



GENERAL
MITCHELL
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**FAR Part 150 Study Advisory Committee
September 15, 2004
Meeting Summary**

Members Present

Tony Adyniec
Al Pijoda
Raymond Glowacki
Edward Richardson
Ralph Voltner
Dennis Bidlencik
Thomas Irwin
Wendy Hottenstein
Mark Hyde
Otto Dobnick
(Representing Ken Yunker)
C. Barry Bateman
Pat Rowe

Members Absent:

Thomas Prince
Martin Martinetti
Elizabeth Mann
Roseann Dieck
Michael Helgeson
LeAnn Launstein
Pat Stoner
Douglas Drescher
Sandy DePotty
Steven Ford
Peter Beitzel
Don Webb

Consultant Team Present:

Ryk Dunkelberg
Brad Rolf
Paul Dunholter
Helen Dixon

Others Present:

Ryan McCue
Dashal Young

14th Supervisory District
19th Supervisory District
Chair – Noise Advisory Committee
City of Milwaukee
City of St. Francis - Administrator
Northwest Airlines
Midwest Airlines
Wisconsin Dept. of Transportation
FAA – MKE ATCT
Southeast Wisconsin Regional
Planning Commission
GMIA – Airport Director
GMIA – Public Relations

11th Supervisory District
17th Supervisory District
18th Supervisory District
23rd Supervisory District
24th Supervisory District
City of Oak Creek
City of South Milwaukee
Signature Flight Support
FAA – MSP – ADO
128th Air Refueling Wing
Metro Milw. Assoc. of Commerce
440th Airlift Wing

Bernard Dunkelberg & Co.
Bernard Dunkelberg & Co.
BridgeNet International
Dixon & Company

Milwaukee County Supervisor
Milw. County Exec. office

Ryk Dunkelberg opened the second meeting of the General Mitchell International Airport (GMIA) Part 150 Study Advisory Committee Meeting at 2:10 pm. with an introduction of the consultant team. Mr. Dunkelberg explained that the Part 150 Study was delayed due to the FAA contemplating the release of a new Integrated Noise Model (INM). Although the new model has not yet been released, the consultant was able to get permission from the FAA to incorporate some of the components of the new model into the GMIA noise study. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that, in some ways, the delay was a positive because those components of the new model will allow us to prepare a more accurate picture of specific conditions at the GMIA.

Mr. Dunkelberg presented an overview of the agenda for the meeting. Items for discussion included:

- Working Paper One – Inventory Chapter - Questions and Comments
- Working Paper Two – Forecasts, Noise Methodology and DNL Contours
- Working Paper Three – Noise Analysis
- What’s Next – Public Information Meeting # 1 –September 22, 2004
- Land Use / Alternatives Development
- Questions / Comments

Mr. Dunkelberg began the power-point assisted discussion of aviation forecasts by stating that the reason that aircraft activity data is important for the existing year, calendar year 2003, and for our short term forecast for 2009, is because noise contours are generated by the aircraft numbers and the aircraft types that operate at the airport. An operation means either a take-off or a landing. A take-off and a landing consist of two operations. The fleet mix of those aircraft also determines the size of the noise contour.

In 2003, General Mitchell International Airport (GMIA) had approximately 211,000 operations. The five year forecast for future operations shows an increase to approximately 235,000 operations. This forecast is based on Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) numbers and methodology. The TAF is a national forecast developed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Initially, GMIA was going to use the forecast developed by the GMIA Master Plan; however, subsequently the FAA published the new 2009 TAF which predicts slower growth of aircraft operations at most airports in the country, including GMIA. That prediction is based on the effects of September 11th, 2001 and the subsequent airline industry reductions that have occurred since then. Because the GMIA Master Plan forecasts for operations were inconsistent with the FAA forecast, the Airport determined that the current Part 150 noise study should be based on the new TAF numbers and methodology to ensure FAA concurrence.

Mr. Voltner asked when the decision was made to use the FAA TAF for the GMIA study. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that the decision was made about 3 months ago. Mr. Hyde asked how accurate, from a historical perspective, is the TAF. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that, on the average, he felt the TAF’s are little low and a little behind. For instance, he has seen

situations where what might have been predicted for 2009 may now occur in 2008 or 2007.

