



GENERAL MITCHELL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY MINUTES – DECEMBER 13, 2005

Present

Barry Bateman
Pat Rowe
Kim Berry
Bill MacLeod
Kevin Demitros
Ramon Navarro
Alfred Pjojda
Tony Adyniec
Roseann Dieck
Raymond Glowacki
Edward Richardson
LeAnn Launstein
Elizabeth Kopplin
Ralph Voltner
Pat Stoner
David Reeve
Tom Donovan
Wendy Hottenstein
Paul Charapata
Robert Hutson
Anthony Polashek
Ryk Dunkelberg
Brad Rolf
Paul Dunholter
Helen Dixon

Affiliation

GMIA – Airport Director
GMIA – Public Relations/Marketing Manager
GMIA – Noise Program Manager
GMIA – Noise Abatement Specialist
GMIA – Planning Analyst
8th Supervisory District
9th Supervisory District
14th Supervisory District
17th Supervisory District
Chair – Noise Advisory Committee
City of Milwaukee
City of Oak Creek
City of Oak Creek
City of St. Francis
City of South Milwaukee
Midwest Airlines
Northwest Airlines
WISDOT – Bureau of Aeronautics
FAA, MKE ATCT
FAA, MKE ATCT
440th Airlift Wing
Barnard Dunkelberg
Barnard Dunkelberg
BridgeNet International
Dixon & Company

Absent

Jane Ferraro
Thomas Prince
Douglas Drescher
Sandy DePotty
Lynn McCarthy
Mark Hyde
Kenneth Yunker
Peter Beitzel
Steven Ford

4th Supervisory District
11th Supervisory District
Signature Flight Support
FAA, MSP-ADO
FAA, MKE ATCT
FAA, MKE ATCT
SEWRPC
Metro Milw. Assoc. of Commerce
128th Refueling Wing

Mr. Barry Bateman, Airport Director, opened the third meeting of the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Advisory Committee at 9:10am and asked those present to introduce themselves. Mr. Bateman turned the meeting over to study consultant Mr. Ryk Dunkelberg. Mr. Dunkelberg gave a brief update on the purpose of the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study, the role of the Study Advisory Committee in providing input into the alternatives selection process, and a brief description of where we are in the study process thus far. He also distributed to each member in attendance a draft copy of the updated existing (2004) noise contour map. The agenda for the meeting included the following topics of discussion:

- Purpose of the Part 150 Study
- Role of the Study Advisory Committee
- Updated Existing (2004) Noise Contours
- Presentation of Working Paper Four
 - a.) Potential Noise Abatement Alternatives
 - b.) Operational Alternatives
- Discussion of Other Alternatives to be considered
- Questions/Comments from Study Advisory Committee Members
- Closing/What's Next

Mr. Dunkelberg gave a power point presentation of Working Paper Four addressing potential noise abatement alternatives and operational alternatives. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that there are various roles and responsibilities given to all of the entities involved in the Part 150 Study. The federal government controls aircraft in the air; the Airport proprietor is responsible for actions that reduce noise and are within their authority to enact; state and local governments are responsible for land use planning and controls; air carriers are responsible for meeting noise standards and operating aircraft to minimize noise; and residents should be aware of the potential effect of noise on their quality of life.

Mr. Dunkelberg discussed the various measures required by Federal Aviation Regulation Part 150 for evaluation of noise abatement alternatives. Those measures include the following: acquisition of land or interest therein; construction of barriers and sound insulation; the use of flight procedures to reduce noise; the implementation of aircraft restrictions based on noise; preferential runway system; other actions or combination of actions; and actions recommended by the FAA.

Measures available to the Airport Proprietor include: acquisition of land or an interest therein; noise barriers (walls, berms, sound insulation); new runways in a different orientation; runway extensions; touch-and-go restrictions; high-speed exit taxiways; noise monitoring programs; noise complaint/citizen liaison programs and fly-quiet programs.

Additional measures which are subject to interstate commerce issues, discrimination, FAR Part 161 requirements, and require FAA approval include: capacity limits based on defined noise levels, landing fees based on noise, complete or partial curfews and a ban on all jets.

Mr. Dunkelberg described the options available to state and local governments. These options include: zoning and easements; transfer of development rights; building code

modifications; capital improvement programs; subdivision regulations; and comprehensive planning. Options dependent upon the Federal Government include: Departure thrust cutback (Departure Climb Profile); Flight Management System (FMS); designated noise abatement take-off/approach paths; preferential runway system; and power and flap settings.

