

Appendix I

Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) and Noise Exposure Map (NEM) Checklists

FAR PART 150			
Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) Checklist			
Airport Name:	WATERBURY-OXFORD AIRPORT (OXC)	Reviewer:	
		Yes/No/ NA	Reference / Comments
I. Identification and Submission of Program:			
A. Submission is properly identified:			
	1. FAR 150 NCP?	No	
	2. NEM and NCP together?	Yes	
	3. Program revision?	No	First NCP
B. Airport and Airport Operator's name identified?		Yes	
C. NCP transmitted by airport operator cover letter?		Yes	Oct. 9 2008
II. Consultation: [150.23]			
A. Documentation includes narrative of public participation and consultation process?		Yes	Appendix C-G
B. Identification of consulted parties:			
	1. All parties in 150.23(c) consulted?	Yes	
	2. Public and planning agencies identified?	Yes	
	3. Agencies in 2., above, correspond to those indicated on the NEM?	Yes	
C. Satisfies 150.23(d) requirements:			
	1. Documentation shows active and direct participation of parties in B., above?	Yes	
	2. Active and direct participation of general public?	Yes	
	3. Participation was prior to and during development of NCP and prior to submittal to FAA?	Yes	
	4. Indicates adequate opportunity afforded to submit views, data, etc.?	Yes	
D. Evidence included of notice and opportunity for a public hearing on NCP?		Yes	Appendix G
E. Documentation of comments:			
	1. Includes summary of public hearing comments, if hearing was held?	Yes	Appendix F
	2. Includes copy of all written material submitted to operator?	Yes	Appendix E
	3. Includes operator's responses/disposition of written and verbal comments?	Yes	Appendix E & F
F. Informal agreement received from FAA on flight procedures?		Yes	
III. Noise Exposure Maps: [150.23, B150.3; 150.35(f)] (This section of the checklist is not a substitute for the Noise Exposure Map checklist. It deals with maps in the context of the Noise Compatibility Program submission.)			
A. Inclusion of NEMs and supporting documentation:			Chapter 5
	1. Map documentation either included or incorporated by reference?	Yes	
	2. Maps previously found in compliance by FAA?	NA	
	3. Compliance determination still valid?	NA	
	4. Does 180-day period have to wait for map compliance finding?	NA	Submitted w/NCP
B. Revised NEMs submitted with program: (Review using NEM checklist if map revisions included in NCP submittal)			First NCP/NEM
	1. Revised NEMs included with program?	NA	
	2. Has airport operator requested FAA to make a determination on the NEM(s) when NCP approval is made?	NA	
C. If program analysis uses noise modeling:			
	1. INM, HNM, or FAA-approved equivalent?	Yes	INM 7.0
	2. Monitoring in accordance with A150.5?	NA*	Informal
D. Existing condition and 5-year maps clearly identified as the official NEMs?		Yes	Chapter 5
IV. Consideration of Alternatives: [B150.7, 150.23(e)]			
A. At a minimum, are the alternatives below considered?			Chapter 3 & 4
	1. Land acquisition and interests therein, including air rights, easements, and development rights?	Yes	
	2. Barriers, acoustical shielding, public building soundproofing	Yes	
	3. Preferential runway system	Yes	

*Note: Limited monitoring was conducted for discussion purpose; not used to make recommendations.

