Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study

Study Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting Summary

May 20, 2025, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

North Terminal, ANC, 4600 Postmark Drive, Anchorage, AK 99502, Flattop Conference Room & Via Teams

Summary Shortcuts:

"Q" = SAC Comments/Questions

"R" = Project Team Responses

"Note" = Additional Notes or Clarifications Not Presented in Accompanying Slides

"Slide #" = Corresponding Guiding Slide – Click HERE for full slide presentation.

A. Welcome & Introductions (see complete list under "Participants" below)

- Study Team
- Study Advisory Committee

B. Study Advisory Committee Role (Slides #7-8)

C. Brief Explanation of Part 150 Study Update

- Purpose and Background of Study (Slide #10-11)
    - **Q:** Has anyone from the Municipality of Anchorage Long Range Planning Department been invited to participate on the project team? They are responsible for land use planning for the MOA.
        - **R:** Yes, a representative from the long-range planning department was invited but could not attend the first SAC meeting.
    - **Q:** Why was the ground runup enclosure disapproved in the previous study?
        - **R:** There was no measurable difference to the 65DNL contour because of the ground runup enclosure. As a result, the FAA disapproved for purposes of Part 150.
- Part 150 Process Summary (Slide #12)
    - **Q:** How long will the noise monitoring be during the summer and winter seasons?
        - **R:** There will be approximately six long term sites which will capture data twenty-four hours per day for seven days and approximately four short term monitors which will be deployed as needed for approximately half a day in various locations.
    - **Q:** Noise patterns change based on runway usage; how will this be addressed during noise monitoring?
        - **R:** The long-term noise monitor locations are chosen to accurately capture noise data for all runway usage scenarios. The short-term noise

monitors will be used to capture supplemental sites that complement the long-term sites.

- **Q:** Are vibrations measured during the Study?
  - **R:** Short answer, no. Vibrations are caused by noise, which is what the study is capturing.

- Why Update the Study? (Slide #13)
  - **Q:** Are noise berms or fences looked at as an alternative?
    - **R:** Yes, noise barriers will be examined as part of the Study. However, it is important to note that physical noise barriers are typically most effective for mitigating noise associated with aircraft ground operations.
  - **Q:** What were the recommendations of the last Study, and implementation of those recommendations?
    - **R:** The team is currently reviewing the past Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) and will be reporting out on those recommendations, including implementation at the next meeting.

D. Airport Constraints (Slide #16)

E. Study Parameters (Slide #17)

F. Forecasts (Slide #18)

G. Noise Analysis (Slides #19-20)

- **Note**: ANC's Master Plan was initiated in 2023; this study will use that to guide the Part 150 Update.
- **Q:** Can you define long-term and short-term noise monitoring?
  - **R:** Long-term monitors are placed at one location for seven days, 24 hours/day. Short-term monitors move throughout the day.
- **Note:** Noise models change two to three times a year; HMMH will use the most recent version, or "Version 3g", through the duration of this project.
- **Q:** How did the airport in Maui, HI set restrictions on times of day that aircraft can land/take-off?
  - **R:** Noise restrictions (not flying at night, for example) are mostly voluntary. If a restriction is mandatory, it was implemented prior to the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA).
- **Note:** In the context of aircraft noise, the FAA classifies civil jet aircraft into "Stages," which is a tiered approach to reducing aircraft noise. It is commonly associated with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) standards on aircraft noise. The five stages identified by ICAO are briefly described below.
  - Stage 1: No longer permitted for operation in most countries (very loud).
  - Stage 2: Older aircraft with higher noise emissions; heavily restricted or banned in many regions.
  - Stage 3: Minimum standard for civil jet aircraft operating in U.S.
  - Stage 4 and 5: Stricter noise standards for newer, quieter aircraft.

Aircraft manufactured in the U.S. in the last five years are quieter. For the most part, Stage 2 and 3 aircraft are no longer flown in the U.S. and the aircraft coming into the fleet are Stage 5, so the fleet is generally getting quieter over time. Stage numbering is based on when the aircraft was certified.

- **Q:** Can you expand more on 65 DNL?
    - **R:** The FAA states that a maximum day-night average sound level (DNL) of higher than 65 dB is non-compatible with residential communities. When FAA wrote the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act (ASNA), they used the 65 DNL metric/threshold, however, there has been stakeholder input regarding impact outside of the 65 DNL contour, citing conflict with intended land uses and economic development activities as a reason to lower the threshold to include areas further out. FAA is currently reevaluating the 65 DNL threshold but that exercise will likely not be complete to consider for the ANC Part 150 Noise Study.

Noise Background/Accepted Noise Exposure Maps (NEM)

- **Note**: The most important part of the NEMs is the future (5-year) noise contour modeling. These future contours are what we use to evaluate noise mitigation alternatives.
- **Q:** For noise monitoring, does it need to be a residential property?
    - **R:** No, but the contracting team leading this piece of the study, the Team will prioritize locations with “quiet” locations that do not have other background noise (such as near roadways or schools) for example.

Next Steps

- The SAC will meet every three to four months.
- HMMH plans to place noise monitors before the end of July.
- **Q:** How soon do you need to establish monitoring locations?
    - **R:** Monitoring locations will be set sometime in June/early July, for monitoring later in July.
- **Q:** How many monitors do you want?
    - **R:** HMMH is aiming to identify six long-term sites located all around the airport. They will then fill in with two short-term monitors they will move throughout the day for approximately two weeks.

SAC Comments

- **Q:** Would the consultants consider modifying the format of future open houses to allow a presentation followed by an open discussion amongst attendees?
    - **R:** Having completed similar projects, the project team has found the open house style effective for Part 150 noise studies. The less formal structure, with multiple project team-led stations and visuals that describe different aspects of the project, provide individuals one-on-one time with the project team to learn and directly ask their questions. One of the stations will focus on “Public Comment” and provide different methods for submitting comments (including paper comment forms that can be immediately submitted), as well as sign-up sheets for anyone interested in having a noise monitor stationed at their residence.

- **Public Comments**
  - There were no public comments.

Adjourn

Participants

SAC Member – *presented in alphabetical order by representative entity/group*	
Representative Entity	***Name***
Alaska Airmen's Association	Priscilla Ribic
Alaska Airmen's Association	Adam White (alternate)
Alaska Department of Public Facilities & Transportation	Erik Hilsinger
Anchorage International Airport	Taylor Beardsley
Anchorage International Airport	Teri Lindseth
Anchorage International Airport	Ian Moore
Anchorage International Airport	Alex Moss
Anchorage International Airport	Jennifer Pepin
Atlas Air	Tyler Cresswell
Federal Aviation Administration Alaska Region	Kristi Ponozzo
Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson	Tor Anderzen
Member of the Public – Big Lake Community	Maggie O'Hara
Member of the Public – North Anchorage	Kristin Knudsen
Member of the Public – South Anchorage	Sybille Hogan
Sand Lake Community Council	Linda Swiss
Turnagain Community Council	Cathy Gleason
Consulting Team	
Name	***Entity***
Kate Andrus	Mead & Hunt
Ryk Dunkelberg	Mead & Hunt
Corbett Smith	Mead & Hunt
Nathan Moran	Mead & Hunt
Gene Reindel	HMMH
Vincent Ma	HMMH
Nastasja von Conta	HMMH
Shelly Wade	Agnew::Beck Consulting
Kirsten Cohen	Agnew::Beck Consulting