Mr. Dunkelberg discussed how the noise abatement alternatives were selected. He stated that alternatives being considered are based on the results of the Part 150 required analysis and data generated from that analysis, as well as discussions with Airport staff and input received from the Study Advisory Committee and interested citizens who attended the Public Information Workshop in September of 2004. He stated that the proposed noise abatement alternatives were grouped into two categories:

- *Alternatives 1-7: Flight Track or Procedural Changes*
- *Alternatives 8-10: On-Airport Changes*

Mr. Dunkelberg turned the presentation over to Mr. Dunholter of BridgeNet International. Mr. Dunholter discussed the following noise abatement alternatives under review by the consultant, the Airport staff and the Part 150 Study Advisory Committee. The noise abatement alternatives include the following:

Alternative 1—Develop Satellite Based Flight Management System (FMS) departure procedures for south departures on Runway 19R. The goal of this alternative is to provide for more precise flight paths for aircraft departing to the south on Runway 19R, one for south departures that head to the east and a second for south departures that head to the west. This alternative is designed to reduce aircraft flight path dispersion and early turns at lower altitudes.

Alternative 2—Develop FMS departure procedures for east departures on Runway 7R (No turns before reaching the shore). The goal of this alternative is to reduce departure turns by jet aircraft before reaching Lake Michigan.

Alternative 3—Develop FMS departure procedures for north departures on Runway 1L. The goal of this alternative is to reduce flight path dispersion for aircraft departing to the northeast and northwest to take advantage of compatible land uses directly north of the Airport.

Alternative 4—Develop FMS departure procedures for west departures on Runway 25L. The goal of this alternative is to reduce flight path dispersion for aircraft departures on Runway 25L, and concentrate jet aircraft over a small area along the runway centerline and other compatible land uses southwest of the Airport.

Alternative 5—Evaluate altitude of small propeller aircraft departures. The goal of this alternative is to increase the altitude over residential neighborhoods of small propeller aircraft departing from the Airport.

Alternative 6—Develop procedures to reduce early turns on approach for small propeller aircraft. The goal of this alternative is to avoid flying over residential areas by reducing early turns by small propeller aircraft on approach.

Alternative 7—Evaluate close-in and distant departure procedures (the location at which aircraft apply power for departures). The goal of this alternative is to reduce single event noise levels from commercial jet departures over residential land uses by utilizing the appropriate thrust cutback departure procedure, which would result in lower noise levels in the community.

Alternative 8—Evaluate intersection departures for south-bound aircraft at night. The goal of this alternative is to reduce jet take-off and taxi noise in the neighborhood north of the Airport, especially during the night hours of 10 p.m. to 6 a.m., by having aircraft depart at the intersection of Runway 19R and taxiway Victor, which is 1,090 feet south of the runway end.

Alternative 9—Develop ground-based noise alternatives. The goal of this alternative is to reduce noise in surrounding communities resulting from aircraft operations on the ground at the General Mitchell International Airport. This alternative will explore available options such as walls, berms, aircraft parking plans, and other options that will minimize ground noise intrusion, especially in areas north of the Airport.

Alternative 10—Provide additional high-speed taxiways to reduce use of reverse thrust on landing. The goal of this alternative is to reduce the noise from reverse thrust when aircraft land at the Airport. Thrust reversers redirect the flow of the jet engine thrust toward the front of the aircraft to assist in slowing the aircraft when landing.

Mr. Voltner asked how the updated existing (2004) noise contour compared to the old noise contour. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that the new contour is smaller overall, but is somewhat longer to the north and east and shorter to the south and west. Mr. Piojda asked if Milwaukee County can veto recommendations made in the Part 150 Study. Mr. Dunkelberg responded that Milwaukee County has the authority to veto any alternatives unless federal statutes prohibit them from doing so.

Mr. Dunkelberg began a discussion of the alternatives. One alternative developed as a result of comments received from many people who attended the Public Information Workshop was having planes fly straight to the lake instead of making early turns over residential areas. Mr. Reeve stated that anything recommended could potentially have an adverse effect on other areas and was concerned about shifting noise from one area only to create noise in another area. Mr. Voltner stated that one of the recommendations that has been discussed before is to create flight paths that fly over homes that have received sound insulation. Mr. Reeve, speaking on behalf of Midwest Airlines, stated that a major consideration for all alternatives discussed is the fact that the airlines are looking at more aggressive ways to save on fuel costs. Mr. Reeve stated that he endorses the use of the flight management system but, if Alternative 2 would require additional fuel costs, it would not be in the best interest of the airlines.

