

**Key West International Airport**  
**Ad-Hoc Committee on Airport Noise**  
**Agenda for Tuesday, February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2015**

Call to Order 2:00 pm Harvey Government Center

Roll Call

- A. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes
  - 1. For December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2014
- B. Discussion of Part 150 Study Update -
  - 1. Role of the FAA and the Part 150 Process
  - 2. Status of NCP ROA
  - 3. RFQ for NIP Consultant
  - 4. Implementation Plan
- C. Other Reports:
  - 1. Noise Hotline and Contact Log
  - 2. Airport Noise Report
    - i. Does the Ad-Hoc Committee want to continue receiving copies of the ANR in the Agenda Package?
- D. Other Discussion
- E. Next meeting: April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Meeting Schedule for 2015

February 3 <sup>rd</sup>	April 7 <sup>th</sup>	June 2 <sup>nd</sup>
August 4 <sup>th</sup>	October 6 <sup>th</sup>	December 1 <sup>st</sup>

***ADA ASSISTANCE: If you are a person with a disability who needs special accommodations in order to participate in this proceeding, please contact the County Administrator's Office, by phoning (305) 292-4441, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., no later than five (5) calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting; if you are hearing or voice impaired, call "711".***

**KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise  
December 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting called to order by Peter Horton at 2:00 PM.**

**ROLL CALL:**

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Commissioner Danny Kolhage  
Kay Miller  
Sonny Knowles  
Marlene Durazo  
Dr. Julie Ann Floyd  
Harvey Wolney  
Amy Kehoe  
Tina Mazzorana (via telephone)

**Staff and Guests in Attendance:**

Peter Horton, Monroe County Director of Airports #1  
Don DeGraw, Monroe County Director of Airports #2  
Deborah Lagos, DML & Associates  
John Mafera, McFarland Johnson  
Robert S. Gold, Old Town Homeowners (via telephone)

**A quorum was present.**

**Welcome New Member Amy Kehoe representing Aviation.**

Amy Kehoe was approved as an official member of the Ad-Hoc Committee by the Board of County Commissioners at their November meeting. She is the Station Manager for Delta Airlines and works for Delta Global Services. She has provided her Oath of Office, which will be transmitted to Monroe County. We welcome her to the committee.

**Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes for the October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Ad Hoc Committee Meetings**

Commissioner Kolhage asked if there were any comments or corrections to the October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2014 minutes. There were no comments or corrections. Kay Miller made a motion to approve the minutes and Amy Kehoe seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as presented.

## **KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise December 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes**

### **Discussion of Part 150 Study Update**

Deborah indicated that she did not really have a lot of new information regarding the status of the Part 150 Update.

Deborah reviewed the chart that shows the Part 150 Process, and indicated that we are at the final step in the process, waiting for FAA to issue their Record of Approval. It has been a long process, over three years to get to this point, but we are almost finished. She also reviewed the Role of the FAA in the Part 150 Process. The FAA requested that we include these two documents in the agenda package of every meeting during the time that the Part 150 Study is underway. The FAA's role at this point in the process is to review and approve/disapprove the Noise Compatibility Program and issue their Record of Approval. The FAA's Record of Approval will indicate whether they approve or disapprove each individual measure recommended by the airport.

We have been informed by the FAA that the document is finally at a point where the ADO has no more questions or comments that would require another revision of the document. Several revisions were required to incorporate all of FAA's comments and to get to the point where FAA was willing to accept the document for formal review and approval. The document has been sent to the Regional Office in Atlanta, as well as to Headquarters in Washington, D.C. The FAA issued a Federal Register Notice on September 15, 2014 indicating their receipt of the Noise Compatibility Program and announcing their formal review of the proposed program. The official 180-day review began on September 15, 2014, and will be completed by March 15, 2015. The FAA has indicated they expect to issue the Record of Approval in December 2014 or January 2015, and they expect to approve most, if not all, of the recommendations.

Deborah (along with Chris Bowker from Jacobs) met with the FAA in Orlando at the end of October to discuss how they would like us to proceed following their approval of the NCP. The FAA indicated that the next steps in the process are (1) to develop a NIP Implementation Plan and Proposed Testing Protocol, and (2) to conduct the Initial Testing Phase. FAA's guidance describes a process for characterizing the diversity of the residences in the Program Areas and developing a property classification protocol, selecting a representative sample of each type of similarly-constructed residences for testing, and performing pre-testing of the

## **KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise December 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes**

representative sample of residences to determine eligibility of each property classification. We believe this methodology will probably work OK for Key West by the Sea since the construction of all the condos is pretty consistent. However, for the single family houses this may present a challenge since their construction is generally more unique.

The timeline we anticipate is to submit a grant application to the FAA in March 2015 in order to obtain funding in August 2015. When we met with the FAA, we discussed the timeline for the NIP moving forward. At this time it looks like we will receive a grant in August 2015 that will fund development of the Implementation Plan, selection and testing of the homes in the Initial Testing Phase, and development of generic design packages for the various housing categories that are identified. For example, we would develop a generic design package for a concrete block home, a frame home, a 3-bedroom unit at KWBTs, a 1-bedroom unit at KWBTs, etc. That would complete the work for that grant. The second grant, which would be in August 2016, would fund the development of detailed design packages for each individual home that was included in the Initial Testing Phase. The third grant, which would be in August of 2017, would fund the construction of the homes in the Initial Testing Phase, as well as the post-construction acoustical testing of those homes. The post-construction testing results will be used to determine if the design packages need to be adjusted in order to achieve the desired/required results.

We are hoping to convince the FAA to include the design of homes in Phase 1 in the August 2017 grant as well. There is a chance they will not approve that, and then the funding for that task will slip to August 2018. Once we get to that point, the process should continue in a similar way to the previous NIP, where we did the Construction for Phase 1 and the Design for Phase 2 simultaneously, and then the following year we would do the Construction for Phase 2 and Design for Phase 3, and so on.

Kay Miller asked about the status of homes that were eligible in the previous NIP, but did not participate for one reason or another. Deborah explained FAA has tentatively agreed that homes that are still within the DNL 65 dB contour (or the FAA-approved Program Area) will remain eligible. Priority could be given to homes that were in foreclosure during the previous NIP, but homeowners who just refused participation should be placed at the end of the list in the last phase. Kay asked

## **KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise December 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes**

what, if anything, she should tell the residents on Linda Avenue. Deborah advised that at a minimum, we should wait until the FAA approves the NCP, and maybe wait until the Initial Testing Phase is completed, before raising expectations.

Julie Ann Floyd expressed concern, as she had at the previous meeting, regarding the sampling and testing process and its potential to result in challenges from homeowners who were not included in the sampled group. Deborah indicated that we will need to work very closely with the FAA during development of the Implementation Plan and Testing Protocol, because the FAA has not had much experience with this new approach, and therefore there is going to be a learning curve on everyone's part. Julie Ann Floyd expressed concern that the Ad-Hoc Committee has worked very hard, for a very long time, to get this NIP approved, and she believes we need to do everything possible to ensure the fair and equitable treatment of all the homes. She stated that even though her home is not included, she wants to make sure those that are included are given the opportunity to participate.

Peter Horton expressed that this will be a long and expensive process to complete the next 325 dwelling units, probably somewhere around \$20 million. The good news is that the money should be available because it comes from a fund that is generated by ticket taxes, and there is a special set-aside just for dealing with noise issues. We'll be looking for \$4 to \$5 million per year. FAA will only be paying 90% of the cost, and the other 10% will come from the airport's Passenger Facility Charges. It would be helpful to also seek money from the FDOT (Florida Department of Transportation), because otherwise, the airport will have to come up with \$400 - \$500,000 per year from PFCs. FDOT may pay half (i.e., 5%), such that the airport only has to contribute \$200 - \$250,000 per year from PFCs. FDOT never participated in the previous NIP, but at that time FAA was paying 95%. The latest FAA Reauthorization reduced FAA's participation to 90%. Peter cautioned that the next FAA Reauthorization will be occurring soon, and it is unknown what the level of participation will be.

Danny Kolhage asked about the timeline for implementation of the other recommended measures, once FAA approval is obtained. Deborah explained that the other measures that required FAA funding were included in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) over the course of several years. For example, in FY'16 we requested money to purchase the aviation easement for the vacant parcel, the pilot education

## **KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise December 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes**

information, and installation of the airfield signs. In FY'18 we requested money to purchase the noise and flight track monitoring system.

### **Other Reports**

#### **Noise Hotline and Contact Log**

There were no calls to report. Peter was glad to go out on that note. Obviously, we've come a long way.

#### **Airport Noise Report**

Amy Kehoe mentioned the article in the Airport Noise Report (Volume 26, Number 39) that describes legislation proposed in Illinois and Kentucky that would provide property tax breaks to homeowners living in high noise areas around airports. In Illinois, the proposed legislation would double the homestead exemption for property within the DNL 65+ dB contour of Chicago O'Hare International Airport. In Kentucky, the proposed legislation would provide a refundable tax credit for 100 percent of the costs of sound insulation paid for by homeowners in the DNL 60+ dB contour of airports in the state. Audubon Park, Kentucky, passed an ordinance prohibiting residents from signing aviation easements, which were required for participation in the Louisville insulation program, because they didn't want residents to have to give up an aviation easement as a condition of receiving sound insulation. The City of Audubon Park then fined Louisville Airport Authority \$13,000 for 13 alleged violations of the ordinance. The Airport Authority then sued the City. Amy felt that other states and airports may seek to do something similar.

Danny Kolhage mentioned that in Florida the homestead exemption is in the State constitution, and therefore, would be more difficult to change.

It will be interesting to see how this plays out.

### **Any Other Discussion**

Kay Miller moved to approve the meeting dates for 2015. Marlene Durazo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting dates for 2015 were approved as follows:

**KWIA Ad-Hoc Committee on Noise  
December 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes**

February 3<sup>rd</sup>  
August 4<sup>th</sup>

April 7<sup>th</sup>  
October 6<sup>th</sup>

June 2<sup>nd</sup>  
December 1<sup>st</sup>

Next meeting February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2015.

Amy Kehoe moved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

## 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**



# Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 26, Number 40, 41

November 26, 2014

## *AIP Noise Grants*

### **NOISE GRANTS TOTALING \$121.5 MILLION AWARDED TO 22 AIRPORTS IN FISCAL 2014**

In fiscal 2014, some 22 airports received a total of \$121.5 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 \$4.09 million less than the \$125.6 million in AIP noise mitigation grants awarded to 25 airports in fiscal 2013. The fiscal 2014 funding level for noise grants is \$67.7 million less than the \$189 million awarded to 29 airports in fiscal 2012, which had marked 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 million, 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 more recent federal belt-tightening.

The \$121.5 million in noise grants awarded in fiscal 2014 includes:

- \$105.7 million to 17 airports for sound insulation of homes;
- \$4.8 million to one airports for insulation of public buildings (schools);
- \$10.09 million to three airports for land acquisition; and
- \$912,942 to three airports for noise compatibility planning studies.

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. ANR will report PFC noise data later in December.

Once again, Los Angeles International Airport received the most AIP funding for noise mitigation in fiscal 2014: \$21.5 million for residential sound insulation; one million more than it received in fiscal 2013.

