



Memorandum

US Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration

Subject: ACTION: FAR Part 150 Noise
Compatibility Program for Danbury
Municipal Airport, Connecticut

Date: August 16, 1988

From: Associate Administrator for Airport
System Development, ARP-I

Reply to
Attn. of:

To: Administrator

Attached for your action is the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) for the Danbury Municipal Airport under FAR Part 150. The New England Region, in conjunction with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) headquarters, has evaluated the program and recommends action as set forth below.

On February 24, 1988, the FAA determined that the noise exposure maps for Danbury Municipal Airport are in compliance with the requirements of section 103(a) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (ACT) and Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations Part 150. Concurrent with this action, the FAA made notification in the Federal Register of the formal 180-day review period for Danbury's proposed program under the provisions of section 104(a) of the Act and FAR Part 150. The 180-day formal review period needs to be completed on or before August 22, 1988. If the program is not acted on by the FAA by that date, it will be automatically approved by law with the exception of flight procedures.

The Danbury Municipal Airport NCP describes the current and future noncompatible land uses. The NCP recommends twelve (12) measures to remedy existing noise problems and prevent future noncompatibilities. These measures are grouped into two categories: Airport Operational Measures (4) and Land Use Control Measures (8). Each measure is identified in the attached Record of Approval by category with page reference given for location in the NCP.

Ten measures are recommended for approval. One airport operational measure, IIA is recommended for approval in part and disapproval in part. Another airport operational measure IIA 4 is recommended for disapproval in its entirety. One land use control measure B.1 (land acquisition outside Ldn 65) is also recommended for disapproval.

The Associate Administrator for Policy and International Aviation, the Chief Counsel, and I have concurred with the recommendations of the New England Region.

If you agree with the recommended FAA determinations, you should sign the "approve" line on the attached New England Region's letter. I recommend your approval.


Robert L. Donahue

Attachments



Memorandum

US Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration

Subject: **Action:** Recommendation for
Approval of the Danbury Municipal Airport,
Connecticut, Noise Compatibility Program

Date: July 14, 1988

From: Regional Administrator, ANE-1

Reply to
Attn. of:

To: The Administrator
THRU: The Deputy Administrator

On March 21, 1988, a notice was published in the Federal Register announcing Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) determination of compliance, for the noise exposure maps for Danbury Municipal Airport, Danbury, Connecticut, under Section 103 (a) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 ("the Act"). Coincident with that determination, we began the formal 180-day review period (from our determination date of February 24) for Danbury's proposed noise compatibility program under the provisions of Section 104(a) of the Act. That program must be approved or disapproved by the FAA within 180 days or it shall be deemed to be approved as provided for in Section 104(b) of the Act. The last date for such approval or disapproval is August 22, 1988.

We have reviewed and evaluated the proposed noise compatibility program and have concluded that it is consistent with the intent of the Act and that it meets the standards set forth in FAR Part 150 for such programs. The requirements of Part 150 were itemized in a checklist (Attachment 1) which was used to ensure that all required items were present in the proposed program. Our review of each item is shown in the evaluation narrative (Attachment 2).

The evaluation narrative, checklist, and documentation submitted by city of Danbury were reviewed by Airports, Air Traffic, and Flight Standards Divisions, and by Regional Counsel and the Regional Noise Abatement Technical Committee. No substantive comments have been received from other participants in the study, nor from other interested parties. Each proposed action in Danbury's noise compatibility program was then reviewed and evaluated on the basis of effectiveness and potential conflict with federal policies and prerogatives. These include safe and efficient use of the nation's airspace and undue burden on interstate commerce.

Our approval or disapproval recommendations on each of these proposed actions are described in the Record of Approval (Attachment 3). Each proposed action is described in detail in **Volume 2: Noise Compatibility Program: Danbury Municipal Airport Noise Compatibility Program**.

/s/

Arlene B. Feldman

Attachments (3)

Concur X	/s/	
Nonconcur	Associate Administrator for Airport System Development, ARP-1	
8/1/88		
Concur X	/s/	
Nonconcur	Associate Administrator for Policy and International Aviation, API-1	
8/4/88		
Concur X	/s/	
Nonconcur	Chief Counsel, AGC-1	8/16/88
Approve V	/s/	
Disapprove	Administrator, AOA-1	8/22/88

ATTACHMENT 3

Record of Approval Danbury Municipal Airport Danbury, Connecticut Noise Compatibility Program

I. Introduction

The city of Danbury sponsored an Airport Noise Compatibility Planning Study (under a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grant), in compliance With Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150. The Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) and its associated Noise Exposure Maps (NEM) were developed concurrently and submitted to the FAA for review and approval on July 9, 1987. The NEM was approved on February 24, 1988. This determination was announced in the Federal Register on March 21, 1988.

The FAR Part 150 study was closely monitored by an Advisory Committee comprising membership from the city of Danbury (including the Airport Commission), Airport Administration, Connecticut DOT, the Department of Environmental Protection, airport fixed base operators, citizens from Danbury and Ridgefield, and the FAA. A series of meetings were held between the consultant performing the study and the Advisory Committee. A public information meeting was held on April 15, 1987. The consultant addressed comments at this meeting and other written comments subsequently received.

The study focused on defining an optimum set of noise and land use mitigation measures to improve compatibility between airport operations and community land use, and to continue good compatibility into the future.

