
WATERBURY-OXFORD AIRPORT (OXC) FAR PART 150 NOISE STUDY

*Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting #6
June 13, 2007 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
Robert Bruno	ConnDOT - Bureau of Aviation & Ports
John Silva	FAA
Brian Emerick	CT Department of Environmental Protection
Raymond Pietrorazio	Town of Middlebury
Aaron Allen (for David Blackburn)	Keystone Aviation
Joseph Perrelli (for Peter Dorpalen)	COGCNV
Ben Baker	OXC Tower Manager

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>
Gail Lattrell	FAA
August Palmer	Town of Oxford
Mark Cooper	Town of Southbury
David Schweighofer	Executive Flight Services
Sandy Sanderson	Pilot - Executive Flight Services
Daniel Morely	CT Office of Policy & Management

Other Attendees Signed-In:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Carmine Trotta	ConnDOT - Bureau of Policy & Planning
Kurt Walton	ConnDOT - Bureau of Policy & Planning
Diane Bray	ConnDOT - Bureau of Policy & Planning
Derrick Ireland	ConnDOT - Rights Of Way
James I. Mason	ConnDOT - Rights Of Way

Paul McDonnell	Clough Harbour & Associates LLP (CHA)
Michael Kotlow	CHA
Laurel Stegina	Fitzgerald & Halliday (FHI)
Jim Kelly	Resident
Bill Gaynor	Resident
Paul Lavallee	Resident
Sandra Lavallee	Resident
Lori Tooth	Resident
Charles Tooth	Resident
Greg Escedy	Resident
Lynn Wilczewski	Resident
Tammie Fiske	Resident
Ron Brandes	Resident
Alicia Brandes	Resident
Quannah Leonard	Reporter - Republican-American

Meeting Purpose:

- ➔ Present the progress of the Noise Study to the AC members
- ➔ Present Draft Working Paper No. 3 of the Noise Study, which includes the Draft Noise Compatibility Program

Meeting Summary:

1. Laurel Stegina of FHI served as the meeting moderator.
2. David Head of ConnDOT stated that a Public Information Meeting (PIM) will be held on Wednesday, June 20, 2007. The PIM will consist of essentially the same presentation as presented here tonight. Study documents are available on www.oxcstudies.com.
3. Paul McDonnell of CHA led the presentation to the AC members, which mainly outlined the progress of the Noise Study since the last AC meeting. Key items to note include:
 - ➔ The Airport Master Plan Update (AMPU) depicts the recommended facilities at OXC over the next 20 years. The AMPU is currently being reviewed by the FAA and approval is anticipated this summer.
 - ➔ The study team is currently working on the final task of the Noise Study – the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP). A Draft NCP (Noise Study Working Paper No. 3), which includes the preliminary recommendations of the Noise Study, has been developed and is being presented here tonight. The Draft NCP includes recommendations for Noise Abatement (NA), Land Use (LU), and Implementation Measures (IM), as described below. Note that the preliminary recommendations may be revised based on comments from local towns and the public.

→ The process of narrowing down the Noise Study alternatives was discussed. Originally 14 Noise Abatement (NA) Alternatives were identified and evaluated – these were described as a “long list” of alternatives. The NA Alternatives primarily consist of changes in the way aircraft operate (e.g., flight tracks, runway use, thrust settings, flight restrictions). Of the 14 NA Alternatives, three were selected as NA Candidate Alternatives – these were described as a “short list” of alternatives with the potential to be included in the Draft NCP. All three NA Candidate Alternatives were included in the Draft NCP, as described below.

NCP Measure NA-1 – Create Area Navigation (RNAV) Overlay Procedures for all existing and proposed departure paths. RNAV would reduce the dispersion (i.e., variation in flight tracks) of aircraft flight tracks near noise sensitive areas through the use of on-board Global Positioning System (GPS) equipment.

NCP Measure NA-2 – Implement the National Business Aviation Association (NBAA) Noise Abatement Close-In Departure Procedures. This operational measure would reduce noise exposure in areas near OXC through the use of specific aircraft takeoff thrust and flap settings.

NCP Measure NA-3 – Establish Runway 18 (departures to the south) as the Preferential Nighttime Use Runway (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). This measure would provide the most noise reduction for residents to the north of OXC (e.g., the Triangle Hills neighborhood) by sending nighttime departures to the south.

