

---

**WATERBURY-OXFORD AIRPORT (OXC)  
AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE (AMPU) &  
FAR PART 150 NOISE STUDY**

---

*Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting #5  
September 18, 2006 7:00 p.m.  
Southbury Crowne Plaza*

Meeting Report

Advisory Committee Members Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Matthew Kelly	ConnDOT - OXC Manager
David Head	ConnDOT - Bureau of Policy & Planning
David Blackburn	Keystone Aviation
Gail Lattrell	FAA
John Silva	FAA
David Schweighofer	Executive Flight Services
Raymond Pietrorazio	Town of Middlebury
Brian Emerick	CT Department of Environmental Protection
Herman Schuler	Town of Oxford
Mark Cooper	Town of Southbury
Daniel Morely	CT Office of Policy & Management
Sandy Sanderson	Pilot - Executive Flight Services

Note: Each AC member was provided with copies of the agenda and slide presentation

Advisory Committee Members Not Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
August Palmer	Town of Oxford
Robert Bruno	ConnDOT - Bureau of Aviation & Ports
Peter Dorpalen	COGCNV

Other Attendees Signed-In:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Ned Hurle	ConnDOT - Bureau of Policy & Planning
Carmine Trotta	ConnDOT - Bureau of Policy & Planning
Kurt Walton	ConnDOT - Bureau of Policy & Planning
Robert Ike	ConnDOT - ROW

Paul McDonnell	Clough Harbour & Associates LLP (CHA)
Michael Kotlow	CHA
Rob Price	QED
Rob Adams	Landrum & Brown (L&B)
Laurel Stegina	Fitzgerald & Halliday (FHI)
Joe Healy	Resident
Jim Kelly	Resident

Meeting Purpose:

- Present the progress of both the AMPU and Noise Study to the AC members
- Present the Draft AMPU and ALP Drawing Set
- Present Draft Working Paper No. 2 of the Noise Study, including the Noise Abatement Alternatives, Land Use Alternatives, and Noise Monitoring Summary
- Discuss the “Candidate Alternatives” for inclusion in the Draft Noise Compatibility Program

Meeting Summary:

1. Laurel Stegina of FHI served as the meeting moderator.
2. The new manager of OXC, Matthew Kelly, introduced himself to the AC.
3. Paul McDonnell of CHA led the presentation to the AC members, which outlined the progress of both the AMPU and Noise Study since the last AC meeting. Key items to note include:
  - The next Public Information Meeting (PIM), which is going to be scheduled for late-October or November 2006, will consist of essentially the same presentation. At the PIM, the public will have the opportunity to comment on the Draft AMPU recommendations and the Noise Study “Candidate Alternatives.” The PIM will be advertised in local newspapers, on the study website ([www.oxcstudies.com](http://www.oxcstudies.com)) and in a study newsletter and ConnDOT press release. Study reports will be available for public review at least two weeks prior to the PIM.
  - A power plant is proposed to be constructed in the Town of Oxford, in a location approximately ½-mile to the east of OXC. Although the power plant is an ongoing issue in the local communities, it is not directly associated with the AMPU. The AMPU and Noise Study do not address noise or other issues associated with the power plant.
  - The AMPU forecasts show based corporate jets (CJ) increasing from 37 in 2003 to 72 by 2023 (the most growth of any aircraft type at OXC). Corporate jets are the fastest growing general aviation aircraft type in the country. The AMPU curtailed the CJ forecasts because the limited space at OXC will ultimately prevent the development of support facilities.