	4. Flight procedures	Yes	
	5. Restrictions on type/class of aircraft (at least one restriction below must be checked)	Yes	
	a. Deny use based on Federal standards	NA	
	b. Capacity limits based on noisiness	NA	
	c. Noise abatement takeoff/approach procedures	Yes	
	d. Landing fees based on noise or time of day e. nighttime restrictions	NA	
	6. Other actions with beneficial impact	Yes	
	7. Other FAA recommendations	Yes	
	B. Responsible implementing authority identified for each considered alternative?	Yes	
	C. Analysis of alternative measures:		
	1. Measures clearly described?	Yes	
	2. Measures adequately analyzed?	Yes	
	3. Adequate reasoning for rejecting alternatives?	Yes	
	D. Other actions recommended by the FAA: Should other actions be added? (list separately or on back of this form actions and discussions with airport operator to have them included prior to the start of the 180-day cycle)	NA	
V. Alternatives Recommended for Implementation: [150.23(e), B150.7(c); 150.35(b), B150.5]			
	A. Document clearly indicates:		
	1. Alternatives recommended for implementation?	Yes	Chapter 5
	2. Final recommendations are airport operator's, not those of consultant or third party?	Yes	
	B. Do all program recommendations:		
	1. Relate directly or indirectly to reduction of noise and noncompatible land uses?	Yes	
	2. Contain description of contribution to overall effectiveness of program?	Yes	
	3. Noise/land use benefits quantified to extent possible?	Yes	
	4. Include actual/anticipated effect on reducing noise exposure within noncompatible area shown on NEM?	Yes	
	5. Effects based on relevant and reasonable expressed assumptions?	Yes	
	6. Have adequate supporting data to support its contribution to noise/land use compatibility?	Yes	
	C. Analysis appears to support program standards set forth in 150.35(b) and B150.5?	Yes	
	D. When use restrictions are recommended:		
	1. Are alternatives with potentially significant noise/compatible land use benefits thoroughly analyzed so that appropriate comparisons and conclusions can be made?	NA	
	2. Use restriction coordinated with APP-600 prior to making determination on start of 180-days?	NA	
	E. Do the following also meet Part 150 analytical standards:		
	1. Formal recommendations which continue existing practices?	Yes	
	2. New recommendations or changes proposed at end of Part 150 process?	Yes	
	F. Documentation indicates how recommendations may change previously adopted plans?	NA	First NCP/NEM
	G. Documentation also:		Chapter 5, Appendix C
	1. Identifies agencies which are responsible for implementing each recommendation?	Yes	
	2. Indicates whether those agencies have agreed to implement?	Yes	
	3. Indicates essential government actions necessary to implement recommendations?	Yes	
	H. Timeframe:		Chapter 5
	1. Includes agreed-upon schedule to implement alternatives?	Yes	
	2. Indicates period covered by the program?	Yes	
	I. Funding/Costs:		Chapter 5
	1. Includes costs to implement alternatives?	Yes	
	2. Includes anticipated funding sources?	Yes	
VI. Program Revision: [150.23(e)(9)] Supporting documentation includes provision for revision?			
		NA	First NCP/NEM

FAR PART 150			
Noise Exposure Map (NEM) Checklist			
Airport Name:	WATERBURY-OXFORD AIRPORT (OXC)	Reviewer:	
		Yes/No/NA	Reference / Comments
I. Identification and Submission of Map Document:			
A. Is this submittal appropriately identified as one of the following, submitted under FAR Part 150:			
	1. A NEM only	No	
	2. A NEM and NCP	Yes	
	3. A revision to NEMs which have previously been determined by FAA to be in compliance with Part 150?	No	First NEM
B. Is the airport name and the qualified airport operator identified?		Yes	
C. Is there a dated cover letter from the airport operator which indicates the documents are submitted under Part 150 for appropriate FAA determinations?		Yes	
II. Consultation: [150.21(b), A150.105(a)]			
A. Is there a narrative description of the consultation accomplished, including opportunities for public review and comment during map development?		Yes	Appendix C-G
B. Identification:			
	1. Are the consulted parties identified?	Yes	
	2. Do they include all those required by 150.21(b) and A150.105(a)?	Yes	
C. Does the documentation include the airport operator's certification, and evidence to support it, that interested persons have been afforded adequate opportunity to submit their views, data, and comments during map development and in accordance with 150.21(b)?		Yes	
D. Does the document indicate whether written comments were received during consultation and, if there were comments, that they are on file with the FAA region?		Yes	
III. General Requirements: [150.21]			
A. Are there two maps, each clearly labeled on the face with year (existing condition year and 5-year)?		Yes	
B. Map currency:			
	1. Does the existing condition map year match the year on the airport operator's submittal letter?	Yes	
	2. Is the 5-year map based on reasonable forecasts and other planning assumptions and is it for the fifth calendar year after the year of submission?	Yes	
	3. If the answer to 1 and 2 above is no, has the airport operator verified in writing that data in the documentation are representative of existing condition and 5-year forecast conditions as of the date of submission?	NA	
C. If the NEM and NCP are submitted together:			Chapter 5
	1. Has the airport operator indicated whether the 5-year map is based on 5-year contours without the program vs. contours if the program is implemented?	Yes	
2. If the 5-year map is based on program implementation:			
	a. Are the specific program measures which are reflected on the map identified?	Yes	
	b. Does the documentation specifically describe how these measures affect land use compatibilities depicted on the map?	Yes	
3. If the 5-year NEM does not incorporate program implementation, has the airport operator included an additional NEM for FAA determination after the program is approved which shows program implementation conditions and which is intended to replace the 5-year NEM as the new official 5-year map?		NA	
IV. Map Scale, Graphics, and Data Requirements: [A150.101, A150.103, A150.105, 150.21(a)]			
A. Are the maps of sufficient scale to be clear and readable (they must not be less than 1" to 8,000'), and is the scale indicated on the maps?		Yes	
B. Is the quality of the graphics such that required information is clear and readable?		Yes	
C. Depiction of the airport and its environs.			
	1. Is the following graphically depicted to scale on both the existing condition and 5-year maps:		
	a. Airport boundaries	Yes	
	b. Runway configurations with runway end numbers	Yes	
2. Does the depiction of the off-airport data include:			
	a. A land use base map depicting streets and other identifiable geographic features	Yes	