The three preliminary NA measures were combined to form the year 2008 Draft NCP contour, which represents “Mitigated Conditions.” The table below compares the year 2008 Baseline contour (representing “Unmitigated Conditions”) to the year 2008 Draft NCP contour. As shown, under “Mitigated Conditions,” a total of 27 homes are removed from incompatible noise levels.

<i>HOMES WITHIN DNL NOISE CONTOURS</i>		
<i>DNL Contour</i>	<i>2008 Unmitigated</i>	<i>2008 Mitigated</i>
65 (& Greater)	58	36
70 (& Greater)	5	0

→ Originally 17 Land Use (LU) Alternatives were identified and evaluated – these were described as a “long list” of alternatives. The LU Alternatives consist of changes in surrounding zoning to prevent future noise exposure, or corrective measures to remove homes from incompatible noise levels (e.g., voluntary acquisition). Of the 17 LU Alternatives, eight were selected as LU Candidate Alternatives – these were described as a “short list” of alternatives with the potential to be included in the Draft NCP. Four of the LU Candidate Alternatives were included in the Draft NCP, as described below.

NCP Measure LU-1 – Maintain Existing Commercial/Industrial Zoning within two miles of the OXC property line. An OXC representative should review proposed zoning changes for airport compatibility.

NCP Measure LU-2 – Fair Disclosure of airport noise required within the NCP contours. This measure would require sellers to inform buyers of the property’s airport noise exposure.

NCP Measure LU-3 – Establish Subdivision Regulations for new residential development within the NCP contours. This measure would include Noise Level Reduction (NLR) requirements for new home construction, in addition to aviation easements.

In order for NCP Measures LU-1, LU-2, and LU-3 to remain recommendations of the Noise Study, the surrounding towns must demonstrate an interest in their implementation.

NCP Measure LU-4 – Voluntary Acquisition of Homes within the 65-70 DNL contour, plus a select number of homes outside the 65 DNL for community cohesion and equitable planning purposes.

- ➔ Derrick Ireland of ConnDOT Office of Rights of Way described the voluntary acquisition process as it pertains to the *Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act*. Homeowners would be offered Fair Market Value (FMV) for their homes. FMV is determined based on providing a comparable home in the area, but not within the impact area. In addition, expenses for relocation would be covered if voluntary acquisition is pursued.
- ➔ Four NCP Implementation Measures (IM) were described. These are actions that are taken to facilitate the execution of the NCP recommendations.

NCP Measure IM-1 – Establish Noise Abatement Committee.

NCP Measure IM-2 – Develop Website for Public Outreach.

NCP Measure IM-3 – Publish Recommended Noise Abatement Procedures in Pilot Guides.

NCP Measure IM-4 – Provide for Updates to the NCP Measures and Noise Contours.

- The preliminary Implementation Schedule for the Draft NCP recommendations is shown below.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	
Noise Abatement Measures: NA-1 (RNAV) NA-2 (NBAA) NA-3 (Runway 18 Nighttime Use)	To be implemented by ConnDOT, upon FAA approval of the Noise Study.
Land Use Measures: LU-1 (Maintain Existing Commercial/Industrial Zoning) LU-2 (Fair Disclosure) LU-3 (Subdivision Regulations)	If accepted/approved by the towns, implementation could begin upon FAA approval of the Noise Study and at a locally decided schedule.
Land Use Measure: LU-4 (Voluntary Acquisition)	Upon FAA approval of the Noise Study, an implementation plan and environmental documentation would be developed by ConnDOT in 2008-2009. Initial voluntary acquisition could then begin in 2010. Full implementation is expected to take 5 or more years.

Comments/Discussion:

- What happens if the contours change? Do you have to continually revise the area in which the LU measures apply?

Discussion: Yes, any updates to the contours would carry over to the LU measures. However, contour updates only occur as needed or as part of a Noise Study Update, so changes would not occur frequently.

- When you put together the Final NCP contour, will it reflect future conditions (five or more years out)?

Discussion: Yes, the Final NCP contour will be updated to reflect future conditions. This is done to make sure that the plan includes all persons currently impacted, as well as those with the potential to be impacted in the coming years.

- Raymond Pietrorazio asked who is responsible for conducting the environmental analysis of the NCP measures.

