13/92	\$124,226,950
Seattle	WA	Multi-phase	\$43,000,000	\$3.00	12/29/95	12/25/95	
Seattle	WA	Multi-phase	\$50,000,000	\$3.00	6/24/98	10/16/01	
Seattle	WA	Soundproofing	\$16,134,627	\$3.00	10/25/93	10/25/93	
Seattle	WA	Soundproofing	\$153,212	\$3.00	10/25/93	10/25/93	
Appleton	WI	Land	\$14,502	\$3.00	4/25/94	4/25/94	\$14,502
Milwaukee	WI	Land	\$3,099,197	\$3.00	2/24/95	2/24/95	\$49,719,420
Milwaukee	WI	Land	\$1,425,187	\$3.00	2/24/95	2/24/95	
Milwaukee	WI	Land	\$156,000	\$3.00	12/31/09	12/31/09	
Milwaukee	WI	Misc	\$50,000	\$3.00	3/8/01	3/8/01	
Milwaukee	WI	Misc	\$4,382,162	\$3.00	7/9/02	7/9/02	
Milwaukee	WI	Monitoring	\$40,956	\$3.00	2/24/95	2/24/95	
Milwaukee	WI	Monitoring	\$160,000	\$3.00	12/31/09	12/31/09	
Milwaukee	WI	Multi-phase	\$34,994,828	\$3.00	12/21/95	12/21/95	
Milwaukee	WI	Planning	\$230,000	\$3.00	7/9/02	7/9/02	
Milwaukee	WI	Planning	\$35,600	\$3.00	9/8/11	9/8/11	
Milwaukee	WI	Soundproofing	\$2,290,230	\$3.00	12/21/95	12/21/95	
Milwaukee	WI	Soundproofing	\$2,855,260	\$3.00	12/31/09	12/31/09	
Cheyenne	WY	Land	\$81,192	\$4.50	3/28/01	3/28/01	\$210,951
Cheyenne	WY	Misc	\$129,759	\$4.50	3/28/01	3/28/01	
Jackson	WY	Monitoring	\$47,272	\$4.50	2/9/04	2/9/04	\$73,588
Jackson	WY	Monitoring	\$26,316	\$4.50	4/8/08	4/8/08	
Total:							\$3,235,935,617

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 36, 37

October 29, 2012

AIP Noise Grants

NOISE GRANTS TOTALING \$189.2 MILLION AWARDED TO 29 AIRPORTS IN FISCAL 2012

In fiscal 2012, some 29 airports received a total of \$189.2 million in federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants to conduct noise compatibility planning studies and to implement noise mitigation projects, according to data provided by the Federal Aviation Administration.

That funding level is \$50.08 million more than the \$139.1 million in AIP noise mitigation grants awarded to 37 airports in fiscal 2011 and marks the first increase in the amount of AIP grants being awarded for noise mitigation in seven years.

AIP funding levels for noise mitigation projects peaked in fiscal 2005 when 57 airports received a total of \$337.1 million. In fiscal 2006, the funding level for noise projects dropped to \$303.1 million. The funding level dropped again in fiscal 2007 to \$288.3 million, in fiscal 2008 to \$272.7 million, in fiscal 2009 to \$217.7 million, in fiscal 2010 to \$206.4, and in fiscal 2011 to \$139.1 million.

The drop in AIP noise project funding levels following fiscal 2005 reflects a congressionally-mandated broadening of the special noise set-aside in the AIP program to also fund airport emission mitigation projects and some water quality projects. The set-aside is now capped at \$300 million.

The \$189.2 million in noise grants awarded in fiscal 2012 includes:

- \$129.2 million to 16 airports for sound insulation of homes;
- \$11.4 million to two airports for insulation of public buildings (schools);
- \$43.6 million to eight airports for land acquisition;
- \$3.2 million to eight airports for noise compatibility planning studies; and
- \$1.78 million to one airport to acquire easements.

No AIP grants were awarded in fiscal 2012 for installation of airport noise monitoring systems.

The AIP grants represent only one of two federal funding sources available to airport proprietors to fund noise mitigation projects. The other funding source is revenue from Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs). ANR reported in the previous issue that the total PFC revenue that has been earmarked for airport noise mitigation projects since 1992 is \$3.23 billion, an increase of \$26.9 million over the end of fiscal 2011 total (24 ANR 136).

Los Angeles International Airport received the most AIP funding for noise mitigation in fiscal 2012: \$25 million for residential sound insulation.

The next highest AIP noise grant awards in fiscal 2012 went to Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (\$20 million for residential sound insulation and land acquisition); Milwaukee General Mitchell International Airport (\$15.9 million for residential sound insulation); San Diego International Airport (\$14.3 million for residential sound insulation); Waterbury-Oxford Airport (\$10 million for land acquisition); and Atlanta Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport (\$10 million for residential sound insulation).

In This Issue...

AIP Grant Data ... This special issue of ANR provides data on grants awarded to airports for noise compatibility planning and noise mitigation projects under the federal Airport Improvement Program in fiscal year 2012.

Some 29 airports received a total of \$189.2 million in AIP noise mitigation grants in fiscal 2012.