The next highest AIP noise grant awards in fiscal 2014 went to Atlanta Hartsfield International (\$13 million for sound insulation); Chicago O'Hare International (\$11.6 million for sound insulation); San Diego International (\$11.3 million for sound insulation); Alexandria (LA) International (\$7 million for sound insulation); Louisville International (\$6.7 million for sound insulation and land acquisition); Chicago Midway International (\$6.6 million for sound insulation); and San Antonio International (\$6.4 million for sound insulation).

No AIP grants were awarded in fiscal 2014 for noise monitoring systems.

## *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 2014.

Table 1. Grants for residential sound insulation - p. 160

Table 2. Grants for insulation of public bldgs. - p. 161

Table 3. Grants for land acquisition - p. 161

Table 4. Grants for noise compatibility planning studies - p. 162

Table 5. Grants by airport for all categories - p. 163

***Part 161 ...*** FAA rejects LAWA's proposal to restrict Stage 3 aircraft operations at LAX; finds it failed to meet three of six statutory requirements - p. 165

***NextGen ...*** Washington, DC, metroplex is first in the nation to have three satellite-based highways in the sky, running side-by-side-by-side, each dedicated to one of the three major airports in the region - p. 166

**Table 1: AIP Grants for Residential Sound Insulation in Fiscal 2014 (by contour)**

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Contour</u>
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Int'l	L.A. County	\$4,500,000	65-69 DNL
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Int'l	City of El Segundo	\$7,000,000	65-69 DNL
CA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Int'l	City of Inglewood	\$10,000,000	65-69 DNL
CA	San Diego	San Diego Int'l	Airport Authority	\$11,351,753	65-69 DNL
CT	New Haven	Tweed-New Haven	Airport Authority	\$764,624	65-69 DNL
GA	Atlanta	Hartsfield-Jackson Int'l	City of Atlanta	\$13,000,000	65-69 DNL
HI	Hilo	Hilo Int'l	State of Hawaii	\$1,765,530	65-69 DNL
IL	Chicago	Chicago Midway Int'l	City of Chicago	\$688,000	65-69 DNL
IL	Chicago	Chicago O'Hare Int'l	City of Chicago	\$6,820,000	65-69 DNL
KY	Louisville	Louisville Int'l	Airport Authority	\$4,000,000	65-69 DNL
MS	Gulfport	Gulfport-Biloxi Int'l	Airport Authority	\$2,925,000	65-69 DNL
MT	Great Falls	Great Falls Int'l	Airport Authority	\$2,000,000	65-69 DNL
NY	Buffalo	Buffalo Niagara Int'l	Transp. Authority	\$2,945,656	65-69 DNL
RI	Providence	T.F. Green	R.I. Airport Corp.	\$3,893,149	65-69 DNL
TX	Laredo	Laredo Int'l	City of Laredo	\$4,000,000	65-69 DNL
TX	San Antonio	San Antonio Int'l	City of San Antonio	\$6,400,000	65-69 DNL
WI	Milwaukee	Gen. Mitchell Int'l	Milwaukee County	\$4,800,000	65-69 DNL
IL	Chicago	Chicago Midway	City of Chicago	\$8,712,000	70-74 DNL
LA	Alexandria	Alexandria Int'l	Econ. Dev. District	\$7,000,000	70-74 DNL
MA	Westfield	Westfield Barnes Reg.	City of Westfield	\$2,500,000	70-74 DNL
NY	Buffalo	Buffalo Niagara Int'l	Transp. Authority	\$36,817	70-74 DNL
IL	Chicago	Chicago Midway	City of Chicago	\$600,000	75 DNL

**Table 1 (Cont.): AIP Grants for Residential Sound Insulation in Fiscal 2014 (by Contour)*****Grand Total: Residential Sound Insulation (all contours): \$105,702,529*****Table 2: AIP Grants for Sound Insulation of Public Buildings (Schools) in Fiscal 2014**

<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	City of Chicago	\$4,800,000	not specified

***Grand Total: Sound Insulation of Public Buildings: \$4,800,000*****Table 3: AIP Grants for Land Acquisition in Fiscal 2014 (by contour)**

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Contour</u>
AL	Birmingham	Birmingham Int'l	Airport Authority	\$1,904,891	65-69 DNL
CT	Oxford	Waterbury-Oxford	Airport Authority	\$5,490,000	65-69 DNL
KY	Louisville	Louisville Int'l	Airport Authority	\$2,700,000	65-69 DNL

***Grand Total: Land Acquisition: \$10,094,891***

**Table 4: AIP Grants for Noise Compatibility Planning Studies in Fiscal 2014**

<u>State</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Amount</u>
CA	Fresno	Fresno Yosemite	City of Fresno	\$360,000
ID	Boise	Boise Air Terminal	City of Boise	\$438,300
PA	Harrisburg	Harrisburg Int'l	Airport Authority	\$114,642

***Grand Total: Noise Compatibility Planning Studies: \$912,942***

**Table 5: AIP Grants by Airport for All Noise Mitigation Projects in Fiscal 2014**

<u>State</u>	<u>Airport</u>	<u>Insulation</u>	<u>Studies</u>	<u>Land/Other</u>	<u>Monitoring</u>	<u>Total</u>
AL	Birmingham			\$1,904,891		\$1,904,891
CA	Fresno		\$360,000			\$360,000
CA	LAX	\$21,500,000				\$21,500,000
CA	San Diego	\$11,351,753				\$11,351,753
CT	Tweed	\$764,624				\$764,624
CT	Oxford			\$5,490,000		\$5,490,000
GA	Hartsfield	\$13,000,000				\$13,000,000
HI	Hilo	\$1,765,530				\$1,765,530
ID	Boise		\$438,300			\$438,300
IL	Midway	\$6,688,000				\$6,688,000
IL	O'Hare	\$11,620,000				\$11,620,000
KY	Louisville	\$4,000,000		\$2,700,000		\$6,700,000
LA	Alexandria	\$7,000,000				\$7,000,000
MA	Westfield	\$2,500,000				\$2,500,000
MS	Gulfport	\$2,925,000				\$2,925,000
MT	Great Falls	\$2,000,000				\$2,000,000
NY	Buffalo	\$2,982,473				\$2,982,473
PA	Harrisburg		\$114,642			\$114,642
RI	T.F. Green	\$3,893,149				\$3,893,149
TX	Laredo	\$4,000,000				\$4,000,000
TX	San Antonio	\$6,400,000				\$6,400,000
WI	Milwaukee	\$4,800,000				\$4,800,000

**Table 5 (Cont.): AIP Grants by Airport for All Noise Mitigation Projects in Fiscal 2014**

***Grand Total: All Noise Mitigation Projects: \$121,510,362***

---

**Part 161****FAA REJECTS LAWA'S PROPOSAL TO IMPOSE NOISE RESTRICTION**

The Federal Aviation Administration announced Nov. 25 that it has rejected Los Angeles World Airport's application to impose a noise restriction on Stage 3 aircraft at Los Angeles International Airport under the agency's Part 161 regulations on Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions.

"As I reported to our Round Table at the Nov. 12 meeting, the bar set under Part 161 was extremely high, and we were aware of this from the outset," Scott Tatro of LAWA's Environmental and Land Use Planning Division told ANR.

"LAWA spent \$3.4 million on the application and did our best to convince FAA that the restrictions on such a small number of operations annually would not negatively impact LAX operators, and would benefit the communities east and south of LAX. The FAA ultimately disagreed with us, and LAWA accepts the FAA's decision. We have no plans for any further action at this time."

LAWA proposal would have impacted only 125 aircraft operations per year. It would have restricted easterly departures of all aircraft, 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 was 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 sought to make this preferential runway use program mandatory.

LAWA's proposed restriction would have been the first imposed on Stage 3 aircraft since passage of the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990, which required FAA to promulgate its Part 161 Regulations.

Almost a quarter of a century after ANCA's passage, Naples is still the only airport to have successfully imposed a noise restriction under FAA's Part 161 rules. Naples' restriction involved only Stage 2 aircraft and thus did not require FAA approval, which is needed for restrictions on Stage 3 aircraft.

**Three Statutory Conditions Not Met**

FAA rejected LAWA's Part 161 application because the agency concluded that the proposed restriction would not satisfy three of the six statutory conditions that must be met under Part 161 in order to impose a restriction on Stage 3 aircraft:

- Condition 1: The restriction is reasonable, non-arbitrary, and non-discriminatory;
- Condition 2: The restriction does not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce; and
- Condition 4: The proposed restriction does not conflict

with any existing Federal statute or regulation.

Regarding Condition 1, FAA found that LAWA has not provided substantial evidence that the proposed action could relieve LAX's noise problem.

LAWA calculated that the proposed restriction would remove only 116 residents from the CNEL 65 dB noise contour by 2018. "This would amount to only 0.2% of the 64,343 people projected to reside within the CNEL 65 dB contour in that year," FAA said, concluding that LAWA's proposed restriction "would have a negligible impact on nighttime noise at LAX."

FAA said that LAWA did not satisfy Condition 2 because its cost-benefit analysis does not demonstrate that the estimated potential benefits of the restriction have a reasonable chance to exceed the estimated potential cost of the adverse effects on interstate and foreign commerce.

Specifically, the FAA found that LAWA's analysis:

- Understates the loss of operating profits by approximately \$1.9 million per year due to compensation paid to off-loaded passenger;
- Does not estimate the cost to operators for delayed crew;
- Does not address adequately the cost of auxiliary power unit (APU) operation or provision of electrical power by the airport during offloading delay;
- Does not adequately quantify cargo handling costs;
- Overstates the qualitative noise benefits of the proposed restriction, when the quantitative evidence shows that population exposed to significant noise and sleep awakenings will each be reduced by just 0.2%;
- Does not address the effect on benefits should operators choose to conduct a non-conforming departure to the east and pay the fine; and
- Asserts but does not substantiate an unquantified savings in controller workload costs.

Regarding Condition 4, FAA concluded that LAWA failed to demonstrate that its proposed restriction does not present a conflict with existing federal statutes and regulations that govern the control of aircraft operations.

FAA said LAWA's application "fails to take into account whether changing the current voluntary regime to a mandatory one might affect the response and authority of the pilot to judge safe operations in a way that could introduce an unnecessary risk."

"Unlike wind, weather, and aircraft limitations, this restriction on easterly departures and the prospect of an injunction or a financial penalty introduce factors that could influence operators and pilots to reduce safety margins in making operational decisions.

"An airport sponsor may not interfere with the safety-based actions of the aircraft operator. The FAA is concerned that by imposing a restriction with penalties on aircraft operator decisions to take off with a headwind rather than a tailwind, LAWA's proposed restriction could establish a conflict with regulations in 14 CFR 91.3 (a) Responsibility and Authority of the Pilot in Command, which states that the Pilot in Command (PIC) of an aircraft is the final authority as to the

## 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.

operation of that aircraft. Conflicts with the Federal structure of PIC authority can introduce an increase in risk level which can have serious safety implications. LAVA also fails to demonstrate that the proposed restriction does not present a conflict with Grant Assurance 22 which requires airports to be operated on reasonable terms.”