Mr. Richardson asked why noise contours were not based on all factors other than just the number of operations. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that noise contours are based on general airborne operations numbers, however, aircraft ground traffic such as taxiing and ground run-ups, (including powering up for departure) are also taken into consideration and reflected in the noise model. Mr. Dobnick of the Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWRPC) stated that his agency had closely followed the GMIA Master Plan. He stated that SWRPC's internal study closely matched the GMIA Master Plan predictions and forecasts. Mr. Dobnick said that because the FAA TAF traditionally has been on the lower side he encouraged the FAA to develop a standardized model for every airport that reflects local unique characteristics and situations. Mr. Dunkelberg responded that the FAA states that if a Part 150 study shows a significant difference in operations (10% or more) from what was forecasted by the TAF, the study would likely be sent back for further review. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that in the last five Part 150 studies he has been involved in at various airports across the country where noise contours and noise abatement packages have been submitted to the FAA for approval, the FAA has said they will not accept the forecasts and directed the airports to redo the noise contours and change the recommendations to reflect TAF changes resulting from September 11, 2001.

Mr. Paul Dunholter, of BridgeNet International, presented an analysis and methodology of noise measurement results and the existing 2003 and the short term future 2009 DNL noise contours. Those noise contours will be the basis for comparison for all operational alternatives. The next step in the process will be to identify the number of people and housing units within these contours. Alternatives will then be developed to reduce the size of the contours by either operational activities or airport facilities activities. Finally, several months from now, we will look at land uses and produce a final abated noise contour. We will then begin the process of looking at the land use mitigation and land use abatement measures that will be defined by the boundaries of one of the three noise contours.

Mr. Dunholter explained how the noise measurements were completed and what went into the noise model for developing the noise contours. Data was retrieved from seven (7) permanent noise monitors at various locations around the airport and from an additional 11 sites set up to supplement the permanent monitors and fill in any gaps that the permanent monitors did not measure. These supplemental locations also provided additional metrics that the permanent monitors did not measure. Mr. Hyde asked what the timeframe was for site monitoring. Mr. Dunholter stated that monitoring was done during June 2003 for the portable supplemental monitoring system and permanent noise monitoring data was obtained from 2002 – 2003. In addition to the measurement data, radar data was obtained from the airport's noise monitoring system which has a feed to the FAA's radar data allowing the Airport to get continuous data for all the aviation operations. A full years set of data was obtained for analyzing the operations at the Airport.

Ms. Hottenstein asked if there was any construction going on during the noise monitoring timeframe. Mr. Dunholter stated that there was construction going on during 2003 which affected north/south operations during the summer. As a result, a decision was made to model the 2003 operations level using the annual average runway use that occurred in 2002 because it reflected more normal pattern.

Mr. Dunholter stated that the noise analysis included the measurement of continuous noise, including aircraft overflight, ground noise and ambient noise to arrive at the DNL, which is the measurement that the noise contour is based on. Mr. Dunholter used graphic maps to show the specific noise monitoring locations. Maps and computer generated graphics were also used to show the following data:

- Time Above Contour
- Number of Events Above Contour
- Single Event Contour
- Existing Noise Contour 2003
- Future Noise Contour 2009

Mr. Dunholter stated that much of the change in noise at the airport is a result of the retirement of the older stage 2 aircraft and the gradual introduction of the newer generation aircraft that are less noisy.

Mr. Piojda stated that people complain most about aircraft noise at night. Mr. Dunkelberg agreed that noise at night is much more apparent when a person is trying to sleep and always sounds louder than day time noise. Mr. Richardson asked if Runway 13/31 could be used by regional jets. Mr. Bateman stated that the runway is now restricted but could be utilized more in the future.

Mr. Dunkelberg reminded the committee of the first Public Information Meeting scheduled for September 22, 2004 at the Best Western Hotel. He encouraged everyone to attend the meeting.

Mr. Dunkelberg discussed topics for the next meeting which will include land use analysis associated with the existing and future noise contours. We will also begin discussing various reasonable and viable alternatives from both the operational and facilities side.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.