



Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (FAR) Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update

Study Input Committee Summary Notes
November 19, 2013 1:30 p.m. Airfield Maintenance Facility

<i>NAME</i>	<i>AFFILIATION</i>	<i>PRESENT</i> ✓
Staff and Consultants		
Trudy Wassel	ANC	✓
John Johansen	ANC	✓
Scott Lytle	ANC	✓
Katie Gage	ANC	✓
Teri Lindseth	ANC	✓
Mike Lee	ANC	✓
Ryk Dunkelberg	Barnard Dunkelberg & Company (Mead & Hunt)	✓
Kate Andrus	Barnard Dunkelberg & Company (Mead & Hunt)	✓
Rachel Jones	Barnard Dunkelberg & Company (Mead & Hunt)	✓
Mary Vigilante	Synergy Consultants	✓
Christian Valdes	Landrum & Brown	✓
 Committee Members		
Merle Akers	Turnagain Community Council	✓
Mary Lee	Citizen Representative	✓
Jim Seeley	LHD Pilot Association	✓
Bruce Greenwood	FAA Airports Division	✓
Breck Tostevin	Turnagain Community Council	✓
Thede Tobish	MOA	✓
Cathy Hammond	Citizen Representative	✓
David Chilson	FAA	✓
 Other		
Cathy Gleason		✓

Summary Notes

Mr. Dunkelberg began the seventh meeting of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update Input Committee by presenting the meeting agenda as follows:

- ▶ **Introduction**
- ▶ **Presentation and Discussion of Potential Noise Abatement Alternatives for Part 150 Study Update**

Introduction

Mr. Dunkelberg welcomed the committee back and gave a brief overview of the agenda for this meeting. He then identified the next steps for the Part 150 Study Update process. This meeting presented preliminary noise contours as well as a list of proposed recommended noise abatement alternatives developed based upon previous discussions and comments received from committee members.

Presentation of Alternatives Analysis

The Part 150 Team presented the results of the operational alternatives that were analyzed based on previous input from the committee. These alternatives included: Close In-Departure Procedure, Distant Departure Procedure, Noise Barriers, Ground Run-Up Enclosure, and Reduced Use of Reverse Thrust.

Mr. Dunkelberg presented the Close-In and Distant Departure Procedures and Reduced Use of Reverse Thrust, Christian Valdes presented the Noise Barrier alternatives, and Kate Andrus presented the Ground Run-Up Enclosure alternative.

Mr. Dunkelberg then addressed the results of two additional contour runs that were examined as part of separate ongoing studies, the Master Plan Update and a Study by the FAA looking at Required Navigational Performance (RNP) Procedures. The conditions examined under these two studies have a potential to change the noise exposure around the Airport, therefore, they were modeled in the Part 150 Study to determine their potential impact.

Next Steps

Mr. Dunkelberg explained the next steps, which include further refining the operational alternatives, as necessary, and starting on the analysis of potential land use alternatives, and facility change alternatives, and administrative alternatives. The next Study Input Committee Meeting will likely be in early 2014, and it will include a presentation of land use and administrative alternatives.

The following questions and comments occurred during the meeting:



Questions and Comments on Noise Abatement Alternatives

Close-In and Distant Departure Procedures

Question: If these procedures look at changes outside of the 65 DNL, why are these included in the Study when you mentioned that the Study generally looks at the alternatives that only affect the 65 DNL (i.e., if these alternatives can be included in the Study, why can't other alternatives that affect areas outside the 65 DNL (such as the Eagle River area).

Answer: These alternatives show the changes in the 60 DNL for informational purposes only. Because neither of these alternatives result in a substantial change in noise level within the 65 DNL noise contour, they would not be recommended as part of the Noise Compatibility Program. The 65 DNL is still the contour which the FAA looks at to determine whether an alternative would reduce noise, as the 65 DNL contour is the contour which is the federal threshold in a Part 150 Study for non-compatible land uses. Because Eagle River is well outside the 65 DNL, the alternatives that could reduce noise in those areas are under tower jurisdiction and would not be included as a recommendation in the Part 150 because it would not reduce noise within the federally defined threshold for non-compatible land uses.

Question: Where would this alternative produce an increase/decrease in noise? It seems like it could increase noise over certain communities.

Answer: The close-in and distant departure procedures have provided noise reduction at other airports. However, they would not provide as clear a benefit at ANC. This would be primarily due to the heterogeneous nature of the fleet mix at ANC, which causes the noise contours to not show the typical benefits from the procedures that are seen at other airports with more homogenous fleet mixes. This is why you see no substantial change in the number of houses within the 65 DNL in either alternative, but you are correct that you see a slight increase in the number of homes within the 60 DNL. Because there is no potential reduction in noise under either alternative, this alternative would not be recommended.