FAA’s 54-page explanation of why it rejected LAVA’s Part 161 application can be downloaded at <http://www.lawa.org/uploadedFiles/LAX/noise/Part161/11-7-14%20FAA%20Decision%20on%20LAX%20Part%20161.pdf>

### *NextGen*

## WASHINGTON, DC, METROPLEX IS FIRST IN U.S. TO HAVE THREE NEXTGEN FLIGHT PATHS

Just in time for the busy holiday travel season, the Federal Aviation Administration announced Nov. 24 that the Washington, D.C., Metroplex is the first in the nation to have three, state-of-the-art, satellite-based highways in the sky running side by side by side, each dedicated to one of the three major airports in the region.

“The national capital region is reaping the benefits of NextGen and this announcement further highlights how the federal government is making a difference,” said Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx. “These new and improved highways in the sky mean increased safety, more on time arrivals and departures, reduced fuel consumption, and reduced pollution-causing emissions.”

Estimates predict airlines will burn at least 2.5 million fewer gallons of fuel each year in the skies above Washington, while emitting at least 25,000 fewer metric tons of carbon dioxide.

The three parallel Optimized Profile Descents (OPD) enable aircraft serving the capital area’s three major airports from the northwest to descend from cruising altitude to the runway in a smooth, continuous arc instead of the traditional staircase descent. This saves time for passengers, while reducing fuel and carbon dioxide emissions. In addition, voice communications between air traffic controllers and pilots are greatly reduced since clearances required during each step of a staircase descent are eliminated.

The three airports benefitting from the NextGen arrivals are Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport, Dulles International Airport, and Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

The OPD into Baltimore/Washington opened this month, joining the existing OPDs into Dulles and National. Complementary, satellite-based departure paths are also being rolled out at the three airports, allowing aircraft to more quickly join high altitude traffic streams.

By improving traffic flow to the three major airports, the D.C. Metroplex initiative, a collaborative effort involving American, Southwest, United, and labor unions, also enhances the safety and efficiency of flights serving Richmond International Airport, Andrews Joint Base Airport, and at least nine smaller airports, FAA said.

## 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](mailto: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



5A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 24, Number 42, 43

December 5, 2014

## PFCs

### \$3.35 BILLION OF TOTAL PFC REVENUE DEVOTED TO NOISE MITIGATION PROJECTS

At the end of fiscal year 2014, some \$3.35 billion (4 percent) of the \$89.5 billion in Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) that the Federal Aviation Administration has approved for collection and use since 1992 has been 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 Nov. 1, 2014, was \$3.35 billion – an increase of \$57.2 million over the end of fiscal 2013 noise project total (25 ANR 161).

The FAA subdivides noise mitigation projects into six categories. Following is the total amount airports plan to collect for each category, as of Nov. 1, 2014, as well as the percentage that category represents of the total PFCs for noise mitigation being collected:

- \$1.41 billion (42.1 percent) for soundproofing projects;
- \$1.38 billion (41.4 percent) for multi-phase projects;
- \$506.2 million (15.1 percent) to purchase land;
- \$18.7 million (0.6 percent) for noise monitoring systems;
- \$15.2 million (0.5 percent) for planning; and
- \$15.5 million (0.5 percent) for miscellaneous projects.

#### 108 Airports Using PFCs for Noise Mitigation

A total of 108 airports were using PFCs for noise mitigation projects at the end of fiscal 2014. Los Angeles International, Louisville International, and T.F. Green Airport were the only airports listed as having imposed new PFC's for noise mitigation projects in fiscal 2014.

The top 20 airports targeting PFC revenue for noise mitigation projects as of Nov. 1, 2014, are: Los Angeles International (\$866.9 million); Chicago O'Hare International (\$547.6 million); Chicago Midway (\$260.9 million); Phoenix Sky Harbor International (\$230.5 million); Minneapolis-St. Paul International (\$188.7 million); San Jose International (\$117.8 million); Seattle-Tacoma International (\$124.2 million); Bob Hope Airport (\$95.8 million); Ontario International (\$84.7 million); Cleveland Hopkins International (\$73.9 million); Louisville International (\$61.7 million); Charlotte-Douglas International (\$59.2 million); Lambert-St. Louis International (\$54.8 million); Milwaukee General Mitchell International (\$53.8 million); Las Vegas International (\$51.7 million); Detroit Metropolitan International (\$49.4 million); San Diego International (\$46.3 million); Indianapolis International (\$43.1 million); Ft. Lauderdale International (\$39.1 million); and Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International (\$36.6 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 were reported in last week's issue of ANR (Vol. 26, No. 40, 41).

### *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, since 1992, some 108 airports have imposed PFCs to address airport noise mitigation.

Approximately \$3.35 billion in PFCs has been imposed by airports for noise mitigation projects as of the end of fiscal year 2014, up \$57.2 million compared to the end of fiscal 2013.

Los Angeles International remains far ahead of other airports in using PFCs for noise mitigation projects (\$866.9 million), followed by Chicago O'Hare International (\$547.6 million).

Table 1 shows a breakdown of all airport projects supported by PFCs - p. 168.

Table 2 shows PFCs by project type being collected for noise mitigation - p. 169.

Table 3 shows PFCs for noise mitigation projects being collected by individual airports - p. 177.

**APPROVED PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES BY CATEGORIES**  
(as of Nov. 1, 2014)

<b><u>CATEGORY</u></b>	<b><u>PROJECT TYPE</u></b>	<b><u>AMOUNT</u></b>	<b><u>PERCENT</u></b>
<b><u>AIRSIDE</u></b> (19% w/o DIA)(18% w DIA)			
	RUNWAYS	\$ 7,376,805,211	46.1
	TAXIWAYS	\$ 2,676,462,314	16.7
	APRONS	\$ 1,596,324,554	10.0
	LAND	\$ 552,662,671	3.5
	EQUIPMENT	\$ 1,491,367,106	9.3
	PLANNING	\$ 643,861,893	4.0
	LIGHTING	\$ 437,818,021	2.6
	OTHER	\$ 1,213,547,652	7.6
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$15,988,849,422</b>	<b>100</b>
<b><u>LANDSIDE</u></b> (36% w/o DIA)(34% w DIA)			
	TERMINAL	\$26,797,552,135	87.3
	LAND	\$ 1,311,689,848	4.3
	SECURITY	\$ 2,591,062,168	8.4
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$30,700,304,151</b>	<b>100</b>
<b><u>NOISE</u></b> (4% w/o DIA)(4% w DIA)			
	LAND	\$ 506,230,100	15.1
	MULTI-PHASE	\$ 1,387,705,077	41.4
	SOUNDPROOFING	\$ 1,411,977,735	42.1
	MONITORING	\$ 18,767,113	0.6
	PLANNING	\$ 15,246,516	0.5
	OTHER	\$ 15,514,387	0.5
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 3,355,440,928</b>	<b>100</b>
<b><u>ACCESS</u></b> (6% w/o DIA)(6% w DIA)			
	ROADS	\$ 2,221,295,757	37.9
	RAIL	\$ 3,559,595,628	60.8
	LAND	\$ 11,701,823	0.2
	PLANNING	\$ 62,911,585	1.1
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 5,855,504,793</b>	<b>100</b>
<b><u>INTEREST</u></b> (35%)(34% w/DIA)		<b>\$30,495,607,155</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$86,395,706,449</b>	
<b>DENVER (4%)</b>		<b>\$ 3,137,099,200</b>	
<b>PFC TOTAL</b>		<b>\$89,532,805,649</b>	

SOURCE: FAA (PFC BRANCH)

**PFC FUNDED NOISE PROJECTS (BY WORK CODE)**  
(as of Oct. 31, 2014)

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Birmingham	AL	Land	\$3,173,639	\$4.50	7/2/08	7/2/08	\$506,230,100
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	
Sanford	FL	Land	\$199,189	\$4.00	7/12/12	7/12/12	
Sanford	FL	Land	\$73,775	\$4.00	7/12/12	7/12/12	
Sanford	FL	Land	\$65,789	\$4.00	7/12/12	7/12/12	
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	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
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	
Louisville	KY	Land	\$58,770,761	\$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	\$33,136,470	\$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	
Burlington	VT	Land	\$836,481	\$4.50	1/31/12	1/31/12	
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	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
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	
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	\$18,767,113
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	\$125,000	\$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	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
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	
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$75,000,000	\$4.50	12/6/04	12/6/04	\$1,387,705,077
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$25,900,000	\$4.50	9/27/07	9/27/07	
Phoenix	AZ	Multi-phase	\$63,322,279	\$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	\$3,303,000	\$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	
Providence	RI	Multi-phase	\$8,942,198	\$4.50	6/19/14	6/19/14	
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	\$15,246,516
Bullhead City	AZ	Planning	\$8,250	\$2.00	11/1/13	11/1/13	
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	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
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	
Gainesville	FL	Planning	\$8,978	\$4.50	11/8/13	11/8/13	
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	
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	\$1,088,000	\$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	
Latrobe	PA	Planning	\$16,173	\$4.50	4/17/13	4/17/13	
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	
Burlington	VT	Planning	\$5,463	\$4.50	1/31/12	1/31/12	
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	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
Milwaukee	WI	Planning	\$35,600	\$3.00	9/8/11	9/8/11	
Mobile	AL	Soundproofing	\$77,557	\$3.00	4/18/13	4/18/13	\$1,411,977,735
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	
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	
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$6,288,486	\$3.00	5/2/11		
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$44,378,659	\$3.00	10/24/14	10/24/14	
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	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
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	
Atlanta	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	
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	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$1,242,000	\$4.50	11/2/12	11/2/12	
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	
Louisville	KY	Soundproofing	\$2,650,000	\$4.50	3/14/14	3/14/14	
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	\$7,799,500	\$4.50	1/24/03	1/24/03	
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	

CITY	STATE	PROJECT	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	PROJ. TOTAL
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	\$6,953,470	\$3.00	12/31/09	12/31/09	
						Total:	\$3,355,440,928

**PFC FUNDED NOISE PROJECTS (BY LOCATION)**  
(as of Oct. 31, 2014)

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	\$1,449,562
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	
Mobile	AL	Soundproofing	\$77,557	\$3.00	4/18/13	4/18/13	
Juneau	AK	Land	\$21,931	\$4.50	5/30/01	5/30/01	\$21,931
Bullhead City	AZ	Planning	\$8,250	\$2.00	11/1/13	11/1/13	\$8,250
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	\$230,594,435
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	\$63,322,279	\$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

