



TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

Glossary of Noise Compatibility Terms

TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

GLOSSARY OF NOISE COMPATIBILITY TERMS

A-WEIGHTED SOUND LEVEL - A sound pressure level, often noted as dBA, which has been frequency filtered or weighted to quantitatively reduce the effect of the low frequency noise. It was designed to approximate the response of the human ear to sound.

AMBIENT NOISE - The totality of noise in a given place and time — usually a composite of sounds from varying sources at varying distances.

APPROACH LIGHT SYSTEM (ALS) - An airport lighting facility which provides visual guidance to landing aircraft by radiating light beams in a directional pattern by which the pilot aligns the aircraft with the extended centerline of the runway on the final approach for landing.

ATTENUATION - Acoustical phenomenon whereby a reduction in sound energy is experienced between the noise source and receiver. This energy loss can be attributed to atmospheric conditions, terrain, vegetation, and man-made and natural features.

AZIMUTH - Horizontal direction expressed as the angular distance between true north and the direction of a fixed point (as the observer's heading).

BASE LEG - A flight path at right angles to the landing runway off its approach end. The base leg normally extends from the downwind leg to the intersection of the extended runway centerline. See "traffic pattern."

CNEL - The 24-hour average sound level, in A-weighted decibels, obtained after the addition of 4.77 decibels to sound levels between 7 p.m. and 10 p.m. and 10 decibels to sound levels between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., as averaged over a span of one year. In California, it is the required metric for determining the cumulative exposure of individuals to aircraft noise. Also see "Leq" and "DNL".

COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL - See CNEL.

CROSSWIND LEG - A flight path at right angles to the landing runway off its upwind end. See "traffic pattern."


DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE SOUND LEVEL - See DNL.

DECIBEL (dB) - The physical unit commonly used to describe noise levels. The decibel represents a relative measure or ratio to a reference power. This reference value is a sound pressure of 20 micropascals which can be referred to as 1 decibel or the weakest sound that can be heard by a person with very good hearing in an extremely quiet room.

DISPLACED THRESHOLD - A threshold that is located at a point on the runway other than the designated beginning of the runway.

DISTANCE MEASURING EQUIPMENT (DME) -

Equipment (airborne and ground) used to measure, in nautical miles, the slant range distance of an aircraft from the DME navigational aid.



DNL - The 24-hour average sound level, in A-weighted decibels, obtained after the addition of ten decibels to sound levels for the periods between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. as averaged over a span of one year. It is the FAA standard metric for determining the cumulative exposure of individuals to noise. Also see "Leq."

DOWNWIND LEG - A flight path parallel to the landing runway in the direction opposite to landing. The downwind leg normally extends between the crosswind leg and the base leg. Also see "traffic pattern."

DURATION - Length of time, in seconds, a noise event such as an aircraft flyover is experienced. (May refer to the length of time a noise event exceeds a specified dB threshold level.)

EASEMENT - The legal right of one party to use a portion of the total rights in real estate owned by another party. This may include the right of passage over, on, or below the property; certain air rights above the property, including view rights; and the rights to any specified form of development or activity, as well as any other legal rights in the property that may be specified in the easement document.

EQUIVALENT SOUND LEVEL - See Leq.

FINAL APPROACH - A flight path in the direction of landing along the extended runway centerline. The final approach normally extends from the base leg to the runway. See "traffic pattern."

FIXED BASE OPERATOR (FBO) - A provider of services to users of an airport. Such services include, but are not limited to, hangaring, fueling, flight training, repair and maintenance.

GLIDE SLOPE (GS) - Provides vertical guidance for aircraft during approach and landing. The glide slope consists of the following:

1. Electronic components emitting signals which provide vertical guidance by reference to airborne instruments during instrument approaches such as ILS, or
2. Visual ground aids, such as VASI, which provide vertical guidance for VFR approach or for the visual portion of an instrument approach and landing.

GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM - See "GPS."