Noise Barriers

Question: Is the Sand Lake Berm the same as the potential South Airpark noise barrier location? Was a noise barrier parallel to Raspberry Road considered for these alternatives?

Answer: The existing berm in Sand Lake is in a different location than the South Airpark location that is being considered in the draft Noise Abatement Alternatives chapter. The Sand Lake Berm was intended to be a visual barrier and is not designed to reduce noise. The potential noise barrier in South Airpark would indeed be located parallel to Raspberry Road.



Question: Was the Eco parking lot considered for placement of a noise barrier?

Answer: No, because idling taking place in that parking lot would not be a major source of general aviation aircraft noise.

Comment: Regarding potential placement of a barrier very close to the homes near the Gravel Airstrip barrier location, those homeowners may not be in favor of such a barrier.

Comment: Those homes may have changed ownership in recent years, and so therefore we cannot say whether or not those homeowners would tend to be in favor of a barrier close to their homes.

Question: Would placement of a barrier close to the runway for the Gravel Airstrip location be considered acceptable in relation to aircraft operations taking place on that airstrip?

Answer: If the Gravel Airstrip barrier location were to be recommended to act as an obstruction near the noise source, it would need to be constructed so as to comply with the requirements of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 so that it would not impede or endanger aircraft operations on the airstrip.

Comment: Airborne noise from aircraft using the Gravel Airstrip would not be reduced by a barrier. I know from personal experience that the noise from the Gravel Airstrip can be extremely loud in my neighborhood (Turnagain), especially when one is outdoors.

Question: What is the process for community input, approval, and funding for a barrier? At what stage would the length of the barrier be determined?

Answer: If the construction of a barrier is a recommendation of the Part 150 Study, a Site Selection Study would then be performed in order to determine the best location and specifications for the barrier, including barrier length. Community input would be received on the Site Selection Study. Finally, funding would be acquired for barrier construction.

Ground Run-Up Enclosure (GRE)

Question: Why were Runways 25L or 25R not assessed for these GRE location alternatives?

Answer: The GRE locations that are examined in the alternatives were provided by the Airport. Two of the locations, at the ends of Taxiways Quebec and Juliet, are locations where maintenance run-ups currently take place. The other two potential GRE locations were thought



to be good options for a new GRE site that would be both convenient for taxiing aircraft and have a beneficial placement for noise reduction in the community.

Question: Where would the GRE be placed and how would the GRE be oriented? How could this affect noise to the community? It seems like locating the GRE furthest away from the communities would result in the greatest reduction.

Answer: GREs are placed facing into the wind. The analysis suggests that in all four proposed locations, the use of a GRE would reduce the number of people in the 60 Lmax by 100%. This does not mean that there will be no noise from run-ups, but rather, people at the higher noise levels will be exposed to greatly reduced noise levels. It is true that a location further away from the communities would likely result in a greater noise reduction; however, taxi time and operational factors, as well as Part 77 considerations must be taken into account as well.

Question: Does concentrating run-ups at a single GRE at an airport have a negative noise impact due to taxiing noise from aircraft travelling to and from that GRE?

Answer: The positive noise-reducing impact of the GRE outweighs any ground noise created from aircraft taxiing to the GRE, resulting in a noticeable reduction in noise for the communities surrounding the Airport.

Question: What is meant by the statement that all four potential GRE locations would result in a '100% reduction in population and housing units affected by the 60 Lmax?'

Answer: It means that no homes or people would any longer be within the 60 Lmax (Maximum Noise Level, or the highest noise level reached during a noise event) contour created by the GRE. These people would still be exposed to noise, but it would be greatly reduced.

Question: What would the process be for choosing a GRE location and having it approved?

Answer: If the construction of a GRE is a recommendation of the Part 150 Study, a Site Selection Study would then be performed in order to determine the best location for the GRE. The GRE would need to comply with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 regulations and would need to be placed and constructed so as not to impede the ability of the Air Traffic Control (ATC) Tower to see aircraft movement taking place inside the GRE. Additionally, operational considerations, such as taxi time, as well as the access to utilities need to be taken into consideration.



Reduced Use of Reverse Thrust

Question: Would the measure for reduced use of reverse thrust provide a noise reduction benefit to Eagle River, since Eagle River is outside of the 65 DNL noise contour?

Answer: Because Eagle River is outside of the 65 DNL noise contour, noise issues experienced there would be beyond the scope of the Part 150 Study, and should be addressed to the FAA Air Traffic Control (ATC). However, the issues identified in the Part 150 Study might help facilitate discussions between the Eagle River neighborhood and the ATC.