Table 1. Grants for residential sound insulation - p. 153

Table 2. Grants to acquire easements - p. 154

Table 3. Grants for land acquisition - p. 154

Table 4. Grants for noise compatibility planning studies - p. 155

Table 5. Grants for sound insulation of public buildings (schools) - p. 155

Table 6. Grants for noise monitoring systems - p. 156

Table 7. Grants by airport for all categories of noise mitigation (compiled by ANR from FAA data), p. 157

News Briefs ... Annual UC Davis aviation noise, AQ symposium to be held on March 3-6, 2013 - p. 159

Table 1: AIP Grants for Residential Sound Insulation in Fiscal 2012 (by contour)

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Contour</u>
AK	Anchorage	Anchorage Int'l	State of Alaska	\$8,206,520	65-69 DNL
CA	Fresno	Fresno Yosemite Int'l	City of Fresno	\$1,000,000	65-69 DNL
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Int'l	City of Inglewood	\$15,000,000	65-69 DNL
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Int'l	L.A. County	\$10,000,000	65-69 DNL
CA	San Diego	San Diego Int'l	Airport Authority	\$14,392,500	65-69 DNL
CA	San Francisco	San Francisco Int'l	City, County of S.F.	\$1,696,000	65-69 DNL
FL	Ft. Lauderdale	Ft. Laud./Hollywd Int'l	Broward County	\$12,000,000	65-69 DNL
GA	Atlanta	Hartsfield/Jackson Int'l	City of Atlanta	\$10,000,000	65-69 DNL
MA	Boston	Logan Int'l	Airport Authority	\$1,824,000	65-69 DNL
NV	Reno	Reno/Tahoe Int'l	Airport Authority	\$7,000,000	65-69 DNL
NY	Buffalo	Buffalo Niagara Int'l	Airport Authority	\$5,759,666`	65-69 DNL
TX	Laredo	Laredo Int'l	City of Laredo	\$1,200,000	65-69 DNL
TX	Laredo	Laredo Int'l	City of Laredo	\$2,800,000	65-69 DNL
TX	San Antonio	San Antonio Int'l	City of San Antonio	\$4,000,000	65-69 DNL
TX	San Antonio	San Antonio Int'l	City of San Antonio	\$4,000,000	65-69 DNL
WA	Seattle	King County Int'l	King County	\$4,000,000	65-69 DNL
WA	Seattle	King County Int'l	King County	\$2,000,000	65-69 DNL
WI	Milwaukee	Gen. Mitchell Int'l	Milwaukee County	\$15,913,963	65-69 DNL
LA	Alexandria	Alexandria Int'l	Econ. Dev. District	\$3,000,000	70-74 DNL
LA	Alexandria	Alexandria Int'l	Econ. Dev. District	\$4,000,000	70-74 DNNL
MA	Westfield	Barnes Municipal	City of Westfield	\$1,425,402	70-74 DNL

Grand Total: Residential Sound Insulation (all contours): \$129,218,051

Table 2: AIP Grants to Acquire Easements outside 65 DNL in Fiscal 2012

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Contour</u>
TX	Fort Worth	Ft. Worth Alliance	City of Ft. Worth	\$1,784,000	70-74 DNL

Grand Total: Grants for Easements: \$1,784,000

Table 3: AIP Grants for Land Acquisition in Fiscal 2012 (by contour)

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Contour</u>
CT	Oxford	Waterbury-Oxford	State of CT	\$1,772,246	65-69 DNL
CT	Oxford	Waterbury-Oxford	State of CT	\$3,227,754	65-69 DNL
CT	Oxford	Waterbury-Oxford	State of CT	\$5,000,000	65-69 DNL
FL	Ft. Lauderdale	Ft. Lauderdale Int'l	Broward County	\$8,000,000	65-69 DNL
PA	Harrisburg	Harrisburg Int'l	Airport Authority	\$1,845,486	65-69 DNL
RI	Providence	T.F. Green State	Airport Authority	\$5,000,000	65-69 DNL
TX	Ft. Worth	Ft. Worth Alliance	City of Ft. Worth	\$3,285,038	65-69 DNL
VT	Burlington	Burlington Int'l	City of Burlington	\$4,599,000	65-69 DNL
VT	Burlington	Burlington Int'l	City of Burlington	\$5,000,000	65-69 DNL
MA	Springfield	Westover ARB	Westover Corp.	\$2,500,000	70-74 DNL
MA	Springfield	Westover ARB	Westover Corp.	\$2,500,000	70-74 DNL
MA	Westfield	Barnes Municipal	City of Westfield	\$936,002	70-74 DNL

Grand Total: Grants for Land Acquisition in Fiscal 2012: \$43,665,524

Table 4: AIP Grants for Noise Compatibility Planning Studies in Fiscal 2012

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>
AK	Anchorage	Anchorage Int'l	State of AK	\$843,750
FL	Melbourne	Melbourn Int'l	Airport Authority	\$381,600
IL	Chicago/Rockford	Chicago/Rock. Intl	Airport Authority	\$253,266
LA	Alexandria	Alexandria Int'l	Airport Authority	\$270,000
LA	Shreveport	Shreveport Reg.	City of Shreveport	\$450,000
NH	Portsmouth	Portsmouth Int'l	Airport Authority	\$146,124
OH	Akron	Akron Canton Reg.	Airport Authority	\$698,185
VT	Burlington	Burlington Int'l	City of Burlington	\$165,780

Grand Total: Grants for Noise Compatibility Planning Studies: \$3,208,705

Table 5: AIP Grants for Sound Insulation of Public Buildings (Schools) in Fiscal 2012

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Contour</u>
IL	Chicago	Chicago O'Hare Int'l	Board of Ed	\$4,500,000	not specified
IL	Chicago	Chicago O'Hare Int'l	City of Chicago	\$4,900,000	not specified
WA	Seattle	Seattle/Tacoma Int'l	Port of Seattle	\$2,000,000	not specified