GPS - GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM - A system of 24 satellites used as reference points to enable navigators equipped with GPS receivers to determine their latitude, longi-

tude, and altitude. The accuracy of the system can be further refined by using a ground receiver at a known location to calculate the error in the satellite range data. This is known as Differential GPS (DGPS).

GROUND EFFECT - The attenuation attributed to absorption or reflection of noise by man-made or natural features on the ground surface.

HOURLY NOISE LEVEL (HNL) - A noise summation metric which considers primarily those single events which exceed a specified threshold or duration during one hour.

INSTRUMENT APPROACH - A series of predetermined maneuvers for the orderly transfer of an aircraft under instrument flight conditions from the beginning of the initial approach to a landing, or to a point from which a landing may be made visually.

INSTRUMENT FLIGHT RULES (IFR) - Rules governing the procedures for conducting instrument flight. Also a term used by pilots and controllers to indicate type of flight plan.

INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEM (ILS) - A precision instrument approach system which normally consists of the following electronic components and visual aids:

1. Localizer.
2. Glide Slope.
3. Outer Marker.
4. Middle Marker.
5. Approach Lights.

Ldn - (See DNL). Ldn used in place of DNL in mathematical equations only.

Leq - Equivalent Sound Level. The steady A-weighted sound level over any specified period (not necessarily 24 hours) that has the same acoustic energy as the fluctuating noise during that period (with no consideration of a nighttime weighting.) It is a measure of cumulative acoustical energy. Because the time interval may vary, it should be specified by a subscript (such as Leq 8) for an 8-hour exposure to workplace noise) or be clearly understood.

LOCALIZER - The component of an ILS which provides course guidance to the runway.

MERGE - Combining or merging of noise events which exceed a given threshold level and occur within a variable selected period of time.

MISSED APPROACH COURSE (MAC) - The flight route to be followed if, after an instrument approach, a landing is not effected, and occurring normally:

1. When the aircraft has descended to the decision height and has not established visual contact, or
2. When directed by air traffic control to pull up or to go around again.

NOISE CONTOUR - A continuous line on a map of the airport vicinity connecting all points of the same noise exposure level.

NONDIRECTIONAL BEACON (NDB) - A beacon transmitting nondirectional signals whereby the pilot of an aircraft equipped with direction finding equipment can determine his bearing to and from the radio beacon and home on or track to or from the station. When the radio beacon is installed in conjunction with the Instrument Landing System marker, it is normally called a Compass Locator.

NONPRECISION APPROACH - A standard instrument approach procedure providing runway alignment but no glide slope or descent information.

PRECISION APPROACH - A standard instrument approach procedure providing runway alignment and glide slope or descent information.

PRECISION APPROACH PATH INDICATOR (PAPI) - A lighting system providing visual approach slope guidance to aircraft during a landing approach. It is similar to a VASI but provides a sharper transition between the colored indicator lights.

PROFILE - The physical position of the aircraft during landings or takeoffs in terms of altitude in feet above the runway and distance from the runway end.

PROPAGATION - Sound propagation refers to the spreading or radiating of sound energy from the noise source. Propagation characteristics of sound normally involve a reduction in sound energy with an increased distance from source. Sound propagation is affected by atmospheric conditions, terrain, and man-made and natural objects.

RUNWAY END IDENTIFIER LIGHTS (REIL) - Two synchronized flashing lights, one on each side of the runway threshold, which provide rapid and positive identification of the approach end of a particular runway.

RUNWAY USE PROGRAM - A noise abatement runway selection plan designed to enhance noise abatement efforts with regard to airport communities for arriving and departing aircraft. These plans are developed into runway use programs and apply to all turbojet aircraft 12,500 pounds or heavier. Turbojet aircraft less than 12,500 pounds are included only if the airport proprietor determines that the aircraft creates a noise problem. Runway use programs are coordinated with FAA offices as outlined in Order 1050.11. Safety criteria used in these programs are developed by the Office of Flight Operations. Runway use programs are administered by the Air Traffic Service as "Formal" or "Informal" programs.