	b. The area within the 65 Ldn (or beyond, at local discretion)	Yes	
	c. Clear delineation of geographic boundaries and the names of all jurisdictions with planning and land use control authority within the 65 Ldn (or beyond, at local discretion)	Yes	
D.			
	1. Continuous contours for at least the Ldn 65, 70, and 75?	Yes	
	2. Based on current airport and operational data for the existing condition year NEM, and forecast data for the 5-year NEM?	Yes	
	E. Flight tracks for the existing condition and 5-year forecast timeframes (these may be on supplemental graphics which must use the same land use base map as the existing condition and 5-year NEM), which are numbered to correspond to accompanying narrative?	Yes	Chapter 2
	F. Locations of any noise monitoring sites (these may be on supplemental graphics which must use the same land use base map as the official NEMs)	Yes	Appendix A
G. Noncompatible land use identification:			
	1. Are noncompatible land uses within at least the 65 Ldn depicted on the maps?	Yes	
	2. Are noise sensitive public buildings identified?	NA	None Exist
	3. Are the noncompatible uses and noise sensitive public buildings readily identifiable and explained on the map legend?	Yes	
	4. Are compatible land uses, which would normally be considered noncompatible, explained in the accompanying narrative?	NA	
V. Narrative Support of Map Data: [150.21(a), A150.1, A150.101, A150.103]			
A.			
	1. Are the technical data, including data sources, on which the NEMs are based adequately described in the narrative?	Yes	
	2. Are the underlying technical data and planning assumptions reasonable?	Yes	
B. Calculation of Noise Contours:			
	1. Is the methodology indicated?	Yes	
	a. Is it FAA approved? b. was the same model used for both maps? c. Has AEE approval been obtained for use of a model other than those which have previous blanket FAA approval?	a. Yes b. Yes c. NA	
	2. Correct use of noise models:		
	a. Does the documentation indicate the airport operator has adjusted or calibrated FAA-approved noise models or substituted one aircraft type for another? b. if so, does this have written approval from AEE?	a. NA b. NA	
	3. If noise monitoring was used, does the narrative indicate that Part 150 guidelines were followed?	NA*	Informal Modeling
	4. For noise contours below 65 Ldn, does the supporting documentation include explanation of local reasons? (Narrative explanation is highly desirable but not required by the Rule.)	Yes	
C. Noncompatible Land Use Information:			
	1. Does the narrative give estimates of the number of people residing in each of the contours (Ldn 65, 70 and 75, at a minimum) for both the existing condition and 5-year maps? 2. Does the documentation indicate whether table 1 of Part 150 was used by the airport operator?	Yes	
	a. If a local variation to table 1 was used:		
	(1) Does the narrative clearly indicate which adjustments were made and the local reasons for doing so?	NA	
	(2) Does the narrative include the airport operator's complete substitution for table 1?	NA	
	3. Does the narrative include information on self-generated or ambient noise where compatible/- noncompatible land use identifications consider non-airport/aircraft sources?	NA	
	4. Where normally noncompatible land uses are not depicted as such on the NEMs, does the narrative satisfactorily explain why, with reference to the specific geographic areas?	NA	
	5. Does the narrative describe how forecasts will affect land use compatibility?	Yes	
VI. Map Certifications: [150.21(b), 150.21(e)]			
	A. Has the operator certified in writing that interested persons have been afforded adequate opportunity to submit views, data, and comments concerning the correctness and adequacy of the draft maps and forecasts?	Yes	
	B. Has the operator certified in writing that each map and description of consultation and opportunity for public comment are true and complete?	Yes	

*Note: Limited monitoring was conducted for discussion purpose; not used to make recommendations.