Grand Total: Sound Insulation of Public Buildings: \$11,400,000

Table 6: AIP Grants for Installation of Noise Monitoring Systems in Fiscal 2012

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>
--------------	-------------	----------------	----------------	---------------

No grants this year for noise monitoring systems

Grand Total: Grants for Installation of Noise Monitoring Systems: \$0

Table 7: AIP Grants by Airport for All Noise Mitigation Projects in Fiscal 2012

<u>State</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Insulation</u>	<u>Studies</u>	<u>Land/Other</u>	<u>Monitoring</u>	<u>Total</u>
AK	Anchorage	\$8,206,520	\$843,750			\$9,050,270
CA	Fresno	\$1,000,000				\$1,000,000
CA	LAX	\$25,000,000				\$25,000,000
CA	San Diego	\$14,392,500				\$14,392,500
CA	San Fran.	\$1,696,000				\$1,696,000
CT	Oxford			\$10,000,000		\$10,000,000
FL	Ft. Lauder.	\$12,000,000		\$8,000,000		\$20,000,000
FL	Melbourne		\$381,600			\$381,600
GA	Atlanta	\$10,000,000				\$10,000,000
IL	O'Hare	\$9,400,000				\$9,400,000
IL	Rockford		\$253,266			\$253,266
LA	Alexandria	\$7,000,000	\$270,000			\$7,270,000
LA	Shreveport		\$450,000			\$450,000
MA	Barnes	\$1,425,402		\$936,002		\$2,361,404
MA	Boston	\$1,824,000				\$1,824,000
MA	Westover			\$5,000,000		\$5,000,000
NH	Portsmouth		\$146,124			\$146,124
NV	Reno-Tahoe	\$7,000,000				\$7,000,000
NY	Buffalo	\$5,759,666				\$5,759,666
OH	Akron		\$698,185			\$698,185
PA	Harrisburg	\$		\$1,845,486		\$1,845,486
RI	Providence			\$5,000,000		\$5,000,000

Table 7 (Cont.): AIP Grants by Airport for All Noise Mitigation Projects in Fiscal 2012

<u>State</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Insulation</u>	<u>Studies</u>	<u>Land/Easements</u>	<u>Monitoring</u>	<u>Total</u>
TX	Ft. Worth	\$1,784,000	(easement)	\$3,285,038		\$5,069,038
TX	Laredo	\$4,000,000				\$4,000,000
TX	San Antonio	\$8,000,000				\$8,000,000
VT	Burlington		\$165,780	\$9,599,000		\$9,764,780
WA	King County	\$6,000,000				\$6,000,000
WA	Sea-Tac	\$2,000,000				\$2,000,000
WI	Milwaukee	\$15,913,963				\$15,913,963

Grand Total: All AIP Grants for Noise Projects: \$189,276,280

ANR EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

John J. Corbett, Esq.

Spiegel & McDiarmid
Washington, DC

Carl E. Burleson

Director, Office of Environment and Energy
Federal Aviation Administration

Michael Scott Gatzke, Esq.

Gatzke, Dillon & Ballance
Carlsbad, CA

Peter J. Kirsch, Esq.

Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
Denver

Vincent E. Mestre, P.E.

President, Mestre Greve Associates
Laguna Niguel, CA

Steven F. Pflaum, Esq.

McDermott, Will & Emery
Chicago

Mary L. Vigilante

President, Synergy Consultants
Seattle

Conferences

UC AVIATION NOISE, AQ SYMPOSIUM SET FOR MARCH 3-6 IN ORANGE COUNTY

“The Evolution of Green Aviation in the Sea Change Ahead,” is the theme of the 2013 University of California at Davis’ annual aviation noise and air quality symposium, which will be held at the Westin South Coast Plaza Hotel in Orange County, CA, on March 3-6, 2013.

UC Davis issued the following announcement regarding the symposium:

Since 1985 the University of California has organized this symposium addressing the most pressing environmental concerns of airports. Join us this year in Orange County California for a program packed with talks by top experts and colleagues on key topics impacting the aviation sector.

Our program begins on Sunday afternoon March 3rd with an optional pre-Symposium workshop focusing on how major demographic shifts will be affecting your workplace in the near future and what you can do to prepare for it. In the evening, a Welcome Reception will bring attendees together to meet and greet faces familiar and new.

Monday and Tuesday are full days of program with optional luncheon talks on special topics of interest. Monday evening - a reception and opportunity to network with colleagues. Continental Breakfasts and Afternoon Breaks provide attendees the opportunity to visit booths showcasing the latest technology and services to help airports achieve environmental compatibility. Student Posters will also be on display highlighting the efforts of the “next generation” of aviation environmental specialists. On Wednesday an optional full day hands-on workshop on the newly updated Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT2a) model (laptops provided).

Our location this year in the heart of Orange County provides many opportunities for pre- and post-Symposium fun. The renowned Westin hotel provides a soothing setting to absorb new information and regenerate and we are pleased to be able to offer attendees a highly discounted rate for this special Starwood hotel.

Do you have a business to promote in this arena? Consider becoming a Sponsor (see symposium website).

Students – the symposium provides a wonderful opportunity to see an aviation sector in depth and to meet and greet leaders in the field. Take advantage of our special discounted student registration and consider submitting a poster to the poster session to share your work with day-to-day practitioners.