RUNWAY USE PROGRAM (FORMAL) - An approved noise abatement program which is defined and acknowledged in a Letter of Understanding between FAA - Flight Standards, FAA - Air Traffic Service, the airport proprietor, and the users. Once established, participation in the program is mandatory for aircraft operators and pilots as provided for in F.A.R. Section 91.87.

RUNWAY USE PROGRAM (INFORMAL) - An approved noise abatement program which does not require a Letter of Understanding

and participation in the program is voluntary for aircraft operators/pilots.

SEL - Sound Exposure Level. SEL expressed in dB, is a measure of the effect of duration and magnitude for a single-event measured in A-weighted sound level above a specified threshold which is at least 10 dB below the maximum value. In typical aircraft noise model calculations, SEL is used in computing aircraft acoustical contribution to the Equivalent Sound Level (Leq), the Day-Night Sound Level (DNL), and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).

SINGLE EVENT - An occurrence of audible noise usually above a specified minimum noise level caused by an intrusive source such as an aircraft overflight, passing train, or ship's horn.

SLANT-RANGE DISTANCE - The straight line distance between an aircraft and a point on the ground.

SOUND EXPOSURE LEVEL - See SEL.

TACTICAL AIR NAVIGATION (TACAN) - An ultra-high frequency electronic air navigation system which provides suitably-equipped aircraft a continuous indication of bearing and distance to the TACAN station.


TERMINAL RADAR SERVICE AREA (TRSA) - Airspace surrounding designated airports where ATC provides radar vectoring, sequencing, and separation on a full-time basis for all IFR and participating VFR aircraft. Service provided in a TRSA is called Stage III Service.

THRESHOLD - Decibel level below which single event information is not printed out on the noise monitoring equipment tapes. The noise levels below the threshold are, however, considered in the accumulation of hourly and daily noise levels.

TIME ABOVE (TA) - The 24-hour TA noise metric provides the duration in minutes for which aircraft-related noise exceeds specified A-weighted sound levels. It is expressed in minutes per 24-hour period.

TOUCHDOWN ZONE LIGHTING (TDZ) - Two rows of transverse light bars located symmetrically about the runway centerline normally at 100 foot intervals. The basic system extends 3,000 feet along the runway.

TRAFFIC PATTERN - The traffic flow that is prescribed for aircraft landing at or taking off from an airport. The components of a typical traffic pattern are the upwind leg, crosswind leg, downwind leg, base leg, and final approach.




UNICOM - A nongovernment communication facility which may provide airport information at certain airports. Locations and frequencies of UNICOM's are shown on aeronautical charts and publications.

UPWIND LEG - A flight path parallel to the landing runway in the direction of landing. See "traffic pattern."

VECTOR - A heading issued to an aircraft to provide navigational guidance by radar.

VERY HIGH FREQUENCY OMNIDIRECTIONAL RANGE STATION (VOR) - A ground-based electric navigation aid transmitting very high frequency navigation signals, 360 degrees in azimuth, oriented from magnetic north. Used as the basis for navigation in the national airspace system. The VOR periodically identifies itself by Morse Code and may have an additional voice identification feature.



VERY HIGH FREQUENCY OMNIDIRECTIONAL RANGE STATION/TACTICAL AIR NAVIGATION (VORTAC) - A navigation aid providing VOR azimuth, TACAN azimuth, and TACAN distance-measuring equipment (DME) at one site.

VICTOR AIRWAY - A control area or portion thereof established in the form of a corridor, the centerline of which is defined by radio navigational aids.

VISUAL APPROACH - An approach wherein an aircraft on an IFR flight plan, operating in VFR conditions under the control of an air traffic control facility and having an air traffic control authorization, may proceed to the airport of destination in VFR conditions.

VISUAL APPROACH SLOPE INDICATOR (VASI) - An airport lighting facility providing vertical visual approach slope guidance to aircraft during approach to landing by radiating an directional pattern of high intensity red and white focused light beams which indicate to

the pilot that he is on path if he sees red/white, above path if white/white, and below path if red/red. Some airports serving large aircraft have three-bar VASI's which provide two visual guide paths to the same runway.

