

Part 150: Records of Approval

Manchester Airport, New Hampshire

Approved on 8/5/98

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Manchester Airport Authority sponsored an update of its 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 FAA for review in January 1997. The NEMs were determined to be in compliance on February 6, 1998. This determination was announced in the Federal Register on February 27, 1998, and included Figure 11.1, 1995 Existing Noise Exposure Map and Figure 15.1, Future Noise Exposure Map. Language in chapter 15 of the Part 150 update indicates that Figure 15.1 represents projected operations for the year 2004, at the earliest. However, due to substantial recent growth at the airport, both the airport operator and the FAA agree that this latter map accurately represents projected operations for the 5-year timeframe.

The Part 150 Study was closely monitored by an advisory committee that represented area municipalities, airport users, and community interests. A series of advisory committee meetings was held, with the airport's consultant presenting material and findings. Three public information meetings were held. The consultant addressed comments at all of these meetings and subsequent written comments as well.

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, presently and in the future.

The resultant program is described in detail in Sections 12.0 through 15.0 of the study. Section 12.0 analyzes alternative operational measures. Section 13.0 analyzes potential land use control measures. Section 14.0 evaluates administrative measures. Section 15.0 sets forth the Noise Compatibility Program. The program elements below summarize as closely as possible the airport operator's recommendations in the noise compatibility program and are cross-referenced to the program. The statements contained within the summarized recommendations and before the indicated FAA approval, disapproval, or other determinations do not represent the opinions or decisions of the FAA.

The approvals that follow include actions that the Manchester Airport Authority recommends be taken by FAA. It should be noted that these approvals indicate only that the actions would, if implemented, be consistent with the purposes of Part 150. These approvals do not constitute decisions to implement the actions. Later decisions concerning possible implementation of these actions may be subject to applicable environmental or other procedures or requirements.

2.0 PROGRAM ELEMENTS

2.1 NOISE ABATEMENT ELEMENTS

2.1.1 Continue to Designate Runway 17 as the Calm Wind Runway Until Runway 6-24 Becomes the Preferred Runway for Noise Abatement (Sections 12.2 and 15.2.1). Runway 17 is currently the preferred calm-wind runway for noise abatement. This measure would continue this practice.

Approved as voluntary. This measure would continue to provide noise relief within the 65DNL contour to more densely populated residential areas in Manchester to the north of the runway.

2.1.2 Establish a Short-Term Nighttime (10 P.M.-7 A.M.) Contra-Flow Procedure South of the Airport (Arrive Runway 35, Depart Runway 17) Until Runway 6-24 Becomes the Preferred Runway for Noise Abatement (Sections 12.2 and 15.2.1). Aircraft would depart to the south and arrive from the south as traffic permits during this period of light activity. The following minimums and field conditions would apply to the use of this measure: ceilings no less than 2600 feet AGL; wind 3 knots or less; visibility no less than 5 miles; runway clear and dry.

Approved as voluntary. This measure would also provide reduced noise exposure to more densely populated residential areas in Manchester to the north of the runway. The Air Traffic Control Tower has indicated that this contra-flow procedure can most realistically be expected to occur after midnight and before 5:30 A.M.

2.1.3 Shift Operations to Runway 6-24 and Favor Runway 6 for Takeoffs and Landings (Sections 12.2, 12.3 and 15.2.1). Approximately 35% of daytime and 50% of nighttime operations would occur on Runway 6-24. Approximately two-thirds of Runway 6-24 operations would occur on Runway 6. Aircraft would turn 20 degrees left of runway heading until reaching 3,000 feet above ground level. This would be implemented with ceilings no less than 3,500 feet and visibility no less than 5 miles. It would be effective on completion of the ongoing extension of Runway 6-24 and construction of Taxiway E connecting the terminal area with the Runway 6 end. At that time this runway would become the noise abatement runway, replacing Runway 17.

Approved as voluntary. This measure is described as the "cornerstone" of the noise abatement program and would result in 1,400 fewer people exposed to 65 DNL or higher, leaving 214 people exposed to this noise level (Alternatives 1 and 5 of Table 12.5). Implied in the runway utility specified above is the planned establishment or relocation of an ILS to serve Runway 6, which is to be addressed outside of the Part 150 process.