The symposium website is <https://sites.google.com/site/evolution-greenaviation/>.

AIRPORT NOISE REPORT

Anne H. Kohut, Publisher

Published 44 times a year at 43978 Urbancrest Ct., Ashburn, Va. 20147; Phone: (703) 729-4867; FAX: (703) 729-4528.
e-mail: editor@airportnoisereport.com; Price \$850.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Aviation Emissions Report, provided that the base fee of US\$1.03 per page per copy is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. USA.

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 38

November 9, 2012

Sound Insulation

FAA ANSWERS QUESTIONS ABOUT NEW PGL ON SOUND INSULATION FUNDING ELIGIBILITY

On Nov. 5, the Federal Aviation Administration posted on its website the following answers to questions that airports and others have submitted seeking clarification of the agency's new Program Guidance Letter 12-09 on AIP Eligibility and Justification Requirements for Noise Insulation Projects.

Frequently Asked Questions

NOTE: These answers are intended to clarify and explain the Program Guidance Letter and do not supersede the specific language of the guidance.

1. Does this Program Guidance Letter represent a new policy on eligibility for sound insulation projects?

No. The FAA is clarifying our noise policy that has been in place since the mid-1980's and allows Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funds to be used to sound

(Continued on p. 161)

PBN

TASK GROUP TACKLING CATEX PROVISION WILL HOLD FIRST MEETING NEXT WEEK

The first meeting of a Task Group formed by the RTCA NextGen Advisory Committee (NAC) to determine if it is possible to comply with the so-called "Catex provision" of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 will be held next week.

The Catex provision in the FAA Modernization Act requires the Federal Aviation Administration Administrator to issue a categorical exclusion (Catex) from environmental review for NextGen Performance-based Navigation (PBN) procedures if they "would result in measurable reductions in fuel consumption, carbon dioxide emissions, and noise, on a per flight basis, as compared to aircraft operations that follow existing instrument flight rules procedures in the same airspace."

Airlines and Congress want more precise satellite-based navigation procedures put into effect quickly because of their fuel and emissions saving benefits. Airports welcome PBN procedures but want to participate in their development to ensure that new and greatly tightened flight paths do not undo their efforts to mitigate noise impact in communities near them.

(Continued on p. 162)

In This Issue...

Sound Insulation ... FAA posts answers to questions posed by airports, consultants, and others regarding compliance with the agency's new Program Guidance Letter on sound insulation program funding eligibility - p. 160

Environmental Review ... Members are selected to serve on a Task Group formed at FAA's request by the RTCA NextGen Advisory Committee to determine whether it is possible to comply with the so-called Catex provision for PBN procedures in the FAA Modernization Act. The Task Group will hold its first meeting next week - p. 160

Center of Excellence ... FAA modifies the name and research areas of a new COE it is forming to replace and renew PARTNER to emphasize alternative jet fuel development. An organizational meeting for the new COE will be held in Washington, DC, on Nov. 15 and 16 - p. 161

PGL, from p. 160

insulate homes, schools, and medical buildings. Noise insulation for these structures typically includes windows and doors.

2. What is the purpose of Program Guidance Letter 12-09 AIP Eligibility and Justification Requirements for Noise Insulation Projects?

The Program Guidance Letter (PGL) reiterates the two-step process to determine AIP eligibility for noise insulation projects.

3. What is the two-step process to determine AIP eligibility?

The first step is to determine if the home is within a noise impacted area with an annual average decibel (dB) noise level of 65 or higher, and the second step is to determine that the interior noise level is at or above 45 dB.

4. Are existing EIS mitigation noise insulation projects covered by this PGL?

Existing EIS noise insulation mitigation projects are subject to the conditions of the Record of Decision for that particular airport development project.

5. Won't this guidance be difficult to implement for the airport sponsors?

The PGL establishes a transition period through September 30, 2014 to align all noise programs with the two-step process.

6. What about commitments that an airport sponsor has already made to the public?

In fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, the FAA will allow a sponsor to complete the noise insulation of structures already contracted, as planned, if the noise projects meet all federal contract provisions, such as Buy American. Any noise project that is started during the three-year period must be completed prior to September 30, 2015.

7. What about noise insulation Projects that start or cannot be finished until after September 30, 2015?

Projects with ongoing construction after September 30, 2015, must fully meet the AIP requirements, including experiencing pre-insulation interior noise levels at or greater than 45dB.

8. Many homeowners leave their windows open during good weather. Why are you requiring that these homes be

tested with windows closed?

The interior noise level must be tested with windows closed to determine if the windows and doors of the residence provide appropriate noise level reduction. This test cannot be done with the windows open.

If a home does not have a continuous positive ventilation system, we cannot expect the homeowner to keep their windows closed all the time. Therefore, if the residence does not need to have its windows and doors replaced, the FAA may be able to fund a ventilation system. An airport sponsor may recommend an air conditioning system in lieu of ventilation only.

9. How is the FAA making sure that the airport sponsors implement the program guidance properly?

The FAA continues to actively work with the airport and consulting communities to address their comments and concerns about the interior noise levels as an eligibility criterion.

FAA**NAME OF NEW COE CHANGED TO STRESS ALTERNATIVE FUEL DEV.**

The Federal Aviation Administration modified the name and research areas of a new Center of Excellence on environment and energy it is in the process of forming to emphasize alternative jet fuel development.