The resultant program is described in detail in chapters 6 and 7 of the NCP report. Chapter 6 describes airport operational measures, including noise abatement air traffic pattern procedures, a preferential runway program, continued restriction of nighttime touch-and-go activity by non-based aircraft, and continued prohibition of intersection and formation takeoffs. Chapter 7 describes land use measures to acquire property rights

within the runway 08 clear zone and primary surface, adoption of the Airport Development Zone, notification to the Airport Administrator of proposed subdivisions or special exemption land uses, and revision of Danbury zoning to eliminate that area of the multi-family overlay district off the eastern end of runway 08-26. The FAA actions regarding these items are described below, along with the NCP (volume 2) page references for each recommendation.

II. Program Elements

A. Airport Operations Measures

1. Noise Abatement Pattern Procedures (page 2.2). These procedures reduce noise exposure by raising the traffic pattern 200 feet (to 1700 feet) above mean sea level) and by guiding aircraft over less sensitive areas.

FAA Action: Approved.

2. Preferential Runway Program (page 2.4). This program increases the use of runway 17, shifting activity from runway 26.

FAA Action: Approved.

3. Prohibition of Nighttime Touch-and-Go Activity by Non-Based Aircraft. (page 2.4). An existing restriction on nighttime touch-and-go traffic by all aircraft, between sunset and 7 a.m. on weekdays and between sunset and 9 a.m. from Friday afternoon through Sunday, is revised to apply only to non-based aircraft. This revision will reduce noise exposure slightly by eliminating full-stop landings currently conducted by based aircraft for night training purposes.

FAA Action: Approved in part. Disapproved in part.

Lifting the existing restriction on based aircraft is approved. Continuing the restrictions for all but non-based aircraft is disapproved. This part of the restriction is not based on the relative noisiness of specific aircraft, but favors based airport users over non-based airport users without regard to noise and is, therefore, unjustly discriminatory. In addition, the airport operator indicates that restricting touch-and-go operations for based aircraft was counterproductive in that it resulted in more noise because based aircraft users would simply do full stop landings, which caused more noise on takeoff. It is not unreasonable to assume that a restriction on non-based users would produce the same result. Therefore, FAA believes the measure also does not meet the purposes of Part 150 for reducing noise.

4. Prohibition of Intersection and Formation Takeoffs (page 2.4). The existing prohibition on intersection and formation takeoffs is continued.

FAA Action: Disapproved. As stated by the airport proprietor on page 2.21, this measure provides no noise benefit. Therefore, it is disapproved for purposes of FAR Part 150. This does not constitute an FAA determination with respect to the operational safety of these practices.

B. Land Use Control Measures

1. Acquisition of Property Rights Within the 08 Clear Zone and Primary Surface (page 2.7).

FAA Action: Disapproved. The study recommends outright acquisition of included portions of undeveloped parcels within the runway 08 clear zone and primary surface, as well as outright acquisition of two parcels currently developed in residential use. Our recommendation of disapproval is based solely on the fact that none of these parcels are within the Ldn 65 noise contour, and are not otherwise addressed as **noise** incompatible within the scope or the NCP. The only noise-related justification that the study offers is that the land is impacted by the only portion of the forecast Ldn 60 contour that falls off of airport property. However, since the land is within the clear zone or primary surface, we recommend acquisition for development purposes as stated in the Master Plan because the existing or permitted land uses are incompatible with airport/aircraft operations.

2. Adoption of the Airport Development (AD40) Zone (page 2.7). This zone was first proposed in 1982 and would revise local zoning by permitting certain uses within the zone. Other uses would be permitted by Special Exception or Special Permit. Density, area, height, yard and landscape requirements are specified. Refer to figure 2.4 of the study for details.

FAA Action: Approved.

3. Notification, by the Danbury Planning Department, to the Airport Administrator of Proposed Subdivisions or Special Exception Uses in the Airport Protection District (page 2.7). The intent is to include the Airport Administrator in the land use review process to ensure that those making land use control decisions have all relevant information with regard to areas where aircraft noise may be a problem.

FAA Action: Approved.

4. Revised Danbury Zoning Regulations to Redefine the "MFD" (Multi-Family) Overlay District to Eliminate the Area Off the Eastern End of Runway 8-26 (page 2.13). This area is one of the most frequently overflown, with aircraft flying at relatively low altitudes because of rising terrain.

FAA Action: Approved.

C. Implementation, Monitoring and Review Actions.

1. Revised Noise Complaint Recording Procedures (page 2.13). These procedures will simplify and standardize information gathering.

FAA Action: Approved.

2. Continuation of Citizens' Advisory Committee (page 2.13). A Part 150 Advisory Committee was formed for the study. This recommendation would re-initiate the

Advisory Committee which met prior to the study. The Committee would monitor progress on study implementation.

FAA Action: Approved.

3. Quantitative Evaluation of Changes in Cumulative Noise Exposure (page 2.16).

Follow-up noise exposure would be computed each year, utilizing an exposure (EXP) metric which, while not directly related to changes in Ldn, is a simple, effective means of estimating that the contours are expanding or contracting, without the expense and difficulty of rerunning the computer noise model.

FAA Action: Approved.

4. Program Publicity (page 2.19). The Airport Administrator will request changes to applicable publications, The Airport Administrator will also mail descriptions of noise abatement procedures to relevant aviation contacts.

FAA Action: Approved.