Discussion: The environmental analysis would be conducted by ConnDOT, either in-house or through a consultant. John Silva stated that the environmental analysis effort should be minimal in cost and would require FAA approval.

- Raymond Pietrorazio asked if NA-3 (Runway 18 nighttime departures) is safe for aircraft.

Discussion: Matthew Kelly stated that wind conditions are typically calm at night, so pilots can takeoff or land on either runway end. Ben Baker stated that wind conditions tend to be similar all year long, and do not differ seasonally.

- Jim Kelly questioned why sound insulation was not included in the Draft NCP measures, as this could benefit homes in Brookside and Steeple Chase.

Discussion: John Silva stated that congress prohibits the FAA from funding insulation and acquisition in areas exposed to noise levels less than 65 DNL, unless it is for community cohesion and equitable planning purposes. The sound insulation alternatives were not intended to insulate all homes within the 60-65 DNL contour, only those in proximity to the Triangle Hills neighborhood for community cohesion and equitable planning purposes. Sound insulation was not included in the Draft NCP recommendations because voluntary acquisition is a more suitable recommendation for an area exposed to such high airport noise levels.

- For LU measures (Table 5-5 in Noise Study Working Paper No. 3), the cost to local governments would not be “minimal,” they would lose money.

Discussion: The information in Noise Study Working Paper No. 3 only considers the “cost to implement,” not the costs associated with loss of tax revenue.

- If Fair Disclosure is implemented, it would further reduce the values of our homes. We hope the towns know that this will upset residents.

Discussion: This comment was noted – awaiting official comments from towns.

- Our lives are on hold – we cannot sell our homes, undertake renovations, etc. How long is going to be before we are acquired?

Discussion: A timeline for acquisition has not been established. Once federal funding for the acquisition begins, it could take approximately five years to fully implement the program. ConnDOT is working to minimize the acquisition schedule.

- The suggestion about the “Runway Shift Towards Oxford” was discussed.

Discussion: The study team did investigate this as a potential method for removing the Triangle Hills neighborhood from incompatible noise levels; however, due to several factors (steep terrain, property availability, wetlands and floodplains, Larkin State Trail, electrical transmission lines, and cost), ConnDOT determined that this was not a feasible option.

- I’m an assessor and I know that if you remove the homes in the Triangle Hills neighborhood from the town tax rolls, it is going to increase everyone else’s taxes.

Discussion: Comment noted – this issue would be considered in the separate environmental review and Implementation Plan.

- The issue about the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) as a “crash zone” was mentioned by a member of the public.

Discussion: The RPZ is a defined area beyond each runway end. For land use compatibility, noise, and safety reasons, the FAA considers homes to be an incompatible land use within RPZs. In portions of RPZs that are controlled (i.e., owned) by an airport, homes and places of public assembly are prohibited. In portions of RPZs that are not controlled by an airport, the land use standards have recommendation status (see FAA AC 150-5300-13, *Airport Design*, Paragraph

212.C.). The FAA recommends that airports acquire homes and property within RPZs, where feasible.

- ➔ What about “multi path” noise caused by echoes from hills and valleys – just because I’m not in the noise contour doesn’t mean that I don’t experience significant noise levels.

Discussion: The FAA only considers noise exposure as “line of sight” or straight from the aircraft to the receptor (i.e., home). Although the Integrated Noise Model (INM) does consider regional topography to some degree, such echoes are not incorporated. The Noise Study also reviewed average peak and single-event noise levels at locations beyond the contour areas (see Appendix A).

- ➔ Can you please hold the meeting first and then tell the press? Their articles further reduce the values of our homes – nobody wants to move here now.

Discussion: Comment noted – ConnDOT/FAA policy requires us to advertise all public meetings.

- ➔ If implemented at OXC, who would enforce the NA measures?

Discussion: These measures and associated aircraft procedures would be published in pilot guides. The majority of pilots want to be good neighbors and are conscious of the sensitivity of the surrounding areas. The Airport Manager would work with pilots and businesses to make sure they are aware of the NA measures. John Silva stated that such measures have typically been successful at airports where they have been implemented.

- ➔ Raymond Pietrorazio asked if NA-2 (NBAA procedures) is safe for aircraft.

Discussion: John Silva explained that these procedures have been implemented in many locations and are shown to be safe.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.