In an Oct. 29 modification to its previous pre-solicitation notice, the name of the new COE was changed to the Center of Excellence for Alternative Jet Fuels and Environment (AFJ&E). Dropped is the name in the original notice: Center of Excellence for Environment and Energy.

The modification also specified in greater detail the areas of alternative fuel development the new COE will undertake. Five areas of alternative jet fuel research were listed:

- Feedstock development, processing, and conversion research;
- Regional supply and refining infrastructure;
- Environmental benefits analysis;
- Aircraft component deterioration and wear assessment; and
- Fuel performance testing.

In addition to research on alternative jet fuel development, the new COE also will study aircraft noise and aviation emissions impacts, aircraft technology assessment, environmentally and energy efficient gate-to-gate aircraft operations, and aviation modeling and analysis.

These areas of study were listed in the FAA's original announcement on the new COE, which was issued on Oct. 12 (5 AER 54).

The agency provided greater detail on its goals for the new COE and the process for participating in it in a Nov. 2

Draft Solicitation. It notes that the FAA intends to support the COE at a minimum \$4 million base level annual funding, pending congressional appropriations. Other U.S. federal government organizations also may co-sponsor research and other activities thereby augmenting the FAA's investment in the COE for AJF&E, the Draft Solicitation notes.

Noise Goals, Study Areas

In the area of aircraft noise, the Draft Solicitation notes that the goal of the COE for AJF&E is "to reduce the number of people exposed to significant noise around U.S. airports in absolute terms, notwithstanding aviation growth, and provide additional measures to protect public health and welfare."

The Scope of Work for the new COE includes the following areas of study on aircraft noise and its impacts:

- Characterize the noise from a variety of subsonic aircraft, including but not limited to helicopters, tilt-rotor aircraft, unmanned aerial systems, and advanced vehicle concepts, as well as supersonic aircraft such that the impact of aviation noise on the community, including the impact of en-route noise and low noise sonic boom, can be better understood and measured.
- Explore sound propagation from surface to cruise altitudes including weather effects, turbulence, and impacts due to varying operational procedures and vehicle types.
- Explore metrics, approaches to their computation and define threshold levels that can characterize the impact of aviation noise, including en-route noise and low noise sonic boom, on the community.
- Examine the relationship between community annoyance and aviation noise.
- Examine the relationship between human health and noise, including impacts of aviation noise on sleep, differing impacts of noise in different communities and settings (e.g., urban/rural), and other human impacts.
- Investigate the effects of aircraft noise on children's ability to learn.
- Conduct studies of low frequency noise impacts and potential mitigation approaches.
- Quantify the explicit and implicit economic costs of aviation noise on the social welfare and human health to aid cost-benefit analysis.
- Perform research to aid the development of policies on the impact of aviation noise.
- Investigate the interdependency between actions to reduce aircraft noise and the implication for fuel burn as well as emissions that affect surface air quality and climate change.
- Explore and recommend approaches for community noise outreach.
- Examine noise stringency options and their potential implications.
- Conduct studies of the effectiveness of sound insulation in residences and schools. Explore innovative passive and active noise attenuation approaches for dwellings (homes, schools, offices, etc.)
- Examine correlation in spatial trends in sounds insula-

tion investment, its impact on noise reduction and spread of threshold contour levels.

- Explore techniques, tools and instruments that measure the difference in aviation noise levels outside and inside residences or schools.
- Examine the occurrence and prevention of population encroachment into compatible land use areas.
- Perform research to aid improvements in the guidelines on compatible land use and noise sensitive area identification.
- Conduct studies to identify practices, tools and techniques for long-term compatible land use protection around airports.

An organizational meeting for the new COE will be held on Nov. 15-16 at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center at 801 Mr. Vernon Place, NW, Washington, DC.

A document containing all comments and questions about the COE submitted and answered will be made available to those attending the public meeting and to those requesting to be on the COE mailing list. The COE Program Office also will post this information on the COE website (www.faa.gov/go/coe).

Following the Public Meeting, additional written questions will be answered and the period of public comment will extend through Dec. 15. Six to eight weeks thereafter, the FAA COE Program Office will revise this Draft Solicitation and will issue a Final Solicitation. A closing date for proposal submission will be announced at that time.

Catex, from p. 160

The FAA told the NextGen Advisory Committee in September that it has not been able to identify a "technically sound approach" to measuring reductions in noise *on a per flight basis*, as required in the Catex provision, using DNL, the agency's noise metric for determining compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (24 ANR 128).

The FAA asked the NAC to form a Task Group, comprised of representatives of airlines, airports, and community stakeholders to determine if it can find a way to comply with the Catex provision and, if not, to recommend ways to streamline the environmental review process for PBN procedures.

The Task Group membership is almost complete, RTCA Secretary Andy Cebula told ANR. Some 19 members have already been selected and Cebula is still waiting for two or three additional names of Task Group members.

An interim Task Group report is due to be presented in February 2013 at the next NAC meeting and the Task Group is expected to submit its final report in May 2013.

The Task Group will meet using a combination of conference calls/WebEx and in-person meetings, Cebula said. The meetings are not open to the public. The Federal Aviation Committee Act covers the NAC activities, he explained. "What that means is the recommendations and actions of NAC consideration are open but the support/development ac-

ANR EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Peter J. Kirsch, Esq.

Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
Denver

Vincent E. Mestre, P.E.

President, Mestre Greve Associates
Laguna Niguel, CA

Steven F. Pflaum, Esq.

Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Chicago

Mary L. Vigilante

President, Synergy Consultants
Seattle

Gregory S. Walden, Esq.