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
Los Angeles	CA	Monitoring	\$3,450,000	\$3.00	9/23/05	9/23/05	\$866,917,717
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	
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		
Los Angeles	CA	Soundproofing	\$44,378,659	\$3.00	10/24/14	10/24/14	
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	\$319,282	\$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 Diego	CA	Soundproofing	\$17,469,000	\$4.50	7/3/12	7/3/12	
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	\$153,847
Gainesville	FL	Planning	\$8,978	\$4.50	11/8/13	11/8/13	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
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	
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	Land	\$199,189	\$4.00	7/12/12	7/12/12	\$361,801
Sanford	FL	Land	\$73,775	\$4.00	7/12/12	7/12/12	
Sanford	FL	Land	\$65,789	\$4.00	7/12/12	7/12/12	
Sanford	FL	Planning	\$23,048	\$1.00	12/27/00	12/27/00	
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	
Des Moines	IA	Multi-phase	\$945,178	\$4.50	8/16/05	8/16/05	\$945,178
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	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
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	\$547,668,186
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	
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	
Chicago O'Hare	IL	Soundproofing	\$1,242,000	\$4.50	11/2/12	11/2/12	
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	
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	\$36,658,215
Covington	KY	Monitoring	\$125,000	\$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	\$3,303,000	\$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	\$1,088,000	\$3.00	11/8/01	11/8/01	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
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	\$58,770,761	\$3.00	1/29/97	1/29/97	\$61,795,761
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	
Louisville	KY	Soundproofing	\$2,650,000	\$4.50	3/14/14	3/14/14	
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
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	\$188,740,099
Minneapolis	MN	Land	\$33,136,470	\$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	\$7,799,500	\$4.50	1/24/03	1/24/03	
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	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
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	
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	
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	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
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	
Latrobe	PA	Planning	\$16,173	\$4.50	4/17/13	4/17/13	\$16,173
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	\$31,982,811
Providence	RI	Land	\$12,658,400	\$4.50	11/13/09	11/13/09	
Providence	RI	Multi-phase	\$8,942,198	\$4.50	6/19/14	6/19/14	
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
Brownsville	TX	Planning	\$108,702	\$4.50	2/7/03	2/7/03	
Dallas/Ft. Worth	TX	Monitoring	\$1,266,151	\$3.00	11/7/96	11/7/96	\$1,266,151
Dallas Love	TX	Multi-phase	\$1,913,478	\$3.00	12/24/09	12/24/09	\$1,913,478
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	
Burlington	VT	Land	\$836,481	\$4.50	1/31/12	1/31/12	\$841,944
Burlington	VT	Planning	\$5,463	\$4.50	1/31/12	1/31/12	
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	\$53,817,630
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	

CITY	STATE	WORK CODE	AMOUNT	PFC LEVEL	IMPOSE	USE	TOTAL
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	\$6,953,470	\$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:	\$3,355,440,928

# Airport Noise Report



A weekly update on litigation, regulations, and technological developments

Volume 26, Number 44

December 12, 2014

## *Boston Logan Int'l*

### **FAA BEGINS TESTING FIRST COMPONENT OF POTENTIAL BOS RUNWAY USE PROGRAM**

On Nov. 12, the Federal Aviation Administration began testing the first component of a potential runway use program at Boston Logan International Airport.

It is designed to address a frequent complaint by residents in nearby communities that they wake up to the same aircraft noise they were hearing when they went to bed. Under the test, the runway configuration will be changed from late night to early morning.

The test is part of the third phase of the Boston Logan Airport Noise Study (BLANS), which will evaluate whether changes in runway use at Logan Airport can further reduce aircraft noise in the communities surrounding the airport.

The Logan Airport Community Advisory Committee (CAC), with the technical assistance of an independent consultant, designed the first test scenario and also will design any remaining test scenarios decided upon.

The results will be used to develop a runway use program at Boston Logan International. The Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport) supports this noise abate-

*(Continued on p. 186)*

## *Appropriations*

### **CONGRESS ORDERS FAA PROGRESS REPORT ON MITIGATING PHOENIX PBN NOISE PROBLEM**

A rider to the fiscal 2015 omnibus funding bill passed by the House late last night requires the Federal Aviation Administration to submit a report to Congress within 90 days on FAA's progress addressing the noise problem caused by new NextGen departure paths out of Phoenix Sky Harbor International.

The new departure procedures were put into effect in September and direct aircraft over historic neighborhoods in Phoenix. FAA told city officials in a recent letter that some aircraft were not flying the new Performance-based Navigation Procedures correctly and the agency has taken steps to address that.

The rider states: "FAA has been helpful in evaluating measures to address local concerns that have been raised as a result of new departure routes out of Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport. The FAA is directed to continue to work expeditiously to identify appropriate mitigation measures and to enforce adherence to flight procedures, unless specific flight modifications are necessary for safety purposes, in order to avoid impacts on nearby residential neighborhoods. The FAA is expected to provide a progress report on these measures to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment of this Act."

*(Continued on p. 187)*

## *In This Issue...*

***Boston Logan Int'l ...*** FAA begins testing the first component of a potential runway use program at BOS aimed at reducing noise impact on airport neighbors - p. 185

***Legislation ...*** A rider to the FY 2015 omnibus funding bill requires FAA to provide a progress report to Congress on how well the agency is addressing a PBN noise problem at Phoenix Sky Harbor Int'l - p. 185

***Australia ...*** Airspace changes being made at Gold Coast Airport to reduce noise impact on surrounding community - p. 187

***FAA ...*** Public comment sought on agency's intent to renew information collection for Part 150 program - p. 187

***PANYNJ ...*** HMMH wins contract to conduct Part 150 studies at Newark, Teterboro airports - p. 188

***In Brief ...*** John Wayne Airport seeks Airport Noise/Access Specialist - p. 188

***Boston, from p. 185***

ment effort and asked the FAA to conduct the testing.

The first test is designed to evaluate whether FAA air traffic controllers can switch the runway configuration at the airport overnight, so the direction of arriving and departing flights on a given morning is different than it was the previous night, FAA spokesman Jim Peters explained in a statement to ANR. It continues:

The test calls for the FAA to determine how frequently air traffic controllers can switch the runway configuration they are using between 8:30 p.m. and midnight to a new runway configuration for the period between 6 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. the following morning.

The test is expected to run for at least three months but will not exceed six months. Massport developed the list of runway use recommendations for testing. Those include six runway configurations, with four next-day change options for each configuration, as well as an order of preference for changing runways.

Ultimately, the FAA, Massport, and the CAC may use the results of the first test and any additional planned tests to develop a runway use program that is consistent with FAA safety and operational requirements. Together with the noise relief measures already in place from Phase 1 and 2 of the noise study, the runway use program could lead to a quieter environment in the neighborhoods around the airport.

The FAA's ability to change runways during the test period is dependent on wind, weather, volume, runway availability, and other operational factors. No procedures, flight paths or altitudes will change, but the frequency of procedures or the use of flight paths may vary. With the assistance of project consultants, Massport will conduct a noise analysis at the end of each test.

A link to additional details on the first test and the outline of the runway use plan is available on the homepage of the Boston Logan Airport Noise Study website: <http://bostonoverflightnoisestudy.com>.

### **BLANS Study**

When the FAA issued the 2002 Environmental Record of Decision for the Boston Logan Airside Improvements Planning Project, the agency required the Boston Logan Airport Noise Study as part of the project mitigation.

The Record of Decision required the FAA, Massport, and the CAC to work together to develop a noise study scope that included enhancing existing noise abatement measures and developing new measures that could apply to aircraft overflights.

Phase 1 of BLANS identified safe and efficient noise abatement measures that would not adversely affect other communities within the noise study area and that could be implemented before the study's completion.

That effort produced several modified arrival and departure flight procedures that raised aircraft altitudes over communities or maximized the use of over-water flight routes

when conditions permitted. These measures notably reduced noise levels over land.

Phase 1 was completed in November 2010. All the procedures are described in the FAA's October 2007 Categorical Exclusion/Record of Decision:

[http://www.bostonoverflightnoisestudy.com/docs/BONS\\_Phase1\\_Catex\\_ROD\\_full\\_document.pdf](http://www.bostonoverflightnoisestudy.com/docs/BONS_Phase1_Catex_ROD_full_document.pdf)

Phase 2 identified and implemented other potential measures to reduce noise impacts to communities surrounding Boston Logan Airport.

The FAA evaluated dozens of potential noise abatement measures for ground operations, arrivals, departures and local aircraft traffic over a three-year period and implemented two ground measures. Those measures established an area for engine run-ups and a location for holding aircraft that are delayed before departure. Several other measures included encouraging airlines to use a single engine while taxiing, and establishing and maintaining communications with helicopters and propeller aircraft to maintain altitudes of 2,000 feet over downtown Boston.

The final results of the three-year evaluation are in the Level 3 Screening Report [http://www.bostonoverflightnoisestudy.com/phase2\\_documents.aspx](http://www.bostonoverflightnoisestudy.com/phase2_documents.aspx) December 2012.

### **New Community Advisory Committee**

In related news, the Massachusetts Legislature in July created a new 31-member Massachusetts Port Authority (MPA) Community Advisory Committee (CAC), which will have a seat on the Massport Board of Directors.

The current Logan CAC, which is a participant in the BLANS study, is in the process of organizing the new legislatively-mandated CAC, which will have broad powers.

Chapter 46 of the Mass. Acts of 2013 (Sections 54-55) stipulates that the new CAC be composed of one appointee from each of 25 communities around Logan International and six appointees from Boston. Each appointee will be a voting member of the committee and will be named by the chief executive of their town or city. Appointees must be versed in at least one of the following disciplines: airport operations, environmental affairs, labor relations, public health, or port operations.

"Once formally constituted, the powers of the Community Advisory Committee shall include that the CAC may provide for staff and incur annual expenses not to exceed \$250,000, make recommendations to the Governor and general court with respect to MPA matters, examine MPA reports, review the annual report and provide comments to the Governor, hold hearings on matters relating to MPA, make recommendations to MPA on the annual budget, and appoint a member to the MPA Board of Directors," Massport Chief Executive Thomas P. Glynn explained in a letter to the chief executives of the towns that will appoint members to the committee.

The legislation is at <http://malegislature.gov/Laws/SessionLaws/Acts/2013/Chapter46>

*Australia***AIRSERVICES MAKES AIRSPACE CHANGES TO REDUCE NOISE**

Airservices Australia recently announced that it would make two airspace changes at Gold Coast Airport in the next two months to improve noise impacts for local residents and enhance the safety and efficiency of air services to the airport.

The first change is the permanent introduction of new satellite-based Required Navigation Performance (RNP) flight path, known in Australia a “Smart Tracking.”

RNP, or Smart Tracking, allows aircraft to fly with greater navigational accuracy and make smooth curved approaches in all weather conditions, even when close to the airport.

This new flight path will be available for suitably-equipped flights arriving into Gold Coast Airport from the south-east and is expected to improve noise outcomes for communities living to the north of the airport by keeping aircraft over the water for longer to minimize flying over homes.

This technology will complement the Instrument Landing System (ILS) that is planned for the Gold Coast to help weather-proof the airport and minimize diversions.

The second change is an Airservices trial of an altered flight path to minimize the impact of aircraft noise for some residential areas south of the airport.

It follows a request from the local community to maximize flights over the Banora Point Golf Course and minimize, where possible, aircraft flying over residential areas.

This will change the flight path for southern departures, with jets departing from Runway 14 (over the Banora Point Golf Course) being directed by air traffic control to fly to the south-west.

Airservices Executive General Manager Safety, Environment and Assurance, Dr. Rob Weaver said that the changes were part of Airservices ongoing commitment to investigate ways to reduce the noise impact of flights on the community.

*FAA***FAA TO RENEW INFO COLLECTION ON NOISE MAPS, 150 PROGRAMS**

The Federal Aviation Administration announced Dec. 4 that it intends to request Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection from airport operators voluntarily submitting noise exposure maps and noise compatibility program to the FAA for review and approval.

The public has until Feb. 2, 2015, to comment on the information collection, which is used by the FAA to determine if an airport sponsor’s noise compatibility program is eligible for federal grant funds.