EXAMINATION OF ADDITIONAL STUDIES

Master Plan Update: Modified Preferential Runway Use

Question: Why is the 65 DNL noise contour for the Modified Preferential Runway Use to the east not larger? The increase in aircraft operations on Runway 7L that would occur under the Modified Preferential Runway Use alternative seems as though it would be high enough to expand the contour significantly in that direction.

Answer: The contours to the east of Runway 7L would not be made significantly larger because there would not be a large enough change in operations to the east during nighttime hours, which are weighted more heavily in the noise model. The DNL is annualized to reflect noise generated by aircraft operations for an entire year. While the contour is larger, there would need to be a much larger change in operations to create a contour as big as the 65 DNL noise contour from the previous Part 150 Study that occurred prior to any preferential runway use system being in place.

Comment: Can you please give some clarification on the numbers of additional operations not matching up under the Master Plan side?

Answer: The Modified Preferential Runway Use would not increase the number of operations at the Airport, but rather change the number of operations on the runways. In the slide, it indicated the primary changes in the runway use system, which is primarily an addition in departures on Runway 7L, and a decrease in departures on Runway 33. The numbers for those two runways were included in the presentation slide, but we realize this was confusing, as the numbers diverted from Runway 33 do not exactly equal those added to Runway 7L. The additional operations from these changes in runway use were diverted to the other runways based on how the tower would generally adjust the flow of operations due to the primary changes on Runway 7L and Runway 33.



Question: What is the time frame for examination of the Modified Preferential Runway Use alternative? Would the runway use percentages used to create the 2020 noise contours for this alternative be phased in over time?

Answer: The Modified Preferential Runway Use alternative will be discussed in detail at the Master Plan Public Open House on Wednesday, December 11, 2013. The 2020 contours show the different runway use percentages as they would be if they were fully implemented in 2020. However, these use percentages could be phased over time. More information about this alternative will be available at the December 11, 2013 Master Plan Public Open House.

Question: Why is the reduction in operations on 33 needed to add additional operations on 7L?

Answer: According to the Tower, there are jet blast issues when operating off of Runways 33 and 7L concurrently.

Required Navigation Performance (RNP) Procedure

Question: Is there currently a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-approved approach procedure on Runway 33?

Answer: No. This procedure would be brand new. There are no current instrument approaches to Runway 33. This procedure would be used only during poor weather conditions.

Question: Could the number of arrivals coming in from the south onto Runway 33 potentially be very high on a given day if there were poor weather conditions, thereby affecting neighborhoods south of the Airport?

Answer: Yes, this procedure would occur during poor weather conditions, so there could be certain days where the number of operations would be concentrated on Runway 33 due to their need to use the RNP approach in in-climate weather. There will be a Sand Lake Community Council meeting on December 2, 2013 to discuss the RNP procedure because Sand Lake would be the area primarily impacted by this procedure.

General Questions

Question: What should the Study Input Committee (SIC) members focus on in order to prepare for the next meeting?

Answer: The next SIC meeting will focus on land use and administrative alternatives.



Question: Why is the list of noise abatement alternatives so short, in comparison with other airports?

Answer: Noise is not nearly as much of an issue at ANC as at many other airports, primarily due to the success of the preferential runway use system. The preferential runway system that is currently in place, which directs aircraft operations over water whenever possible, has greatly reduced the number of homes within the 65 DNL noise contour. Many other airports that do not have a preferential runway system have a much greater noise impact on surrounding neighborhoods for that reason, and therefore have more alternatives that could make a difference in the noise exposure.

Question: Why were operational measures for general aviation aircraft not assessed in detail in this study? Will voluntary measures be examined for general aviation aircraft? There is a wide range in noise levels created by different general aviation aircraft.

Answer: Measures to reduce noise from general aviation aircraft would be mainly of a voluntary nature, such as Fly Quiet and Pilot Awareness programs. These programs can be recommended within the Part 150 Study but the actual implementation/product (such as brochures, outreach, etc.) would be developed outside of this Part 150 Study.

Comment: Certain issues addressed in reports such as this Study or identified during discussions are not sufficiently addressed or enforced. These issues include the fact that Fly Quiet program implementation responsibility rests with the pilots and is not enforced, as well as high turnover of staff working in the Air Traffic Control (ATC) Tower.

Answer: Implementation is an important element that occurs subsequent to the Part 150 Study. Development and continuation of the implementation program is important and will take participation of stakeholders. It is important to note that many of these recommendations are voluntary based on legal requirements and therefore the Airport does not have authority to enforce many of these elements. Therefore implementation and success of Fly Quiet Programs is primarily based on outreach/education in the community.