Patton Boggs LLP
Washington, D.C.

tivities are not required to be open.”

Cebula expects the Task Group to hold “quite a few” meetings. “Not sure on the exact number of meetings because we have to get the group together and determine our work plan,” he told ANR, adding, “A hallmark of the RTCA process is thoroughly evaluating an issue including appropriate analytical data. This requires meetings to develop a consensus recommendation.”

Task Group Members

Following are the Task Group Members already selected:

- Dan Allen, FedEx
- Fred Bankert, The Mitre Corporation
- Andy Cebula, RTCA
- Perry Clausen, Southwest Airlines
- Mel Davis, National Air Traffic Controllers Association
- Dan Elwell, Aerospace Industries Association
- Margaret Jenny, RTCA
- Nate Kimball, Port Authority of New York/New Jersey
- Sandy Lancaster, Dallas-Ft. Worth International Airport
- Chad Leqve, Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission
- Robert Luhrs, Raytheon
- Dennis McGrann, National Organization to Insure a Sound-controlled Environment
- Dan McGregor, The Boeing Company
- Glenn Morse, United Airlines
- Katherine Preston, Airports Council International – North America
- T.J. Schultz, Airport Consultants Council
- Ken Shapero, GE
- Travis Vallin, Jviation, Inc.
- Nancy Young, Airlines For America

In Brief...

FAA Approves Van Nuys Noise Maps

On Oct. 22, the Federal Aviation Administration announced its approval of noise exposure maps for Van Nuys Airport.

For further information, contact Environmental Protection Specialist Victor Globa in FAA’s Los Angeles Airports District Office; tel: (310) 725-3637.

AIRPORT NOISE REPORT

Anne H. Kohut, Publisher

Published 44 times a year at 43978 Urbancrest Ct., Ashburn, Va. 20147; Phone: (703) 729-4867; FAX: (703) 729-4528.
e-mail: editor@airportnoisereport.com; Price \$850.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Aviation Emissions Report, provided that the base fee of US\$1.03 per page per copy is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. USA.

Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 39

November 16, 2012

LAX

PART 161 STUDY SEEKING TO RESTRICT EAST DEPARTURES AT NIGHT ISSUED FOR COMMENT

Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) released for public comment on Nov. 1 a Part 161 study proposing to restrict easterly departures of all aircraft at Los Angeles International Airport, with certain limited exemptions, between midnight and 6:30 a.m. when the airport is in over-ocean operations or when it is in westerly operation during these hours.

The restriction is being sought to reduce the nighttime noise burden for communities most affected by late night easterly departures that do not conform to a preferential runway use program that is currently instituted on a voluntary basis. LAWA seeks to make this preferential runway use program mandatory.

The proposed restriction would not be in effect when LAX is in easterly operations.

Since 1972, LAX has had a preferential runway use program that sends departing aircraft to the west, over the Pacific Ocean, to reduce noise impact. The airport does not institute easterly operations until winds are at 10 knots or greater from the east.

(Continued on p. 165)

Sound Insulation

ACI-NA, OTHERS DISAPPOINTED WITH FAA RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON ITS NEW PGL

The Airports Council International – North America and others expert in airport sound insulation programs expressed great disappointment with the superficial responses the Federal Aviation Administration recently posted on its website to the many questions of substance that airports and others had submitted to the agency seeking clarification of its new Program Guidance Letter 12-09 on airport sound insulation program (SIP) funding.

“We are very disappointed in the recently released sound insulation PGL FAQ sheet,” ACI-NA told ANR. “It does not address a number of airports’ concerns and questions, for example on testing protocol. The FAQ sheet also implies that the eligibility requirements for these sound insulation programs has always been clear but FAA has previously acknowledged that this is not the case. This implication is damaging to airports who have received FAA approval for their sound insulation programs and have implemented them in good faith for the benefit of their communities.”

Attorney Peter Kirsch of Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell, which represents many

(Continued on p. 167)

In This Issue...

Part 161 ... LAWA releases for public comment a Part 161 study proposing to restrict easterly departures of aircraft at LAX between midnight and 6 a.m. when the airport is in westerly, over-ocean operations. The restriction would affect a maximum of only 125 operations a year, which could make it difficult for FAA to reject what would be the first new noise restriction on Stage 3 aircraft since passage of ANCA in 1990 - p. 164

Sound Insulation ... ACI-NA, others very disappointed with superficial answers FAA has published to the many questions submitted on its new PGL - p. 164

Awards ... UK group honors Airbus A380 for noise reduction around airports - p. 166

Catex ... Three more members added to Task Group formed by NAC to determine if it is possible to comply with Catex provision in FAA Modernization Act for NextGen procedures - p. 166

LAX, from p. 164

However, occasionally, the airport experiences light easterly winds at night, generally below 8 knots, that prompt pilots departing to Asia or Australia in heavily loaded B747-400 aircraft to request an easterly departure to take advantage of a slight downhill runway slope in that direction and to take off into the wind. Such departures are climbing at full power over communities until they cross the coastline south of LAX.

In announcing its intention to conduct the Part 161 study seven years ago, LAWA explained that such departures “create a significant noise disturbance characterized by very high, long duration single event noise intrusions over heavily populated areas during noise sensitive hours waking up tens of thousands of people.”

Would Be 1st Stage 3 Restriction Since ANCA

If approved by FAA, the LAX Part 161 study would be the first restriction on Stage 3 aircraft to be approved since passage of the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990, which required FAA to promulgate its Part 161 Regulations on Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions.