- There are no runway extensions proposed for OXC. The parallel Taxiway “B” extension is the primary airfield recommendation. The taxiway extension would impact approximately 3.8 acres of wetland. Preliminary options for mitigating the wetland impacts are presented in the Wetland Mitigation Plan (Appendix D of the AMPU).
- Other airfield recommendations include a medium intensity approach lighting system (MALSR) for Runway 36, as well as burying or lowering several of the Northeast Utilities electrical lines/towers beyond Runway 36. At this time, the FAA has indicated that funding is not available for the MALSR system. ConnDOT is currently discussing options with Northeast Utilities to appropriately realign the electrical lines/towers.
- As OXC is very limited in developable space, the landside recommendations focus on infilling available areas. The landside recommendations include hangar development, apron expansion, and service road construction.
- The 20-year Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) totals \$61.5 million. The ACIP extends over three phases, and includes the costs of new airport facilities, rehabilitation of existing facilities, equipment and vehicles, and the noise program. Funding of the ACIP projects includes FAA, State, and private sources.
- The Airport Layout Plan (ALP) Drawing Set for OXC consists of 7 drawings. The ALP must be approved by the FAA in order to implement the AMPU recommendations, and to receive federal funding assistance for the projects.
- The results of the Noise Monitoring activities were presented (Appendix A of the Noise Study). The Noise Monitoring provided sample single-event aircraft noise measurements, and verified that the highest aircraft noise levels were experienced in the Triangle Hills neighborhood.
- The Noise Study alternatives were also presented. The alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Noise Compatibility program are referred to as “Candidate Alternatives.” The Candidate Alternatives may be refined based on comments from the AC, the towns, and the public.
- Rob Adams of L&B presented the Noise Abatement Alternatives. Three Candidate Alternatives were identified.

**2A** – Area navigation procedures (RNAV) using Global Positioning System (GPS). RNAV involves flying predefined departure paths (GPS-guided), which are designed to reduce flyovers of residential areas.

**2B** – Implement the National Business Aviation Association (NBAA) close-in departure procedures. This involves performing specific departure procedures (e.g., thrust & flap settings) to reduce noise exposure in areas near the airport.

**3B** – Establish Runway 18 (departures to the south) as the preferential nighttime runway (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). Winds are generally calm during nighttime hours at OXC, thereby allowing aircraft to depart from either runway end. Overall, this alternative removes 12 homes from noise levels greater than 65 DNL (all within the Triangle Hills neighborhood).

→ Paul McDonnell of CHA presented both the “Preventative” and “Corrective” Land Use Alternatives. The following “Preventative” Land Use Alternatives were identified as Candidates:

**1C** – Retain existing commercial and industrial zoning districts within the vicinity of OXC.

**4** – Acquire undeveloped residentially-zoned property within the 60 and 65 DNL contours.

**5** – Require fair disclosure for residential purchases and transfers within OXC’s DNL contours.

**6** – Require avigation easements for the approval of new residential development within OXC’s DNL contours.

**7** – Implement subdivision regulations within OXC’s DNL contours, potentially requiring fair disclosure, avigation easements, and building code/noise level reduction (NLR) requirements.

**8** – Implement Noise Overlay Zoning to illustrate the requirements of the alternatives above, with varying requirements based on level of noise exposure.

→ The following “Corrective” Land Use Alternatives were identified as Candidates:

**1 – Voluntary** acquisition of homes within the vicinity of the Triangle Hills neighborhood (up to 71 homes). Fair Market Value (FMV) would be provided to homeowners, plus relocation assistance.

**3 – Voluntary** sound insulation of homes within the 60 and 65 DNL contours (acquire all homes within the 70 DNL contour).

Comments Received from AC:

→ Raymond Pietrorazio asked why the removal/lowering of the electrical towers beyond Runway 36 was recommended in the AMPU. Paul McDonnell explained that the towers are obstructions to the existing Runway 36 approach. The towers should be lowered in order to improve the safety and efficiency of the existing approach, and must be lowered to construct the MALSR system. Mr. Pietrorazio

suggested that the min/max elevations of the MALSRL light poles be added to Figure 5-2 of the AMPU.