If airport operators did not voluntarily submit noise exposure maps and noise compatibility program for FAA review and approval, the airport operator would not be eligible for the set-aside of discretionary grant funds, FAA explained.

FAA estimates that the information collection involves approximately 15 airport operators with an average burden per airport of 3,382.6 hours. The agency did not explain how the burden in hours was calculated.

FAA invited the public to comment on any aspect of the information collection including:

- Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA’s performance;
- The accuracy of the estimated burden;
- Ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and
- Ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information.

The agency said it will summarize and/or include the public comments in the request for OMB’s clearance of this information collection.

Comments should be sent to Mr. Kathy DePaepe, Room 126B, Federal Aviation Administration, ASP-110, 6500 S. MacArthur Blvd., Oklahoma City, OK 73169.

For further information, contact Kathy DePaepe at tel: (405) 954-9362; e-mail: [Kathy.DePaepe@faa.gov](mailto:Kathy.DePaepe@faa.gov).

***Appropriation, from p. 185***

The legislation also contains another noise-related rider that prohibits funds from being used to change weight restrictions or prior permission rules at Teterboro Airport in New Jersey, where airport neighbors have sought to keep heavier business jets from using the airport. A 100,000 lb. aircraft weight limit has been in place at Teterboro since 1967 and is strongly support by the surrounding community.

It is unclear at this point who attached these riders to the fiscal year 2015 omnibus appropriations bill, which would provide \$12.4 billion for the FAA, \$17 million below the fiscal year 2014 enacted level.

The funding agreement includes the full budget request for the FAA air traffic organization and NextGen operations and planning but does not increase the Passenger Facility Charge limit from \$4.50 to \$8 as the Obama Administration had sought.

The legislation would provide:

- \$3.35 billion for FAA’s Airport Improvement Program;
- \$14.9 million for the Office of Environment and Energy;
- \$60.08 million for NextGen implementation;
- \$25.5 million for implementation of PBN procedures and FAA Metroplex projects;
- \$5.5 million for the NextGen environment portfolio; \$3 million above the budget request to support the Continuous Low Energy, Emissions and Noise (CLEEN) program and;
- \$23.01 million for environmental research on aircraft technologies, fuels, and metrics, an increase of \$3.5 million above the budget request.

## 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.**

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld  
Washington, D.C.

## PANYNJ

### HMMH WILL CONDUCT PART 150 STUDIES FOR NEWARK, TETERBORO AIRPORTS

The Port Authority Board of Commissioners announced Dec. 10 that it has approved an agreement with Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc. (HMMH) to conduct federal Part 150 airport noise compatibility planning studies for Newark Liberty International and Teterboro airports over the next three years.

The consultant also is required to “design and conduct a robust public participation program to ensure a broad base of public involvement that meets all regulatory requirements” of federal Part 150 studies.

HMMH’s technical proposal was the highest rated in the agency’s publicly advertised Request for Proposals for this project, which will run between January 2015 and November 2017 at an estimated cost of \$6.6 million combined for both airports.

“These studies are an important part of the Port Authority’s effort to address the noise concerns of residents living in close proximity to our airports,” said Port Authority Chairman John Degnan. “The information and feedback from these studies will be vital to developing effective noise mitigation plans at Newark Liberty and Teterboro.”

“As we work to deliver 21st century airports to the region, it’s critical that we serve as good neighbors to those that live close to the airports as well,” said Port Authority Vice Chairman Scott Rechler. “These studies will help evaluate noise levels in areas surrounding the airports in order to identify potential solutions to reduce noise for those that live close to our airports.”

Newark Liberty had its second Community Noise Roundtable meeting last week, following a kick-off meeting earlier this year. Teterboro has had long-standing group discussions regarding noise concerns for residents in communities surrounding the busy general aviation airport.

Along with the roundtables, the Port Authority implemented a flight tracking system on the agency’s website, increased staffing to handle noise complaints, and doubling the number of noise monitors.

### *In Brief...*

#### **John Wayne Airport Seeks Noise Specialist**

John Wayne Airport (SNA) is seeking an experienced Airport Access/Noise Specialist. For a full job description and position requirements, please visit the following website:

<http://agency.governmentjobs.com/oc/default.cfm>. Only on-line applications will be accepted. Apply by Thursday, Dec. 18, 2014.

## 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](mailto: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 Airport Noise 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 27, Number 1

January 9, 2015

## *Chicago O'Hare Int'l*

### **FIRST MEETING OF O'HARE AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY COMMITTEE SET FOR JANUARY 12**

Illinois state Rep. Marty Moylan (D-Des Plaines) is in the process of forming an O'Hare Airport Noise Advisory Committee to bring together citizens, anti-noise groups, elected officials, the Chicago Department of Aviation, and the Federal Aviation Administration in hopes of finding solutions to the aircraft noise problem caused by flight path changes made under the O'Hare Modernization Program.

The first meeting of the committee will be held on Jan. 12 at 7 p.m. at the Park Ridge, IL, City Council Chambers.

"As anyone who lives in the affected areas can tell you, the increase in noise due to O'Hare Airport has reached unacceptable levels," Moylan said in mid-December, when he announced the formation of the committee. "My goal is to bring as many people and groups together as possible to try and reach a comprehensive solution."

Moylan encouraged any interested residents of his 55th District to join the committee. He also invited members from the O'Hare Noise Compatibility Commission (ONCC), the Suburban O'Hare Commission (SOC), the Fair Allocation in

*(Continued on p. 2)*

## *NASA*

### **NASA TESTING NEW SOFTWARE THAT MAY REDUCE AIRCRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

In mid-December, National Aeronautics and Space Administration researchers began flight tests of computer software that shows promise in improving flight efficiency and reducing environmental impacts of aircraft, especially on communities around airports.

Known as ASTAR, or Airborne Spacing for Terminal Arrival Routes, the software is designed to give pilots specific speed information and guidance so that planes can be more precisely spaced, enabling pilots to fly a "follow the leader" approach to their destination airport, NASA explained in a Dec. 14, 2014, news release.

It continues: This type of approach would minimize flight path deviations, allow more efficient use of existing airspace and possibly reduce noise over communities surrounding airports – all of which could lead to reductions in commercial flight delays.

The software is being tested on the Boeing ecoDemonstrator 787 Test Airplane as part of The Boeing Company's ecoDemonstrator Program, a multi-year effort that aims to identify and accelerate the development and testing of new technology

*(Continued on p. 3)*

## *In This Issue...*

### *Chicago O'Hare Int'l ...*

First meeting of O'Hare Airport Noise Advisory Committee set for Jan. 12 - p. 1

*NASA ...* New ASTAR software shows promise in reducing aircraft environmental impacts - p. 1

*Litigation ...* Following court loss, anti-noise group in Queens launches petition on White House web site to require FAA to adopt 55 DNL "noise safety level" - p. 2

*ACRP ...* TRB seeks contractor to develop guidance on FAA grant assurance obligations - p. 3

*Los Angeles Int'l ...* Airport Board authorizes \$2.98 million grant for residential sound insulation - p. 3

*In Brief ...* Bob Hope Airport launches B&K's Web-Trak system ... NAC Chairman Bill Ayer, former CEO of Alaska Air Group, to give keynote address at UC Davis Aviation Noise & Air Quality Symposium - p. 4

## *O'Hare, from p. 1*

Runways Coalition (FAiR), and other grassroots organizations to join the committee and have their voices represented.

In addition to these groups, Moylan has also reached out to the Chicago Department of Aviation and the Federal Aviation Administration and other local elected officials, including U.S. Reps. Jan Schakowsky (D), Tammy Duckworth (D), Mike Quigley (D), state Sen. Dan Kotowski (D), and 41st Ward Chicago Alderman Mary O'Connor (D), to attend the meeting.

A spokesman for Moylan told ANR that there has been a good response to the invitation to join the O'Hare Airport Noise Advisory Committee but did not say whether the Chicago Dept. of Aviation or FAA would participate on it. It is also not clear at this point whether the committee will function like other formal airport/community noise roundtables.

"There are many groups actively fighting the unacceptable increase in noise," said Moylan. "This committee will help create a dialogue between those groups while also allowing residents to voice their ideas and concerns."

In addition to forming this committee, Moylan has also introduced state legislation that would place a greater emphasis on nighttime noise in official noise reporting documents. Moylan has also sent a letter to Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel asking for a moratorium on flights to the northern runway until a new sound study is completed, and has sent another letter to Rep. Jan Schakowsky urging her to obtain more federal funding for soundproofing installation.

"As you are well aware, there are a host of difficulties that we face when addressing the increase in noise pollution," Moylan said in his letter inviting stakeholders to participate on the new committee. "We have all realized how complicated it is to try and find real solutions. We must work together to achieve a solution to the noise problem that is both technically and economically practicable, and that solution begins by opening a dialogue between grassroots organizations, elected officials and other concerned residents."

## **Litigation**

### **APPEALS COURT UPHOLDS EA ON EXTENSION OF JFK RUNWAY**

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on Dec. 23, 2014, upheld the environmental review of the 728-foot extension of the north end of Runway 4L/22R at John F. Kennedy International Airport, which will bring aircraft closer to nearby communities.

The runway extension is being done to comply with Federal Aviation Administration runway design standards.

The Court dismissed a petition by the Eastern Queens Alliance (EQA), a coalition of civic groups in Queens, seeking review of FAA's March 10, 2014, decision to approve the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's Environmental

Assessment (EA) of the project, issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONS), and decision not to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the project.

EQA argued that a number of alleged omissions and flawed analyses in the EA demonstrate that FAA failed to take the required "hard look" required under the National Environmental Policy Act at the possible effects of the project and that its decision not to prepare an EIS was arbitrary and capricious.

A three-judge panel of the Second Circuit said that it understood "the concerns expressed by members of certain communities near the airport" that noise and air pollution would increase. However, the panel concluded that each of EQA's objections "was either forfeited because it was not brought to the agency's attention during the public comment period ... or is unfounded based on our review of the record."

The case is *Eastern Queens Alliance, Inc. v. FAA* (No. 14-1612-ag).

### **White House Petitioned**

Following its loss in court, the Eastern Queens Alliance launched a White House "We the People" petition on Jan. 6 asking the Obama Administration to require the FAA to re-examine its 65 dB DNL "noise safety level" and consider 55 DNL as the new standard.

The petition would need to receive 100,000 signatures by Feb. 5 to trigger action by the Obama Administration. As of 8:30 a.m. today, the EQA petition had received 489 signatures.

If 100,000 signatures are obtained, the petition will be considered at a regular meeting the White House holds with major policy offices to review petitions that have crossed the signature threshold for a response.

"This group will help determine which policy office in the White House or federal agency should review and respond to petitions and ensure that petition responses are posted as quickly as possible," the White House explains on its website.

EQA is sending its petition to other community anti-noise groups around the country seeking their support.

It told them: "By this petition, we are not asking for special treatment, or for the FAA to be held to unreasonable, unreachable standards. We are merely asking that Congress and the FAA revisit the FAA's health and safety standards for noise exposure in light of more than thirty years of technological and scientific advancement and discovery. The communities of Eastern Queens and other airport-adjacent communities across the nation are overburdened and it isn't fair. We deserve better! Our very health, safety and quality of life are at stake!"