Naples is the only other airport to have successfully imposed a noise restriction under FAA’s Part 161 rules. However, that restriction involved only Stage 2 aircraft and thus did not require FAA approval, which is needed for restrictions on Stage 3 aircraft.

The Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority gave up trying to impose a nighttime curfew on Stage 3 aircraft at Bob Hope Airport under FAA’s Part 161 regulations in 2009 after the FAA rejected its Part 161 application. FAA said the application failed to meet four of the six statutory conditions that must be met under Part 161. The agency also concluded that sound insulation would be a more cost-effective way to mitigate nighttime noise than the curfew on Stage 3 aircraft.

It will be interesting to see how FAA reacts to LAWA’s Part 161 application, which, unlike the full nighttime curfew sought for Bob Hope Airport, seeks only a runway use restriction that would affect relatively few aircraft.

Maximum of 125 Ops Would be Affected

A maximum of only 125 operations a year take off to the east from LAX in non-conformance with the nighttime preferential use program. The average number of such yearly easterly departures is about 65 over 30 nights per year.

Also, LAWA asserts that environmental justice is at stake with its proposed noise restriction because predominantly minority and low-income communities east of the airport would be the main beneficiaries of the nighttime noise relief the restriction would provide.

“LAWA is committed to improving the lives of residents and stakeholders who live around the airport to the fullest extent possible and that is why we are doing this [Part 161 study],” Robert Holden, Environmental Supervisor II for LAWA, told ANR.

He asserted that the noise restriction proposed for LAX meets all six statutory conditions stipulated in the Part 161 regulations. Those conditions are the following:

- 1. The proposed restriction is reasonable, nonarbitrary, and nondiscriminatory.
- 2. The proposed restriction does not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce.
- 3. The proposed restriction maintains safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace.
- 4. The proposed restriction does not conflict with any existing Federal statute or regulation.
- 5. The applicant has provided adequate opportunity for public comment on the proposed restriction.
- 6. The proposed restriction does not create an undue burden on the national aviation system.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

The cost/benefit analysis for the restriction required under Part 161 shows that costs exceed benefits in a monetized analysis, Holden said but added that costs overall would not be great.

LAWA interviewed airlines that will be affected by its proposed restriction on easterly departures and learned that most will have to off-load cargo and lighten their aircraft to comply with it, although some may cancel flights.

If cargo rates do not increase, all of the airlines affected by the restriction would lose a total of just under \$3.25 million over a five-year period if they had to reduce their loads by 10,000 pounds and would lose a total of about \$9.6 - \$9.9 million if they had to decrease their loads by 20,000 lb.

With a 3 percent increase in cargo rates, the airlines would lose a total of over \$3.5 million over a five-year period if required to decrease their loads by 10,000 lb. and a total of \$10.5 million if required to decrease their loads by 20,000 lb.

The benefit of making aircraft depart to the west would be a reduction in flying time and emissions. LAWA estimated that about 219,000 lb. of CO2 emissions savings would occur over a 20 years period and the airlines would save about \$500,000 in fuel costs.

The benefit of the restriction to the community would be over 8,000 fewer awakenings in areas east of LAX that are estimated to be 60 percent minority and low-income.

HMMH Inc. was the primary contractor for the Part 161 study. SH&E, the prime sub-contractor, prepared the cost/benefit study.

Qantas is the airline that would have had the most flights over the past three years affected by the proposed restriction, followed by Korean Airlines, China Airlines, Delta, Cathay Pacific, Asiana, All Nippon Air, Japan Airlines, and others. The vast majority of these flights go to the Pacific Rim.

Thus far, the Part 161 study has cost LAWA \$2.6 million. It will probably total around \$3 million when done.

LAWA held a public workshop on its proposed noise restriction on Nov. 13. Only six to eight people attended; half from the airlines, which Holden said were already well-informed about the Part 161 application.

Public Comment Period

The public review and comment period on the LAX Part 161 study began on Nov. 1 and ends Dec. 17.

The LAX Part 161 Study is a technical and legal document that will be submitted to the FAA in January 2013 requesting a waiver of the federal pre-emption and authorization to implement the proposed restriction.

Persons wishing to comment on the LAX Part 161 Study may do so in several ways:

- Via the Online Comment Form of the LAX Part 161 web page

<http://www.laxpart161.com/en/Comments.cfm>

- In writing to Scott Tatro, Los Angeles World Airports, Environmental Services Division, 1 World Way, P.O. Box 92216, Los Angeles, CA 90009-22216

- Via e-mail to laxpart161@lawa.org

Once the application is submitted to the FAA, the agency has 180 days to complete its review and approve or disapprove the application. During the review period, FAA will open a public docket and accept written comments for a 45-day period.

If the application is approved, LAWA would initiate the ordinance approval process, which requires an environmental analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act. Upon completion of the analysis, the proposed ordinance would be submitted for approval to the Board of Airport Commissioners and then transmitted to the Los Angeles City Council for approval and ordinance enactment.

The LAX Part 161 study began in 2005. Asked why it took so long to complete, Holden replied, “The delay was caused by problems with developing the baseline and 5-year fleet mix forecasts. The forecasts we had prior to the economic crash in 2008 [had to be updated] and the disruptions to the airline industry [factored in]. We also had to make sure our Part 161 forecasts were consistent with the LAX Specific Plan Amendment Study. The forecasts were completed earlier this year and it took some time to do the noise modeling, and to complete the study write-up.”