Mr. Richardson stated that when aircraft begin to turn away from the runway heading at 2,000 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL) they are still going over residential areas, especially on Runway 1L to the north, that have not received noise in the past. He suggested using new procedures that would determine an aircraft turning point based upon ground position rather than altitude. Mr. Dunholter stated that it is the intent of Alternative # 2 to come as close to clearing residential areas as possible before making turns. Mr. Charapata stated that the goal of air traffic control is to get aircraft to 10,000 feet as soon as possible. Mr. Charapata stated that not allowing an aircraft to turn before reaching the lake could have a significant impact on departures. In his estimation, not turning until you are out over the lake could add as much as 2.5 miles and 15 seconds of time to departure times. If 60 planes depart in an hour from the airport, you could potentially lose up to 15 minutes an hour in departure time for those planes waiting on the runway. Mr. Charapata also noted the increase in cost of fuel associated with Alternative #2.

A discussion ensued regarding the “low and lumbering” cargo planes that fly into the airport at night. Mr. Voltner asked if there were some way to regulate these larger Stage 3 cargo planes. Mr. Hutson stated that if they were going to be asked to try to change procedures to get cargo aircraft to comply with altitude changes, they would have to force instrument approaches at night. Mr. Hutson stated that he understands the noise concerns and is sympathetic, but that the airlines most important considerations at this time are costs and efficiencies.

Mr. Piojda stated that he lives at the end of Runway 7R which is narrowed down to a small corridor flight path. The planes do not stay on the flight path, often turning very short and not staying within the corridor.

Mr. Dunholter discussed ideas of how to address ground noise. Mr. Richardson asked if the Part 150 Study would look at erecting more noise barriers and asked if barriers just “bounce” more noise. Mr. Dunholter stated that if not properly placed, noise barriers can reflect noise inappropriately. Mr. Piojda stated that Runway 7R from Kimberly Ave. to College Ave. is a wide-open area that could benefit from a noise barriers or berms.

Ms. Kopplin asked if pilots veer off of flight paths because they do not know the procedures. Ms. Rowe stated all pilots are aware of the procedures and that it is usually a result of weather, aircraft weight or some other valid reason that pilots do not always follow exact flight paths.

Mr. Dunkelberg asked the Committee to think about any additional broad alternatives or operational procedures that they would like the consultant team to review. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that a common comment from people during a Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study is them wanting planes to follow flight paths perfectly. He stated that, even with advanced technology, aircraft would probably never be able to do that. But it is important for people to work with the air traffic and facilities people to give suggestions and set goals (like avoiding early turns). In turn, air traffic and facilities can develop procedures to help meet those goals. Mr. Dunkelberg reminded the Committee that whenever a flight track change is

proposed under a Part 150 Study, an environmental study is required by the FAA before that change can be implemented.

Through discussion with the Study Advisory Committee, new alternatives, and variations on current alternatives were suggested for evaluation. All ideas put forward by the Committee have been considered with the following five alternatives being accepted for evaluation in addition to the ten original alternatives.

Alternative 11—Increase altitude to 2,500 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL), which is approximately 1,780 feet Above Ground Level (AGL), for all aircraft prior to turning. This is a more detailed evaluation of Alternative 5.

Alternative 12—Utilize the I-94 corridor for southern departures off of Runway 25L. This is a more detailed evaluation of Alternative 4.

Alternative 13—Evaluate feasibility of a noise wall or berm on property owned by the Airport north of Layton Avenue and east of Howell Avenue.

Alternative 14—Evaluate on-airfield noise barriers at specific locations. This is a more detailed analysis and evaluation of Alternative 9.

Alternative 15—Evaluate location and feasibility of a low-tech turboprop run-up facility.

It was also suggested that the consultants evaluate the alternative of placing all regional jet departures on Runway 07/25R. However, upon initial review, this proposal is considered a capacity or efficiency alternative that should be considered in the Master Planning process and not the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study.

Mr. Dunkelberg stated that the next steps in the Part 150 Study process include additional review of operational alternatives and the development of Part 2 of the operational Working Paper. The Airport staff will then set a date for another Study Advisory Committee Meeting to review operational alternatives.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10am.