VISUAL FLIGHT RULES (VFR) - Rules that govern the procedures for conducting flight under visual conditions. The term VFR is also used in the United States to indicate weather conditions that are equal to or greater than minimum VFR requirements. In addition, it is used by pilots and controllers to indicate type of flight plan.

VOR - See "Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range Station."

VORTAC - See "Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range Station/Tactical Air Navigation."

YEARLY DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE SOUND LEVEL - See DNL.



TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

The Measurement and Analysis of Sound

TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

THE MEASUREMENT AND ANALYSIS OF SOUND



Rock-and-roll on the stereo of the resident of apartment 3A is music to her ears, but it is intolerable racket to the next door neighbor in 3B.

Sound is energy — energy that conveys information to the listener. Although measuring this energy is a straightforward technical exercise, describing sound energy in ways that are meaningful to people is complex. This TIP explains some of the basic principles of sound measurement and analysis.

NOISE - UNWANTED SOUND

Noise is often defined as unwanted sound. For example, rock-and-roll on the stereo of the resident of apartment 3A is music to her ears, but it is intolerable racket to the next door neighbor in 3B. One might think that the louder the sound, the more likely it is to be considered noise. This is not necessarily true. In our example, the resident of apartment 3A is surely exposed to higher sound levels than her neighbor in 3B, yet she considers the sound as pleasant while the neighbor considers it “noise.” While it is possible to measure the sound level objectively, characterizing it as “noise” is a subjective judgement.

The characterization of a sound as “noise” depends on many factors, including the information content of the sound, the familiarity of the sound, a person’s control over the sound, and a person’s activity at the time the sound is heard.



MEASUREMENT OF SOUND



A person's ability to hear a sound depends on its character as compared with all other sounds in the environment.

A person's ability to hear a sound depends on its character as compared with all other sounds in the environment. Three characteristics of sound to which people respond are subject to objective measurement: magnitude or loudness; the frequency spectrum; and the time variation of the sound.

LOUDNESS

The unit used to measure the magnitude of sound is the decibel. Decibels are used to measure loudness in the same way that "inches" and "degrees" are used to measure length and temperature. Unlike the linear length and temperature scales, the decibel scale is logarithmic. By definition, a sound which has ten times the mean square sound pressure of the reference sound is 10 decibels (dB) greater than the reference sound. A sound which has 100 times (10×10 or 10^2) the mean square sound pressure of the reference sound is 20 dB greater (10×2).

The logarithmic scale is convenient because the mean square sound pressures of normal interest extend over a range of 11 trillion to one. This huge number (a "1" followed by 14 zeros or 10^{14}) is much more conveniently represented on the logarithmic scale as 140 dB (10×14).

The use of the logarithmic decibel scale requires different arithmetic than we use with linear scales. For example, if two equally loud but independent noise sources operate simultaneously, the measured mean square sound pressure from both sources will be twice as great as either source operating alone. When expressed on the decibel scale, however, the sound pressure level from the combined sources is only 3 dB higher than the level produced by either source alone. Furthermore, if we have two sounds of different magnitude from independent sources, then the level of the sum will never be more than 3 dB above the level produced by the greater source alone.

This equation describes the mathematics of sound level summation:

$$S_t = 10 \log \sum_i 10^{S_i/10}$$





The loudest sound levels are the dominant influence in the averaging process.

where S_t is the total sound level, in decibels, and S_i is the sound level of the individual sources.

A simpler process of summation is also available and often used where a level of accuracy of less than one decibel is not required. Table 1 lists additive factors applicable to the difference between the sound levels of two sources.