The petition is at

<https://petitions.whitehouse.gov/petition/require-faa-re-examine-its-65-decibel-dba-noise-safety-level-and-consider-55-dba-new-standard-human/2zGt1GN8>

*ACRP***PROJECT WILL DEVELOP GUIDE ON FAA GRANT OBLIGATIONS**

Feb. 19 is the deadline for responding to a Request for Proposals issued by the Transportation Research Board seeking a contractor to develop guidance on Federal Aviation Administration grant assurance obligations.

Airport Cooperative Research Project 03-38, "Understanding FAA Grant Assurance Obligations," is a \$150,000, 12-month effort.

The goal of the project "is to produce a guidebook that is intended to be a comprehensive resource summarizing, in a concise and easy-to-understand format, requirements for compliance with Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant assurance obligations and associated implications," according to the project summary.

The primary audience for the guidebook includes airport owners, policymakers, and other relevant stakeholders.

"Guidance is needed to educate all stakeholders, and to help alleviate the confusion, varying interpretations, and misunderstandings that have occurred in the past or may occur in the future. In response, this research will provide airport sponsors, consultants, and affected communities with a guide to understanding the FAA obligations in terms that are easily understood and applied," the project summary notes.

The RFP can be downloaded at <http://www.trb.org/main/blurbs/171901.aspx>

**Problem Statements for 2016 Program**

TRB announced on Dec. 30 that it is now accepting research problem statements for the FY 2016 Airport Cooperative Research Program.

March 20 is the deadline for submitting the problem statements which are used to identify potential research needs and form the basis for selection of the annual ACRP research program.

ACRP conducts research in 12 airport-related areas including environment.

For further information, go to <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/acrp/ACRP2016ProblemStatementSOLICIT.pdf>

*Los Angeles Int'l***AIRPORT BOARD AUTHORIZES \$2.98 M GRANT FOR INSULATION**

On Dec. 18, 2014, the Los Angeles Board of Airport Commissioners authorized a Letter of Agreement with the County of Los Angeles that will result in a grant of \$2.98 million in Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) funding for residential sound insulation.

The grant funds will complement an earlier grant of \$15.4

million awarded to the County in August 2014.

These additional funds will enable the County to design and sound-insulate 71 dwelling units. The project cost covers all acoustical, architectural, engineering, construction and administrative activities. Construction contractors typically install double-paned windows, solid-core doors, fireplace doors and dampers, attic baffles, insulation, and other elements to achieve a targeted interior noise level of 45 decibels.

The homes included in this project are directly impacted by aircraft approaching Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The area targeted for this phase is located in the Lennox and Athens communities and the soundproofing work is expected to be completed before Sept. 30.

The Federal Aviation Administration approved LAWA's Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program at LAX in 1985, making land-use mitigation projects with the cities of Los Angeles, El Segundo and Inglewood and the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County eligible for FAA funding.

The County's sound insulation program began in the early 1990s and has received noise mitigation funds from both LAWA and the FAA since the inception of the program. To date, the County has received LAWA sound insulation grants totaling \$81 million and FAA grants totaling \$66 million for an overall total of \$147 million.

*NASA, from p. 1*

gies and methods that can potentially reduce the environmental impacts of aviation.

"ASTAR represents the first of several inventive technologies NASA's aeronautical innovators are working on that will be tested with the help of the ecoDemonstrator test airplanes," said Jaiwon Shin, associate administrator for NASA's Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate at the agency's headquarters in Washington. "We're confident the public will benefit from this valuable partnership between NASA and Boeing."

During the flight tests, NASA engineer Roy Roper operates ASTAR on a laptop in the rear of the aircraft. As a second aircraft flies in front of the ecoDemonstrator 787, ASTAR computes and displays the speed required to follow safely behind. Roper then communicates those speed commands to the ecoDemonstrator 787 pilots.

"NASA has tested ASTAR in laboratory simulations, but this flight test on board the ecoDemonstrator 787 gave us the chance to see how well it works in a real-life flight environment," said Will Johnson, a project chief engineer at NASA's Langley Research Center in Hampton, Virginia.

The NASA team will apply the lessons learned from the flight test program to improve the software and then begin development of actual flight hardware for further testing and eventual certification for use.

The ASTAR experiment is the first of several NASA tests flying aboard the ecoDemonstrator Test Airplanes. During the spring and summer of 2015, the ecoDemonstrator 757 Test

## 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.**

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld  
Washington, D.C.

Airplane will host two NASA experiments. The first involves using active flow control technologies on the aircraft's tail to determine if future tail designs can be altered to reduce drag. The second will test the effectiveness of coatings applied to the leading edge of a wing section to reduce turbulence-inducing buildup of insect residue.

### *In Brief...*

#### **Bob Hope Launches WebTrak**

Burbank Bob Hope Airport announced last month that it has launched Brüel & Kjaer's WebTrak system which allows users of the airport's website to view flight movement, air traffic patterns, and noise measurements within the Burbank region.

In addition to providing flight and noise information, WebTrak will also be the primary site for anyone who wishes to file online aircraft noise inquiries with the Airport.

WebTrak visitors can use the system to determine individual aircraft type, origin and destination airports, altitude and flight identification for near real-time flights and flights up to 90 days in the past.

WebTrak also shows the noise level measurements and locations of each of the 20 noise monitors around the Airport. Noise levels are shown and the system can distinguish aircraft movement noise from other community noise such as vehicle traffic or ambient noise.

#### **Ayer to Give Keynote at UC Davis Symposium**

"Shining a light on emerging environmental policies, practices, and mitigation in the era of NextGen," is the timely theme of this year's UC Davis Aviation Noise & Air Quality Symposium, which will be held on March 1-4 in Palm Springs, CA.

Bill Ayer, retired Chairman and CEO of Alaska Air Group and current Chair of the NextGen Advisory Committee, will give the keynote address at the conference on "NextGen: A Model of Stakeholder Engagement."

Other symposium sessions will focus on novel strategies for providing compensation for airport noise impact, preparing airports for NextGen and PBN, measuring and assessing air quality and health impacts, real-world implementation of PBN, an update on FAA's community annoyance survey, creative solutions to dampen ground noise, CatEx2, noise office best practices, sustainability, and emerging environmental issues.

In additional tutorials on aircraft noise and air quality will be held on March 1 and vendors will showcase their latest tools and technologies during the symposium.

Further information is available at the symposium website:  
<https://sites.google.com/site/2015aviationnoiseaq/>

## 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](mailto: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 Airport Noise 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 27, Number 2

January 16, 2015

## *Palm Beach Int'l*

### **TRUMP SUES COUNTY OVER RNAV DEPARTURE WITH "UFIRD" "DONLD" "TRMMP" WAYPOINTS**

Real estate magnate Donald Trump has filed a lawsuit over an RNAV departure procedure at Palm Beach International Airport that is named after his daughter and has waypoints devilishly named "UFIRD" "DONLD" "TRMMP" by Federal Aviation Administration air traffic controllers.

"Your're Fired!" is Trump's signature phrase on his TV show *The Apprentice*. His daughter Ivanka co-hosts the show.

The IVNKA ONE RNAV departure was added in early 2010 for turbojet aircraft departing Palm Beach International. Aircraft following the standard instrument departure to the east fly just one-tenth of a mile (528 ft) north of Trump's exclusive Mar-a-Lago club, which is located 2.5 miles east of the main runway.

On Jan. 6, Trump filed a lawsuit against Palm Beach County, FL, seeking \$100 million in compensation for damages to the façade of his historic club, which he alleges were caused when the County stopped fanning aircraft departures at PBI to lessen noise impact and began concentrating departures on a tight departure flight track over Mar-a-Lago.

*(Continued on p. 6)*

## *Louisville Int'l*

### **STATE BILL WOULD PROVIDE TAX CREDITS TO REIMBURSE SOUND INSULATION COSTS**

On Jan. 6, state Rep. Jim Wayne (D-Louisville) introduced legislation in the Kentucky General Assembly that would provide refundable income tax credits to reimburse homeowners in the 60 dB DNL and higher noise contours of commercial airports for up to 100 percent of the cost of sound insulating their homes.

HB 48 would create a new section of KRS (Kentucky Revised Statutes) Chapter 41 and amend KRS 141.0202 to create the refundable tax credit.

The tax credit program would be capped at \$3 million a year and would be offered on a first-come, first-served basis. The program is retroactive to 2009.

Wayne said his bill was the brainchild two years ago of the Airport Neighbors Alliance, a coalition of communities impacted by noise from Louisville International.

The bill was introduced to help residents near Louisville International Airport who are in the 60 dB DNL contour and not eligible for the airport's residential sound insulation program, which ends at the 65 dB DNL contour line.

The legislation, which currently has 16 co-sponsors, is considered to have momentum, and could be adopted during the current legislative session.

*(Continued on p. 7)*

## *In This Issue...*

***Palm Beach Int'l ...*** Trump sues County again over aircraft noise impact on his Mar-a-Lago club - p. 5

***Tax Credits ...*** Bill introduced in Kentucky General Assembly would provide tax credits to reimburse homeowners for sound insulation costs - p. 5

***Chicago O'Hare Int'l ...*** Mulder giving up ONCC chair; SOC hiring team of experts to find ways to mitigate noise from O'Hare Modernization Project - p. 6

***Europe ...*** Consortium formed under SESAR will demonstrate new green approach, landing technologies at European airports - p. 7

***Germany ...*** DLR, Airbus using laser data to develop aircraft that can land slower, more quietly - p. 7

***In Brief ...*** HMMH seeks young professionals for its Aviation Environmental Services Group - p. 8

**PBI, from p. 5**

Trump learned of IVNKA ONE a few months after it was put into effect in 2010 and said he was flattered by the waypoint names. His lawsuit does not mention the RNAV departure procedure by name but refers to aircraft not longer being fanned on takeoff.

Under PBI's Part 150 program, fanned air routes over Mar-a-Lago were gradually concentrated into a single path as a noise mitigation measure prior to the implementation of IVNKA ONE. There was a discussion in the 1990s over whether aircraft should continue to be fanned or not for noise mitigation and Trump, who wants departures fanned to reduce their noise impact on Mar-a-Lago, lost the debate.

In his lawsuit, Trump alleges that he is the victim of "revenge" by Airport Director Bruce Pelly, who Trump sued personally – but unsuccessfully – in 1995, and that Pelly "is attacking Mar-a-Lago from the air."

Trump, who unsuccessfully sued the County in the past over airport noise, alleged in his lawsuit that Bruce Pelly "has improperly influenced FAA air traffic controllers at the Airport, who would previously fan aircraft so that they would not all fly over Mar-a-Lago, and has pressured them and their superiors to vector all aircraft departing Runway 10L, over Mar-a-Lago. In deference to the Airport owner, the County, the FAA has acquiesced and has directed almost all aircraft departing for the Airport to fly directly over Mar-a-Lago."

**Community Activist Found IVNKA ONE**

ANR learned of IVNKA ONE in an e-mail sent out by the Brooklyn-based community anti-noise group Prospect Park Quiet Skies. Susan Carroll, a community advocate who is a member of Queens Quiet Skies and works with the Prospect Park group, found it.

"I'd been reading about Donald Trump's situation with PBI and figured he was living under an RNAV, so I did a search on PBI's flight paths. However, I did not expect to find one actually called IVNKA, containing waypoints about him!" she told ANR.

