

## Part 150 Noise Exposure Map Checklist

### ***I. IDENTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION OF MAP DOCUMENT: Page Number***

- A. Is this submittal appropriately identified as one of the following, submitted under 14 CFR Part 150: Cover, Cover Letter
1. A NEM only N/A
  2. A NEM and NCP Yes
  3. A revision to NEMs which have previously been determined by FAA to be in compliance with Part 150? Yes
- B. Is the airport name and the qualified airport operator identified? Yes, Cover, Cover Letter
- C. Is there a dated cover letter from the airport operator which indicates the documents are submitted under Part 150 for appropriate FAA determination? Yes

### ***II. CONSULTATION: [150.21 (b), A150.(a)]***

- A. Is there a narrative description of the consultation accomplished, including opportunities for public review and comment during map development? Yes, J.1-J.2, Appendix
- B. Identification:
1. Are the consulted parties identified? Yes, J.1-J.2, Appendix
  2. Do they include all those required by 150.21 (b) and A150.105 (a)? Yes, J.1-J.2, Appendix
- C. Does the documentation include the airport operator's certification, and evidence to support it, that interested persons have been afforded adequate opportunity to submit their view, data, and comments during map development and in accordance with 150.21 (b)? Yes, Cover Letter, Large-scale Maps, Fly Sheet, Appendix
- D. Does the document indicate whether written comments were received during consultation and, if there were comments, that they are on file with the FAA region? Yes, J.1-J.2, Appendix

**III. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:** [150.21]

- A. Are there two maps, each clearly labeled on the face with year (existing condition year and 5-year)?  
Yes, D.97, I.5, Large-scale maps submitted separately
- B. Map currency:
1. Does the existing condition map year match the year on the airport operator's submittal letter? No<sup>1</sup>, D.95/D.97
  2. Is the 5-year map based on reasonable forecasts and other planning assumptions and is it for the fifth calendar year after the year of submission? Yes, I.5
  3. If the answer to 1 and 2 above is no, has the airport operator verified in writing that data in the documentation are representative of existing condition and 5-year forecast conditions as of the date of submission? Yes, Cover Letter
- C. If the NEM and NCP are submitted together:
1. Has the airport operator indicated whether the 5-year map is based on 5-year contours without the program vs. contours if the program is implemented? Yes, I.1-I.2
  2. If the 5-year map is based on program implementation:
    - a. are the specific program measures which are reflected on the map identified? Yes, I.2
    - b. does the documentation specifically describe how these measures affect land use compatibilities depicted on the map? Yes, I.24
  3. If the 5-year NEM does not incorporate program implementation, has the airport operator included an additional NEM for FAA determination after the program is approved which show program implementation conditions and which is intended to replace the 5-year NEM as the new official 5-year map? N/A

<sup>1</sup> Note: The base case year (2009) was used rather than 2014 (submittal date) because it was the last full year of operations under existing conditions (without construction closures). Therefore, it was considered to be the best year for the base case NEM.

**IV. MAP SCALE, GRAPHICS, AND DATA REQUIREMENTS:**

[A150.101, A150.105, 150.21 (a)]

- A. Are the maps of sufficient scale to be clear and readable (they must not be less than 1" to 2,000') and is the scale indicated on the maps? Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately
- B. Is the quality of the graphics such that required information is clear and readable? Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately
- C. Depiction of the airport and its environs.
1. Is the following graphically depicted to scale on both the existing condition and 5-year maps:
    - a. Airport boundaries Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately
    - b. Runway configurations with runway end numbers Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately
  2. Does the depiction of the off-airport data include:
    - a. A land use base map depicting streets and other identifiable geographic features Yes
    - b. The area within the 65 Ldn (or beyond, at local discretion) Yes
    - c. Clear delineation of geographic boundaries and the names of all jurisdictions with the 65 Ldn (or beyond, at local discretion) Yes
- D.
1. Continuous contours for at least the Ldn 65, 70, and 75? Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately
  2. Based on current airport and operational data for the existing condition year NEM, and forecast data for the 5-year NEM? Yes, Large-scale maps submitted separately