TABLE 1


ADDITIVE FACTORS FOR SUMMATION OF TWO SOUND TYPES

DIFFERENCE IN SOUND LEVEL (DB)	ADD TO LARGER LEVEL (DB)	DIFFERENCE IN SOUND LEVEL (DB)	ADD TO LARGER LEVEL (DB)
0	3.0	8	0.6
1	2.5	9	0.5
2	2.1	10	0.4
3	1.8	12	0.3
4	1.5	14	0.2
5	1.2	16	0.1
6	1.0	Greater than 16	0
7	0.8		

Source: HUD 1985, p. 51.

The noise values to be added should be arrayed from lowest to highest. The additive factor derived from the difference between the lowest and next highest noise level should be added to the higher level. An example is shown below.


EXAMPLE OF SOUND LEVEL SUMMATION



Logarithmic math also produces interesting results when averaging sound levels. As the following example shows, the loudest sound levels are the dominant influence in the averaging process. In the example, two sound levels of equal duration are averaged. One is 100 dB; the other 50 dB. The result is not 75 as it would be with linear math but 97 dB. This is because 100 dB contains 100,000 times the sound energy as 50 dB.



EXAMPLE OF SOUND LEVEL SUMMATION



Scientists researching human hearing have determined that most people perceive a 10 dB increase in sound energy over a given frequency range as roughly a doubling of the loudness.

Another interesting attribute of sound is the human perception of loudness. Scientists researching human hearing have determined that most people perceive a 10 dB increase in sound energy over a given frequency range as, roughly, a doubling of the loudness. Recalling the logarithmic nature of the decibel scale, this means that most people perceive a ten-fold increase in sound energy as a two-fold increase in loudness (Kryter 1984, p. 188). Furthermore, when comparing sounds over the same frequency range, most people cannot distinguish between sounds varying by less than two or three decibels.


Exhibit A presents examples of various noise sources at different noise levels, comparing the decibel scale with the relative sound energy and the human perception of loudness. In the exhibit, 60 dB is taken as the reference or “normal” sound level. A sound of 70 dB, involving ten times the sound energy, is perceived as twice as loud. A sound of 80 dB contains 100 times the sound energy and is perceived as four times as loud as 60 dB. Similarly, a sound of 50 dB contains ten times less sound energy than 60 dB and is perceived as half as loud.

FREQUENCY WEIGHTING

Two sounds with the same sound pressure level may “sound” quite different (e.g., a rumble versus a hiss) because of differing distributions of sound energy in the audible frequency range. The distribution of sound energy as a function of frequency is known as the “frequency spectrum.” The spectrum is important to the measurement of sound because the human ear is more sensitive to sounds at some frequencies than others.



TYPICAL SOUND LEVELS



People hear best in the frequency range of 1,000 to 5,000 cycles per second (Hertz) than at very much lower or higher frequencies. If the magnitude of a sound is to be measured so that it is proportional to its perception by a human, it is necessary to weight more heavily that part of the sound energy spectrum humans hear most easily.



An important advantage of the Leq metric is that it correlates well with the effects of noise on humans.



Over the years, many different sound measurement scales have been developed, including the A-weighted scale (and also the B, C, D, and E-weighted scales). A-weighting, developed in the 1930s, is the most commonly used scale for approximating the frequency spectrum to which humans are sensitive. Because of its universality, it was adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other government agencies for the description of sound in the environment.

The zero value on the A-weighted scale is the reference pressure of 20 micro-newtons per square meter (or micro-pascals). This value approximates the smallest sound pressure that can be detected by a human. The average sound level of a whisper at a distance of 1 meter is 40 dB; the sound level of a normal voice at 1 meter is 57 dB; a shout at 1 meter is 85 dB; and the threshold of pain is 130 dB.

TIME VARIATION OF SOUND LEVEL

Generally, the magnitude of sound in the environment varies randomly over time. Of course, there are many exceptions. For example, the sound of a waterfall is steady with time, as is the sound of a room air conditioner or the sound inside a car or airplane cruising at a constant speed. But, in most places, the loudness of outdoor sound is constantly changing because it is influenced by sounds from many sources.