2.1.4 Continue Use of Noise Abatement Departure Procedures for Stage 2 Aircraft (Sections 12.3.2 and 15.2.1). This measure would continue a previously implemented measure. Pilots of Stage 2 turbojet general aviation aircraft would be requested to follow the amended National Business Aircraft Association's standard departure procedure for departures on Runways 6 and 17 and close-in departure procedure for departures on Runways 35 and 24, as outlined in the NBAA Noise Abatement program. Pilots of turbojet aircraft with a maximum certified gross takeoff weight of more than 75,000 pounds would be asked to follow the Noise Abatement Departure Profile (NADP) procedures as outlined in Advisory Circular 91-53A. The distant community NADP would be applicable to departures on Runways 6 and 17. The close-in community NADP would be applicable to departures on Runways 35 and 24.

Approved as voluntary. This measure would afford approximately 6-9 decibels of single-event noise reduction at appropriate distances for narrow-body Stage 2 aircraft and negligible single-event reduction for Stage 3 aircraft (0-2 decibels). Since Manchester Airport's current Stage 3 fleet is in excess of 60%, there would be no appreciable change in DNL contours.

2.2 LAND USE ELEMENTS

2.2.1 Rezone Vacant Parcels (Sections 13.3.3 and 15.2.2). Vacant parcels within the DNL 65dB contour (year 2000) that are zoned for residential uses would be rezoned to more compatible uses such as commercial or industrial.

Approved. While the majority of residentially zoned land within the DNL 65 dB noise contour is not vacant, one notable exception is a parcel that lies under the Runway 6 departure path that would be utilized more frequently.

2.2.2 Establish Noise Overlay Districts for the City of Manchester and Town of Bedford (Sections 13.3.3 and 15.2.2). Noise overlay districts for these two communities would be established for areas within the DNL 65dB noise contour.

Approved. Such districts could restrict noise-sensitive development such as schools that would otherwise be permitted by zoning.

2.2.3 Amend the Noise Overlay District for the Town of Londonderry (Sections 13.3.3 and 15.2.2). Londonderry implemented a Noise Overlay District as a recommendation of the last Noise Compatibility Program. The bounds of the District would be updated to conform to the new 5-year forecast map, Figure 15.1.

Approved.

2.2.4 Amend Existing Land Use Plans (Sections 13.4.3 and 15.2.2). Community comprehensive plans would be amended to ensure compatible land uses in the vicinity of the airport.

Approved.

2.2.5 Provide soundproofing for Noise-Sensitive Structures (Sections 13.7.4 and 15.2.2). This measure would continue soundproofing homes in the DNL 65dB noise contour and contiguous neighborhoods (Figures 15.3-15.5) in accordance with the new 5-year forecast map, Figure 15.1.

Approved.

2.5.6 Expand Building Codes to Require Noise Attenuation of Structures (Sections 13.8.3 and 15.2.2). The City of Manchester would amend its building code to require sound insulation in new construction within the DNL 65dB noise contour.

Approved.

2.5.7 Enact Noise Disclosure Regulations (Sections 13.9.1 and 15.2.2). The airport, with assistance from local real estate agents, would alert potential home buyers that a property is located within a noise zone (see land use elements 2.2.2 and 2.2.3) subject to aircraft noise.

Approved.

2.3 ADMINISTRATIVE ELEMENTS

2.3.1 Continue the Part 150 Update Public Involvement Program (Sections 14.3 and 15.2.3). The public involvement program (workshops, speakers, and newsletters) initiated for the study would be continued, managed by airport personnel.

Approved. This measure would help keep the public informed of noise abatement activities, especially the ongoing soundproofing program.

2.3.2 Distribute an Operational Noise Abatement Brochure (Sections 14.5 and 15.2.3). Such a brochure would include approach and departure paths over least noise sensitive areas, preferential runway information, emphasis on NBAA and FAA noise abatement procedures, and a general map indicating noise sensitive sites such as schools and hospitals.

Approved. This measure would inform pilots and controllers of the adopted noise abatement procedures.

2.3.3 Install Noise Abatement Signs on the Airport (Sections 14.6 and 14.2.3). Noise abatement signs would be posted in conspicuous places along taxiways informing pilots of general or specific noise abatement information.

Approved. Signage must not be misconstrued as mandatory air traffic control procedures. Signage would also need to comply with applicable Advisory Circular requirements.

2.3.4 Noise Program Review and Update (Sections 14.7 and 15.2.3). The program would have a comprehensive review every five years to verify noise levels and program effectiveness. When activity levels or operational changes indicate that there may be a change in the noise contours, new Noise Exposure Maps would be provided. If noise contours change, the Noise Compatibility Program would be updated as well.

Approved.