



**GENERAL MITCHELL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
PART 150 STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
April 25, 2007 9:00 a.m. – Best Western Airport Hotel**

SUMMARY NOTES

Present

Barry Bateman
Pat Rowe
Kim Berry
Scott Schuh
Ramon Navarro
Bill Nowak
Roseann Dieck
Wendy Hottenstein
Edward Richardson
Peter Beitzel
Alderwomen Elizabeth Kopplin
Ralph Voltner
Paul Charapata
Robert Hutson
Ryk Dunkelberg
Helen Dixon

Affiliation

GMIA – Airport Director
GMIA – Public Relations/Marketing Manager
GMIA – Noise Program Manager
GMIA – Noise Abatement Specialist
8th Supervisory District Representative
14th Supervisory District Representative
17th Supervisory District Representative
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
City of Milwaukee
Metro Milw. Assoc. of Commerce
City of Oak Creek
City of St. Francis
FAA, MKE ATCT
FAA, MKE ATCT
Barnard Dunkelberg & Co.
Dixon & Company

Absent

Tom Donovan
David Reeve
Thomas Prince
Christine Mielcarek
Supervisor Paul Cesarz
Douglas Drescher
Sandy DePotty
Wanda Adelman
Arthur Hillmer
Kenneth Yunker
Anthony Polashek
Clair Breckenridge
Alderman Robert Grams
Pat Stoner
LeAnn Launstein
Brad Rolf
Paul Dunholter

Northwest Airlines
Midwest Airlines
11th Supervisory District Representative
4th Supervisory District Representative
Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors – 9th Dist.
Signature Flight Support
FAA, MSP-ADO
FAA, MKE - ATCT
FAA, MKE - ATCT
SEWRPC
440th Airlift Wing
128th Refueling Wing
City of Cudahy
City of South Milwaukee
City of Oak Creek
Barnard Dunkelberg & Co.
BridgeNet International

Airport Director Barry Bateman opened the fifth meeting of the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Advisory Committee at 9:10 a.m. The agenda for the meeting included the following items:

- **Explanation of where we are now in the Part 150 Study Process**
Review of Operational and Facilities Alternatives
- **Explanation of Working Paper Six**
Land Use Alternatives
Administrative Alternatives
- **What's Next**
Recommended Combined Alternatives
Public Information Workshop/Public Hearing
- **Questions and Comments**

Mr. Dunkelberg began his presentation with an explanation of land use alternatives. These alternatives were chosen based on the Part 150 Study analysis, discussions with Airport staff and the Part 150 Study Advisory Committee, and comments from the public at the previous Public Information Meetings.

Land use alternatives are grouped into two categories; remedial and preventive. Remedial alternatives are described as those such as sound insulation of existing structures to reduce inside noise levels, and preventive land use measures, such as a jurisdiction implementing land use controls to prevent the introduction of new non-compatible land uses. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that the Airport would also be looking at various administrative and management alternatives to manage or administer noise programs.

Land Use Alternative 1 – Voluntary Sound Insulation of Noise-Sensitive Structures.

The goal of this alternative is to reduce aircraft-generated noise intrusion levels inside habitable rooms within noise sensitive uses. This alternative would continue the 1993 sound insulation program and be based on the largest noise contour and “squaring off” of the eligibility boundary. This eligibility boundary would involve sound insulation for approximately an additional 560 housing units for a total cost of approximately \$28 million. Being in the eligibility boundary does not guarantee a home will be sound insulated. Other criteria that must be met include; the home must be up to local building codes at the owners expense, an inside decibel of over 45db, and the home must have been constructed prior to 1998.

Land Use Alternative 2 – Acquisition of Noncompatible Land uses or Undeveloped Land Zoned for Residential Use.

The goal of this alternative is to reduce existing and potential future noncompatible land uses within the 65 DNL and greater noise contour. The Airport would voluntarily purchase from willing sellers any noncompatible land uses within the 65DNL that are not part of a contiguous neighborhood or purchase residentially zoned property within the 65 DNL. This is a continuation of the 1993 program based on the new eligibility boundary. This includes

some undeveloped areas zoned or platted for future development along with some existing isolated residential properties.

Land Use Alternative 3 – Voluntary Acquisition of Avigation or Noise Easements over Noncompatible Land uses.