- E. Flight tracks for the existing condition and 5-year forecast time frames (these may be on supplemental graphics which must use the same land use base map as the existing conditioned and 5-year NEM, which are numbered to correspond to accompanying narrative?)  
Yes, D.83-D.93, same existing and future, Appendix
- F. Locations of any noise monitoring sites (these may be on supplemental graphics which must use the same land use base map as the official NEMs)  
Yes, C.31, C.33, Appendix
- G. Noncompatible land use identification:
1. Are noncompatible land uses within at least the 65 Ldn depicted on the maps?  
Yes, 1.5, 1.27-1.29, Large-scale maps submitted separately
  2. Are noise sensitive public buildings identified?  
N/A
  3. Are the noncompatible uses and noise sensitive public buildings readily identifiable and explained on the map legend?  
Yes, 1.5, 1.27-1.29, Large-scale maps submitted separately
  4. Are compatible land uses, which would normally be considered noncompatible, explained in the accompanying narrative?  
Yes, previous Residential Sound Insulation Program, 1.25

## V. NARRATIVE SUPPORT OF MAP DATA:

[150.21 (a), A150.1, A150.103]

- A.1. Are the technical data, including data sources, on which the NEMs are based adequately described in the narrative?  
Yes, B.1-B.2, D.1-D.105, Appendix
2. Are the underlying technical data and planning assumptions reasonable?  
Yes, B.1-B.2, D.1-D.105, Appendix
- B. Calculation of Noise Contours:
1. Is the methodology indicated?  
Yes, Cover Letter, D.1-D.105, Appendix
    - a. Is it FAA approved?  
Yes, C.38-C.40
    - b. Was the same model used for both maps?  
Yes
    - c. Has AEE approval been obtained for use of a model other than those which have previous blanket FAA approval?  
N/A
  2. Correct use of noise models:

- a. Does the documentation indicate the airport operator has adjusted or calibrated FAA-approved noise models or substituted one aircraft type for another? No
    - b. If so, does this have written approval from AEE? N/A
  - 3. If noise monitoring was used, does the narrative indicate that Part 150 guidelines were followed? Yes, C.27-C.40, D.2
  - 4. For noise contours below 65 Ldn, does the supporting documentation include explanation of local reasons? (Narrative explanation is highly desirable but not required by the Rule.) Yes, E.1, informational purposes
- C. Noncompatible Land Use Information:
- 1. Does the narrative give estimates of the number of people residing in each of the contours (Ldn 65, 70 and 75, at a minimum) for both the existing condition and 5-year maps? Yes, E.1-E.5, I.3
  - 2. Does the documentation indicate whether Table 1 of Part 150 was used by the airport operator? C.23-C.24, E.2
    - a. If a local variation to Table 1 was used:
      - (1) does the narrative clearly indicate which adjustments were made and the local reasons for doing so? N/A
      - (2) does the narrative include the airport operator's complete substitution for Table 1? N/A
  - 3. Does the narrative include information of self-generated or ambient noise where compatible/noncompatible land use identifications consider non-airport/aircraft sources? N/A
  - 4. Where normally noncompatible land uses are not depicted as such on the NEMs, does the narrative satisfactorily explain why, with reference to the specific geographic areas? N/A
  - 5. Does the narrative describe how forecasts will affect land use compatibility? E.1-E.7, I.1-I.3, I.24-I.29

**VI. MAP CERTIFICATIONS:** [150.21 (b), 150.21 (e)]

- A. Has the operator certified in writing that interested persons have been afforded adequate opportunity to submit views, data, and comments concerning the correctness and adequacy of the draft maps and forecasts? Yes, Cover Letter, J.1-.2, Appendix
- B. Has the operator certified in writing that each map and description of consultation and opportunity for public comment are true and complete? Yes, Cover Letter, Large-scale maps submitted separately