Awards

AIRBUS A380 RECEIVES TOP AWARD BY UK NOISE ABATEMENT GROUP

The UK Noise Abatement Society presented the Airbus A380 a top award at its annual award ceremony on Nov. 6 recognizing the aircraft’s reduced noise around airport communities.

By the end of the year, there will be 10 daily A380 flights to Heathrow, which has the strictest noise regulations of any airport worldwide and is the world-wide benchmark on which noise measurement for aircraft is based.

At a special event held at the House of Commons in London, the Society presented Airbus with the John Connell

Silent Approach Award for the A380 and its innovations in quiet technology.

The Society was established in 1959 by John Connell OBE who shepherded the Noise Abatement Act through Parliament in 1960, establishing noise as a statutory nuisance in the UK.

The award recognizes local authorities, industry, organizations and individuals judged to have been outstanding in their efforts to reduce the impact of noise nuisance or seeking to pioneer practical and innovative solutions to noise pollution and the enhancement and management of the soundscape.

“The NAS was immensely impressed with the reduced external noise emissions of the A380 compared to typical equivalent aircraft and with its quiet and peaceful interior acoustics,” said Lisa Lavia, Managing Director of the Noise Abatement Society. “This proves that with commitment and engineering excellence noise pollution need not be the inevitable by-product of progress. And that traditionally noisy operations and equipment can be made quieter for the benefit of all.”

Said John Roberts, Airbus in the UK A380 Chief Engineer, “We are immensely proud to have received this award which recognizes the tremendous work done by Airbus and our key stakeholders. The reduction in the environmental impacts of our aircraft is the result of constant investment and commitment over many years. Our industry is committed to greener aviation and in the last 50 years the aviation industry has cut noise by 75 percent.”

He added, “The A380 has been in service with airlines for over five years and is the quietest long-haul aircraft for the foreseeable future – generating only half the noise on departure of some other large long haul aircraft and up to four times less noise on landing whilst carrying 40 percent more passengers.”

In Brief...

Three More Added to Catex Group

Three more members have been added to a Task Group convened by the RTCA NextGen Advisory Committee (NAC) at the request of the Federal Aviation Administration to determine if it is possible to comply with the so-called “Catex provision” for NextGen procedures included in the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012.

The new members are Mary Ellen Eagan of Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc., Bill Sears of FAA, and Scott Tatro of Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA).

That brings the total number of Task Group members to 23 (24 ANR 160). The Task Group held its first meeting this week. Meetings are not open to the public.

ANR EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Peter J. Kirsch, Esq.

Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
Denver

Vincent E. Mestre, P.E.

President, Mestre Greve Associates
Laguna Niguel, CA

Steven F. Pflaum, Esq.

Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
Chicago

Mary L. Vigilante

President, Synergy Consultants
Seattle

Gregory S. Walden, Esq.

Patton Boggs LLP
Washington, D.C.

PGL, from p. 164

airports on noise issues, added, “FAA had an opportunity to put all concerns to rest that the PGL was drafted with little attention to how SIPs were operated. They chose to answer simplistic questions or those that didn’t go to the heart of airports’ concerns.”

He called FAA’s responses to questions posed on the PGL, “seriously disappointing.”

Another observer with expertise in airport sound insulation programs, agree. “I think folks are pretty disappointed that the FAA missed an opportunity to address a number of substantive technical questions. I think airports are trying to implement the new policy to the best of their ability but it’s challenging.”

Michael Hotaling, Vice President, C&S Engineers, Inc., told ANR, “Many were disappointed in the FAQs that were published. Several of the responses don’t really respond to the questions they are supposed to answer and it is unclear where the questions originated.

“While most acknowledge that if you have seen one program, then you have seen one program (i.e., each program is unique), there are consistent features across most of the programs. A meaningful FAQ document could have addressed many of the challenging issues that all airport sponsors are grappling with like the questions raised in the August 24, 2012, issue of *Airport Noise Report* (24 ANR 100).”

The questions Hotaling refers to were prepared by C&S, Kaplan Kirsch, and HMMH, Inc. They point out to FAA many, many areas where its new PGL needs greater clarification.

FAA has said that its FAQ on the PGL will be a living document that will be supplemented as it prepares answers to questions submitted on the PGL. FAA also is working on a guidance document on an acoustical testing protocol.

FAA Issues Revision to PGL

On Nov. 7, FAA issued a revision to the PGL to state that “AIP, PFC, and airport revenue” cannot be used to fund neighborhood equity packages that include more than 10 percent of the homes in the SIP or more than 20 residences.

Prior to the revision, the language said that the cost of neighborhood equity packages that included more than 10 percent or 20 homes “must be funded with other, non-federal, sources of funds.”

In its revision, FAA also deleted “AIP” from the title of the PGL explaining that, although the modification is to FAA Order 5100.38C (“Airport Improvement Program”), it also has corresponding implications for PFC funds and airport revenue.

PGL 12-09 is now entitled, “Eligibility and Justification Requirements for Noise Insulation Projects.”

AIRPORT NOISE REPORT

Anne H. Kohut, Publisher

Published 44 times a year at 43978 Urbancrest Ct., Ashburn, Va. 20147; Phone: (703) 729-4867; FAX: (703) 729-4528.
e-mail: editor@airportnoisereport.com; Price \$850.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Aviation Emissions Report, provided that the base fee of US\$1.03 per page per copy is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. USA.