The goal of this alternative is to reduce the number of noncompatible land uses for property owners wishing to remain on their property, but not participate in a sound insulation program. This alternative would allow the Airport to purchase from willing homeowners an avigation easement (right to fly over and make noise) if they do not want their home to be sound insulated. This is also a continuation of the 1993 noise abatement program. Mr. Dunkelberg explained the procedure for avigation easement stating that the value of the easement ranges from \$2,500 to \$4,000. About ten percent of all homeowners take this easement option which would cost the Airport about \$224,000.

Land Use Alternative 4 – Voluntary Sales Assistance (Sales Assurance).

The goal of this alternative is to provide a voluntary means for homeowners to sell their homes for fair market value determined by three appraisers to a willing buyer without the Airport taking ownership. Under this scenario, the Airport would compensate the seller for any difference in the fair market appraised value and the actual sales value. Mr. Hutson asked if an easement was then given to the Airport. Mr. Dunkelberg answered affirmatively. This alternative is also a continuation of the 1993 noise abatement program.

Administrative Alternative 1 – Upgrade Noise Monitoring and Flight track Monitoring System

The goal of this alternative is to assist in monitoring the success of the noise abatement recommendations by upgrading the Airport's existing monitoring system to provide for more accurate, reliable aircraft noise and flight track information. New options are available that would allow for automatic tracking of the noise abatement procedures and provide web-based noise information to the community. The estimated cost for this new system would be approximately \$1.4 million fundable by the FAA. Pat Rowe asked if there are other airports that have web-based flight track systems in place. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that Oakland, San Jose and other airports currently have the system in place.

Administrative Alternative 2 – Use of Remote Cameras to Monitor Engine Run-ups and Use of APU's and Electrification of Some Ramps.

The goal of this alternative is to monitor compliance with run-up restrictions, aircraft parking recommendations and APU use in remote apron locations. Cameras would be placed in areas that cannot be easily observed to monitor the reduction of ground noise. The cost to implement this alternative is approximately \$30,000 per camera, with a placement of six cameras at a total approximate cost of \$200,000.

Administrative Alternative 3 – Review and Update of the Part 150 Study.

The goal of this alternative is to maintain an active, current noise abatement program responsive to changes in airfield operations and fleet mix, and to update aircraft noise contours as conditions change. The Part 150 Study should be updated when there is a major facility change, a 15% change in operations or a significant change in fleet mix. Operations should be reviewed annually and if conditions warrant, a draft contour should be generated. The Noise Compatibility Program and the eligibility boundary should be reviewed and updated approximately every ten years. Elizabeth Kopplin asked if there was any penalty if you go over the 15% change in operations or fleet mix. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that the FAA would recommend re-running the noise contours to make sure the noise program is still accurate. Mr. Hutson asked if we would need to update the noise contours if we were going to change a route. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that if air traffic did an environmental document and that document showed that there was a shift in population affected by noise, an update to the contour would be necessary.

Staffing/Personnel Recommendations

Provide another technical staff person to the Noise Office, along with a vehicle that allows Noise Office staff easier access to the community and to observe activities on the Airport.

Provide yearly or recurrent training for Noise Office staff on new technology, advances in the industry, and changes in FAA policy.

Provide staff attendance at noise conferences, environmental conferences, and sound mitigation conferences to enhance professional education.

What's Next

The next step in the Part 150 Study process will be to provide a recommended set of alternatives and a noise contour for the existing noise exposure map and the future noise exposure map. Mr. Dunkelberg stated that the Airport management and the County Supervisors want to use the largest noise contour to define the eligibility boundaries to include as many homes as possible. A Public Information Meeting and a Public Hearing will be held to present the information from the Part 150 Study to the public.

Additional Questions and Comments:

Ms. Rowe: How was the 2009 noise contour developed?

Ms. Kopplin: Did you include the rapidly developing southeast corridor in Oak Creek in your Study?

Mr. Nowak: Why am I not in the noise contour?

Mr. Voltner: Why do some areas get sound insulation and others, to the north and south, do not?

Ms. Rowe: (Comment) Noise contours across the nation are shrinking. The FAA was as generous as they could be without breaking policy when defining boundaries in communities surrounding GMIA.

Mr. Voltner: Is there any priority given for Administrative Alternatives? Can the Airport pre-fund for the sound insulation program?

The meeting ended at 11:00 A.M.