- Some of the AMPU report figures inconsistently label facilities as proposed, under construction, or existing. Paul McDonnell explained that several new facilities have been constructed since the beginning of the AMPU process. The Final AMPU will accurately illustrate the status of facilities at OXC (to the extent possible).
- John Silva explained that although the DNL noise contours are shrinking from 2003 to 2008, contour growth may occur after 2008. As such, to address potential long-term noise impacts, the FAA may prefer acquisition of homes versus sound insulation.
- Raymond Pietrorazio questioned the forecasts of based corporate jets (CJ) at OXC. Ron Price explained that OXC is a growing facility that attracts aircraft from the larger metropolitan area (due to available hangar space and less expensive hangar costs). Mr. Price also explained that the CJ capacity of OXC is limited by developable space, which is why the CJ forecast gradually slows throughout the planning period. Mr. Price also explained that OXC is not generally considered a destination airport, and most of the CJ operations are conducted by based aircraft (not itinerant aircraft).
- An AC member asked why the AMPU environmental and noise analysis did not include the impacts associated with the recommended hangar developments. Paul McDonnell explained that the impacts of hangar development (i.e., additional aircraft & noise) are evaluated indirectly through the activity forecasts. The forecasts assume the increased aircraft activity associated with the full build-out of additional hangars and other facilities.
- Several concerns were raised about a 2003 Environmental Assessment (EA) for OXC considering non-aviation noise (e.g., Interstate 84). John Silva explained that cumulative noise impacts were considered in a previous EA, as required by National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations, but that FAA noise studies only consider airport-generated noise impacts. Thus, noise generated from highways, power plants, etc. are not evaluated in the OXC Noise Study.
- Raymond Pietrorazio expressed his concerns about the safety of Middlebury residents. He wanted to know what services OXC would provide to the Town if there was an aircraft accident. Matthew Kelly stated that OXC Airport has mutual aid agreements with the surrounding Towns and that OXC Airport Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF) personnel would respond to any accident in the area in combination with local services. The ARFF personnel currently train local fire fighters from surrounding communities. Mark Cooper stated that when there was an aircraft accident in Southbury last year, the ARFF personnel responded to the scene prior to Southbury emergency personnel.
- An AC member raised a question on very light jets (VLJ). VLJ are the smallest type of corporate jet aircraft, and are anticipated to be as quiet (if not quieter) than

many twin-engine turboprop aircraft. VLJ are considered in the AMPU forecasts under the “Small Business Jet” category.

Comments Received from Public:

- A Brookside resident asked why cumulative noise impacts (e.g., airport, highway, power plant) were not investigated in the Noise Study. As stated above, John Silva stated that FAA noise studies only investigate airport-generated noise. The limited Noise Monitoring activities provide some anecdotal data on ambient (i.e., non airport-generated) noise levels.
- A resident of Middlebury asked why alternatives for landings/approaches were not investigated in the Noise Study. Rob Adams explained that most runway approaches require aircraft to be lined-up straight with the runway for a defined distance. In the case of OXC, aircraft are directed to line-up straight with the runway far enough out that approach alternatives were not considered to be effective in reducing noise levels within areas exposed to high airport noise levels (e.g., greater than 65 DNL). Approaches also create less noise than departures. The OXC DNL contours do include approach noise.
- A Brookside resident requested that additional noise monitoring be conducted during winter months when there are less leaves on the trees. He also expressed concerns that certain homes in the Brookside development are on hilly areas, and may experience noise levels greater than shown in the DNL contours.
- A question regarding the Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) in Oxford was asked. Herman Schuler explained that Oxford is actively pursuing the FTZ, but the FTZ is not related to OXC, nor is it anticipated to use OXC. The FTZ is not intended for air cargo.
- Paul McDonnell expressed the importance of the public commenting on the “Candidate Alternatives” of the Noise Study. In particular, Mr. McDonnell requested that residents of Middlebury and the Triangle Hills neighborhood be informed and encouraged to attend the PIM and offer their opinions regarding potential property acquisition and noise insulation.
- Comments concerning either study can be submitted through [www.oxcstudies.com](http://www.oxcstudies.com).

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.