IVNKA ONE was featured in a May 5, 2010, story in the *Palm Beach Post* which explained that FAA air traffic controllers frequently name navigational waypoints after celebrities.

Palm Beach County has made no comment on Trump's lawsuit.

ANR asked Trump's attorney – John B. Marion, IV of the West Palm Beach law firm Sellars, Marion & Bachi – why Trump's lawsuit did not name FAA as a defendant since the agency has sole authority over airspace issues.

He did not respond by deadline.

The lawsuit, *Mar-a-Lago L.L.C. v. Palm Beach County*, FL (Filing #22229762; no case number has been assigned yet) was filed in the Circuit Court of the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit in and For Palm Beach County FL.

**O'Hare Int'l****MULDER LEAVING ONCC; SOC HIRING AVIATION, LEGAL EXPERTS**

Arlene Mulder announced Jan. 9 that she will not seek reelection as chair of the O'Hare Noise Compatibility Commission, which she has led since its inception in 1993.

She had been under pressure to resign by the community group Fair Allocation in Runways (FAiR) and the Suburban O'Hare Commission (SOC), a group of 11 governmental entities in suburban Cook and DuPage Counties.

FAiR and SOC asserted that Mulder had not been aggressive enough in demanding mitigation of aircraft noise caused by a major realignment of runways made under the O'Hare Modernization Plan in October 2013; a charge she refutes.

An election for a new ONCC chair will be held March 13. Mulder, who retired several years ago from her position as mayor of Arlington Heights, IL, plans to spend more time with her family after she leaves the commission.

For over 20 years, the ONCC – which was formed by the City of Chicago to distribute sound insulation funds – was the dominant voice in O'Hare airport noise mitigation efforts.

But since the shift in noise caused by the runway realignment and opening of a new runway at O'Hare, FAiR and other community anti-noise groups have formed, SOC has been re-energized, and IL Rep. Marty Moylan is in the process of forming an overarching group called the O'Hare Airport Noise Advisory Committee that he hopes will pull the ONCC, SOC, FAiR, the FAA, Chicago Department of Aviation, and others interested in mitigating O'Hare noise impact under one umbrella.

The first meeting of Moylan's Noise Advisory Committee is set for Feb. 12. [ANR incorrectly reported last week that the meeting would be held on Jan. 12.] FAA and the Chicago Department of Aviation have not yet said whether they will attend.

How all these groups seeking noise mitigation will interact is not yet clear but SOC appears to be the group moving with the most deliberate speed to mitigate the OMP noise impact.

**SOC Hiring Team of Experts**

SOC plans at its upcoming Feb. 10 meeting to award a contract to one of a half dozen firms that have submitted proposals to lead a team of aviation and legal experts that SOC is forming to develop short- and long-term mitigation measures to address the OMP noise problems.

The team will be funded by \$190,000 SOC has left in its budget from a federal noise monitoring grant and by contributions from member municipalities.

SOC is bringing together legal and aviation experts to create "a sound, viable realistic plan that works for everyone, the City of Chicago, the airport, and its neighbors," Craig Johnson, SOC chair and Elk Grove Village mayor, told the *Chicago Journal & Topics* newspaper.

## *Tax Credit, from p. 5*

The legislation also has the support of the Louisville Regional Airport Authority, which will help its journey through the state Legislature.

“We are certainly supportive of efforts to encourage homeowners to minimize the impact of aircraft noise in their homes and have gone on record with the legislative committee chair supporting this legislation,” Trish Burke, Public Relations Director for the Airport Authority, told ANR.

To date, she said, Louisville International has 545 homes with sound insulation either installed, under construction, or under contract, which represents almost 80 percent of all eligible families. The airport’s residential sound insulation program has been funded with proceeds from the sale of Part 150 program land and with \$18.1 million in federal grants.

HB 48 has been referred to the Kentucky House Appropriations & Revenue Committee.

## *Europe*

### **CONSORTIUM WILL VALIDATE NEW APPROACH TECHNOLOGIES**

A consortium of 15 aviation companies has been formed under the Single European Sky Air Traffic Management Research (SESAR) program to demonstrate new approach and landing technologies that will increase the capacity of the European airport network while reducing aircraft emissions and noise.

A3 (Advanced Approaches for all Airports) is the name of the consortium, which is being led by NetJets Europe.

It will implement the Augmented Approaches to Land (ALL) project, co-financed by the SESAR Joint Undertaking, and will perform over 200 demonstration flights by 2016 to validate new approach and landing technologies involving a significant number of aircraft types and an extensive range of airport environments.

The project seeks to pave the way for aircraft operators to employ these technologies, which are needed to overcome the limitations of the current Instrument Landing System (ILS) – equipment which is costly to install and maintain, and which does not offer the flexibility to optimize the flight path in terms of fuel efficiency and noise abatement.

The consortium will demonstrate the following new procedures and technologies:

- Curved noise abatement Required Navigation Performance (RNP) legs with transition to either satellite-navigation based approaches (GBAS and SBAS) or to a conventional ILS approach. This will be optionally combined with an increased glideslope of 3.2°; and

- Synthetic Vision Guidance and Enhanced Flight Vision Systems enabling lower decision heights and reduced runway visual range, resulting in increased accessibility to the airport in low visibility conditions.

The project also includes flight planning and information access via portable devices in the cockpit, which is of particular interest to airspace users not supported by a Flight Operations Center (FOC), as is the case for many business aviation operators.

“The Augmented Approaches to Land project aims at showing the complementarities between several approach solutions into different operational environments, said Jean-Philippe Ramu, SESAR Project Manager, Second In Command, Gulfstream V/ 550, NetJets Europe.

“It will demonstrate that augmented vision and satellite-based augmented navigation can improve the access while reducing the environmental impact of all types of Airspace Users into all types of airports.

### **Consortium Participants**

Formulated to bridge the gap between the research and the deployment of SESAR innovations in Europe and around the world, the consortium brings together the following leading aviation companies:

- Airspace users of business and commercial aviation will be represented by NetJets Europe, EBAA, Lufthansa and Swiss;
- Avionics will be supplied and tested by Honeywell Aerospace and Elbit Systems;
- Procedural design will be led by DFS, ANS CR, Skyguide with support from DLR and Airbus ProSky. DSN will provide airport operational procedures study;
- Airframe manufacturer and aircraft systems knowledge will be provided by Dassault Aviation and Airbus;
- Flights will take place at small/medium airports (Perigueux, Bergerac, Bordeaux, Ostrava and Bremen) and large airports (Frankfurt, Zurich). Fraport and Zürich Airport will contribute to the consortium.

## *Germany*

### **LASERS WILL LEAD TO SLOWER, QUIETER AIRCRAFT LANDINGS**

On Jan. 6, researchers at the German Aerospace Center, in collaboration with Airbus, successfully conducted a world’s first: they used lasers to visualize the airflow over the wing of a passenger aircraft in flight.

They have developed a method that captures the movement of water droplets streaming over the wing, which reveals the smallest movements of the air.

Their findings will help optimize future wings to enable slower and quieter approach procedures.

The researchers are now creating precise 3D animations of the airflow around the wing.

“We want to acquire an understanding, in hitherto unachieved precision, of how the airflow behaves around the wings and flaps, and especially around the engine nacelles, during low-speed flight,” says Ralf Rudnik from the DLR In-

## 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.**

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld  
Washington, D.C.

stitute of Aerodynamics and Flow Technology, who is in charge of the HINVA (High Lift Inflight Validation) project.

“Only if we come to a better understanding of the aerodynamic limits during low-speed flight will we have the opportunity to shift these limits to our benefit in the future.”

The in-flight test data now being acquired, combined with previous wind tunnel measurements and computational fluid dynamics, may permit the development of wings and flap systems that are far better suited to low-speed flight and, in the long term, allow a reduction in the minimum speed restriction around airports.

Airbus is supporting the project as part of its own research activities.

### *In Brief...*

#### **HMMH Seeks Young Professionals**

Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc. (HMMH) offers a unique career opportunity for client focused young professionals and recent college graduates with less than four years of work experience who desire to use their analytic analysis and data management skills.

Candidates with strong database querying experience (MSSQL or MySQL) and programing skills in scripting languages (Python, Perl, MATLAB) are highly encouraged to apply. Those with backgrounds in aerospace/aviation, physics, math, engineering or other technical fields are also encouraged to apply.

The focus of our Aviation Environmental Services group is to analyze, evaluate, and find solutions for airport environmental issues, predominantly noise and air quality.

Specific duties include analyzing aircraft flight track databases and other aviation or environmental data sources to create the required inputs for modeling of environmental effects around airports and affected communities. To learn more, visit [www.hmmh.com](http://www.hmmh.com).

Requirements include:

- BS or MS in a technical field
- data management and programing experience
- field measurement trips
- interest in acoustics, aviation and environmental issues a plus

Email your resume with cover letter to Alison J. Moore, Human Resources Manager; [amoore@hmmh.com](mailto:amoore@hmmh.com)

HMMH is an Equal Employment Opportunity Employer

## 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](mailto: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 Airport Noise 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 27, Number 3

January 23, 2015

## ACRP

### PROJECTS WILL MODEL SPACEPORT NOISE, DO GUIDE ON GIS FOR LAND USE PLANNING

On Jan. 21, the Transportation Research Board issued Requests for Proposals (RFPs) seeking contractors for two new Airport Cooperative Research projects:

- ACRP 02-66: Commercial Space Operations and Sonic Boom Modeling and Analysis – a \$600,000, 22-month project authorized to begin in August 2015 (RFP closing date is March 18); and
- ACRP 03-37, Using GIS for Collaborative Land Use Compatibility Planning Near Airports – a \$350,000, 15-month project set to begin in July 2016 (RFP closing date is March 17).

#### Model for Spaceport Noise, Sonic Boom

“Commercial space launch vehicle activities are expected to increase, and as they begin testing and become operational there are many noise issues as well as the effects from sonic booms that need to be evaluated,” the RFP explains.

“Those impacts on the community are dependent upon such factors as the num-

*(Continued on p. 10)*

## Phoenix Sky Harbor Int'l

### PHOENIX CITY COUNCIL DEMANDS THAT FAA REVERSE RNAV DEPARTURE FLIGHT PATHS

At a mid-December meeting, the Phoenix City Council unanimously demanded that the Federal Aviation Administration reverse flight path changes made under an RNAV departure procedure put into effect last September at Sky Harbor International Airport, which sparking hundreds of noise complaints and caught city officials and citizens off guard.

The Council told city officials to take whatever action necessary to reverse the flight path changes. Several City Council members suggested that the city file a lawsuit against the FAA.

Angry that FAA had not informed them of the flight path changes, City Council members directed City Manager Ed Zuercher to request that the agency release all documents related to the RNAV departure, which directed aircraft over historic neighborhoods of Phoenix and led to fears of property devaluation and loss of quality of life from the constant noise impact.

Aviation Department officials were aware that FAA planned to implement an RNAV departure procedure at Sky Harbor but thought it was only in the draft stages and also were surprised when it was implemented.

*(Continued on p. 12)*

## In This Issue...

**ACRP ...** RFPs issued for projects to develop model for spaceport noise, sonic boom and guide on using GIS for land use planning - p. 9

### Phoenix Sky Harbor Int'l ...

City Council demands that FAA reverse RNAV departure flight paths - p. 9

### Boston Logan Int'l ...

FAA resumes head-to-head departures that take aircraft over Boston Harbor - p. 10

**Europe ...** Coalition of 140 community groups in 10 countries petitions European Parliament to ban all night flights at EU airports - p. 11

**Los Angeles Int'l ...** LAWA authorizes up to \$44.3 million to fund sound insulation in Inglewood - p. 11

**In Brief ...** FAA reviewing San Antonio Int'l's Part 150 Program ... On Feb. 3, proposed noise restrictions for East Hampton Airport will be announced ... Tweed New Haven Airport selects homes for pilot SIP - p. 11

**ACRP, from p. 9**

ber of operations, the launch pad configuration, and the type of launch vehicle among others. There are four known types of launch vehicles: those that take-off horizontally with a rocket igniting later launching the vehicle, those that take-off horizontally under rocket power, those that are attached to an aircraft that take-off and later released, and those that take-off vertically.

“Currently airports use the Integrated Noise Model (INM) to evaluate the effects of aircraft noise. INM will soon be replaced with the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) but neither tool has the ability to predict noise and sonic boom from commercial space operations.

“As commercial space launches are still maturing, data has not yet been compiled of the noise parameters of launch vehicles, nor has there been a method(s) developed that can be used with AEDT for environmental analysis.”

The objectives of this research are to:

- Develop a set of noise and sonic boom model(s) suitable for environmental analysis of commercial space operations and airport/space launch site facilities that are compatible with, or can be integrated into AEDT;
- Develop a database of existing rocket/engine/motor data for commercial space launch operations; and
- Describe the approval process for the noise and sonic boom evaluations from airport/space launch operations.

The RFP is at <http://apps.trb.org/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=3839>

**Use of GIS for Land Use Planning**

“GIS is well-documented as a suitable and powerful tool for addressing not only the technical and analytical aspects of land use planning, but also for enhancing the opportunity for collaborative planning among stakeholders,” the RFP notes.

“Yet these benefits have not been fully realized with airport land use compatibility to date. Research is needed to assist airports, local governments, and other stakeholders in using GIS to help protect safety, health, quality of life, and public investments related to airports in or near their jurisdictions. This guidance will help foster greater collaboration among stakeholders.”

The objectives of this research are to develop guidance and resources for using GIS for land use compatibility planning in the vicinity of airports, including, but not be limited to:

- A guidebook of evidence-based best practices;
- Training materials (e.g. webcast, brochures) summarizing the best practices provided in the guidebook; and
- Sample outreach materials to foster ongoing stakeholder collaboration through the use of GIS to enhance land use compatibility around airports.

The RFP is at <http://apps.trb.org/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=3842>

**Boston Logan Int'l****HEAD-TO-HEAD DEPARTURES OVER WATER RESUME AT BOSTON**

The Federal Aviation Administration has resumed late night and early morning “head-to-head” operations, weather permitting, at Boston Logan International Airport that direct aircraft departures over Boston Harbor in order to reduce noise impact on communities near the airport, the Massachusetts Port Authority said Jan. 15.

The announcement was a victory for the “Youth Crew” of the non-profit Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOAH), which conducted a survey of 445 residents living in six areas under the Logan departure path following the nationwide suspension of head-to-head operations in 2012. The survey found that nighttime sleep disruption was as high as 48 percent in some areas under the flight path.

NOAH describes itself as “an East Boston-based community development corporation structured to collaborate with and support residents and communities in their pursuit of affordable housing strategies, environmental justice, community planning, leadership development, and economic development opportunities.”

Massport got behind the organization last fall and urged FAA to reinstate head-to-head operations at Logan, which had been a successful noise abatement procedure developed by Massport and its Community Advisory Committee, and agreed to by FAA, over a decade ago.

FAA suspended head-to-head procedures nationwide in 2012 to conduct a safety review following an incident at Washington, DC, Reagan National Airport after three aircraft came within one mile of each other as air traffic controllers were in the process of changing the operational configuration of the airport.

Under head-to-head operations at Boston Logan, air traffic controllers send departing flights over the water on take off while arriving flights, which are quieter, land on the same runway from the opposite direction coming in over communities.

“We thank the FAA for its safety review of the [head-to-head] procedure and for the decision to include it in its air traffic procedures because it is effective in reducing noise,” said Ed Freni, Massport Director of Aviation. “For decades, Massport has worked to reduce the impacts of noise on residents near the airport.”

Said MA state Sen. Anthony Petrucci, whose constituents are under the Logan flight path, “I’d like to thank the FAA for doing their due diligence in completing a full review of this procedure. I applaud the FAA and Massport’s continuous efforts in putting both our community safety and comfort as a top priority, while exceeding expectations put forth by the regulatory guidelines. I’d also like to thank NOAH’s Youth Crew for their hard work conducting the sleep study and bringing their findings to the community. Their efforts helped bring the plight of residents in Eagle Hill

affected by late night airport noise to the community at large.”

“This is great news,” said Chris Marchi, NOAH’s Community building and Environment Department Director. “NOAH’s youth worked hard on this project to represent East Boston family’s interests. I’m just glad they were able to help. So often people will say, ‘Why bother? We can’t do anything about it anyway.’ What we’re trying to do is say, ‘Yes we can.’ I think it’s also important to recognize that we appreciate Massport’s efforts to expedite their work with the FAA and get this thing resolved. I think this is a good example of how citizen activism, youth, and agencies can work together toward shared goals.”

Massport said that the head-to-head operations have been resumed at airports nationwide following FAA’s safety review.

## Europe

### COALITION ASKS EU PARLIAMENT FOR BAN ON ALL NIGHT FLIGHTS

A coalition of 140 community anti-noise groups from 10 European countries presented a petition to European Parliament representatives on Nov. 18, 2014, demanding a ban on night flights at EU airports.

They also called on legislators to strip the aviation sector of the tax exemptions it currently enjoys.

The coalition presented members of the European Parliament with a petition entitled “Taming Aviation” that formally asks the European Parliament to take action.

During the meeting, Taming Aviation co-founder Susanne Heger said that aircraft noise poses serious health threats for people living near airports.

The petition demands that all airports have an uninterrupted eight-hour ban on nighttime flights, in order to comply with minimum health standards set by the World Health Organization.

A German Court ruled in favour of a night flight ban at Frankfurt Airport in 2012, in response to complaints from local residents. Taming Aviation hopes for the same result across Europe, and said that unless the EU forces all airports to close down at night, the situation will not change.

“Individual airports are reluctant to ban night flights, because the night flights will go to a competitor airport,” said John Stewart, chair of Heathrow Association for the Control of Aircraft Noise (HACAN).

Coalition representatives have raised these problems with local and airport authorities but have been unsuccessful in finding a common ground. They decided to call on the European Parliament to take these concerns in consideration through amendments when adopting future laws.

Parliament will now assess the request, and forward it to the European Commission.

Taming Aviation claims to represent a quarter of a million

citizens in Austria, Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Switzerland, France, Spain, Germany, Italy, and the UK.

## Los Angeles Int'l

### LAWA AUTHORIZES UP TO \$44.3 M FOR INSULATION IN INGLEWOOD

On Jan. 15, the Los Angeles Board of Airport Commissioners authorized a Letter of Agreement with the City of Inglewood that will result in the release of up to \$44.3 million in Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) funding for sound insulation in that city.

This funding will enable the City of Inglewood to design and sound-insulate an additional 1,030 units, consisting of 689 single-family and 341 multi-family homes. Project cost covers acoustical, architectural, engineering, construction, and administrative activities.

Construction contractors typically install double-paned windows, solid-core doors, fireplace doors and dampers, attic baffles, insulation, and other elements to achieve a targeted interior noise level of 45 decibels.

Inglewood has participated in the LAX Noise Compatibility Program since the 1980s, and has received noise mitigation funds from both LAWA and the Federal Aviation Administration since 1985.

To date, LAWA has awarded \$164 million and the FAA has awarded \$236 million to Inglewood, for a total of \$400 million. Nearly 18,000 homes around LAX have been sound-proofed, and more than 5,300 of those homes are located in Inglewood.

## In Brief...

### San Antonio Part 150 Under Review

San Antonio International Airport’s proposed Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program is under review by the FAA, the agency announced Jan. 22.

The program will be approved or disapproved by July 11.

FAA also said that noise exposure maps submitted by the City of San Antonio for the airport meet federal requirements.

The public comment period of the airport’s proposed Part 150 program and noise exposure maps ends on March 13.

For further information, contact John MacFarlane, an environmental specialist in FAA’s Southwest Region; tel: (817) 222-5681.

### E. Hampton Noise Restrictions To Be Unveiled

After weighing input from the community, consultants, and the East Hampton Airport Planning Committee’s noise subcommittee, the East Hampton Town Board plans to unveil proposed noise restrictions for East Hampton Airport at a Feb. 3 meeting.

## 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.**

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld  
Washington, D.C.

The restrictions will likely focus on helicopters because those operations have been identified as causing the most noise complaints. The Town is being extremely careful about how it crafts its noise restrictions, which are expected to be challenged by aviation interests.

On Jan. 1, the Town came out from under FAA grant obligations, which, among other things, required the Town to provide aviation services on a "reasonable" and "not unjustly discriminatory" basis.

### **Tweed New Haven Pilot SIP**

Tweed New Haven Regional Airport has selected 12 homes to participate in its pilot residential sound insulation program. Planning and design for the broader SIP, which includes the homes in the pilot program, is being funded by an \$849,582 federal grant. Construction costs for the pilot program are funded under a separate \$660,000 federal grant.

Some 187 homes are included in the airport's SIP, which is an element of its Part 150 Airport Noise Mitigation Program. The Jones Payne Group is managing the SIP.

### **Phoenix, from p. 9**

The City Council instructed them to bring future flight path changes to its attention within 30 days of learning about them, whether they be in draft or final stages.

Phoenix officials enlisted the aide of the Arizona congressional delegation for help in rolling back the new RNAV departure procedure.

Former congressman Ed Pastor (D-AZ), who retired from Congress at the end of December, managed to add language to the fiscal 2015 omnibus funding bill passed by Congress last month requiring FAA to submit a report to Congress within 90 days documenting FAA's progress in mitigating the noise problem caused by the RNAV departure (26 ANR 185).

Asked what progress FAA has made in addressing the noise problem caused by the new RNAV departure at Sky Harbor, Ian Gregor, Public Affairs Manager in FAA's Western Pacific Region, told ANR, "We are committed to working with the city to explore possible adjustments to the new procedures."

The congressional language directs FAA "to continue to work expeditiously to identify appropriate mitigation measures and to enforce adherence to flight procedures, unless specific flight modifications are necessary for safety purposes, in order to avoid impacts on nearby residential neighborhoods. The FAA is expected to provide a progress report on these measures to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment of this Act."

The 90-day period ends in mid-March.

## **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 Airport Noise 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.

**Commercial Passenger Aircraft that Fly Into Key West International Airport**

US Airways EMB-175



American Eagle EMB-175



Delta B737-700



American Eagle EMB-145



Delta CRJ-700



Silver Airways SF-340B