While the continuous variation of sound levels can be measured, recorded, and presented, comparisons of sounds at different times or at different places is very difficult without some way of reducing the time variation. One way of doing this is to calculate the value of a steady-state sound which contains the same amount of sound energy as the time-varying sound under consideration. This value is known as the Equivalent Sound Level (Leq). An important advantage of the Leq metric is that it correlates well with the effects of noise on humans. On the basis of research, scientists have formulated the “equal energy rule.” It is the total sound energy perceived by a human that accounts for the effects of the sound on the person. In other words, a very loud noise lasting a short time will have the same effect as a quieter noise lasting a longer time if the total energy of both sound events (the Leq value) is the same.

KEY DESCRIPTORS OF SOUND



The SEL is the quantity that best describes the total noise from an aircraft overflight.

Four descriptors or metrics are useful for quantifying sound (Newman and Beattie 1985, pp. 9-15). All are based on the logarithmic decibel (dB) scale and incorporate A-weighting to account for the frequency response of the ear.

Sound Level

The sound level (L) in decibels is the quantity read on an ordinary sound level meter. It fluctuates with time following the fluctuations in magnitude of the sound. Its maximum value (L_{max}) is one of the descriptors often used to characterize the sound of an airplane overflight. However, L_{max} only gives the maximum magnitude of a sound — it does not convey any information about the duration of the sound. Clearly, if two sounds have the same maximum sound level, the sound which lasts longer will cause more interference with human activity.

Sound Exposure Level


Both loudness and duration are included in the Sound Exposure Level (SEL), which adds up all sound occurring in a stated time period or during a specific event, integrating the total sound over a one-second duration. The SEL is the quantity that best describes the total noise from an aircraft overflight. Based on numerous sound measurements, the SEL from a typical aircraft overflight is usually four to seven decibels higher than the L_{max} for the event.

Exhibit B shows graphs of two different sound events. In the top half of the graph, we see that the two events have the same L_{max} , but the second event lasts longer than the first. It is clear from the graph that the area under the noise curve is greater for the second event than the first. This means that the second event contains more total sound energy than the first, even though the peak levels for each event are the same. In the bottom half of the graph, the Sound Exposure Levels (SELs) for each event are compared. The SELs are computed by mathematically compressing the total sound energy into a one-second period. The SEL for the second event is




COMPARISON OF L_{max} AND SEL

Two sound events with the same maximum sound level (L_{max}).



Different sound exposure levels (SEL) for two sound events with the same L_{max} .



greater than the SEL for the first. Again, this simply means that the total sound energy for the second event is greater than for the first.

Equivalent Sound Level

The equivalent sound level (L_{eq}) is simply the logarithm of the average value of the sound exposure during a stated time period. It is typically used for durations of one hour, eight hours, or 24 hours. In airport noise compatibility studies, use of the L_{eq} term applies to 24-hour periods unless otherwise noted. It is often used to describe sounds with respect to their potential for interfering with human activity.





The multiplication factor of 10 applied to nighttime sound is often referred to as a 10 decibel penalty. It is intended to account for the increased annoyance attributable to noise during the night when ambient levels are lower and people are trying to sleep.




Day-Night Sound Level

A special form of Leq is the day-night sound level, abbreviated as DNL in discussions and Ldn in equations. DNL is calculated by summing the sound exposure during daytime hours (0700 - 2200) plus 10 times the sound exposure occurring during nighttime hours (2200 - 0700) and averaging this sum by the number of seconds during a 24-hour day. The multiplication factor of 10 applied to nighttime sound is often referred to as a 10 decibel penalty. It is intended to account for the increased annoyance attributable to noise during the night when ambient levels are lower and people are trying to sleep.

Exhibit C shows how the sound occurring during a 24-hour period is weighted and averaged by the DNL descriptor (or metric). In that example, the sound

EXHIBIT C

TYPICAL NOISE PATTERN AND DNL SUMMATION



Source: Coffman Associates 2003

occurring during the period, including aircraft noise and background sound, yields a DNL value of 71. As a practical matter, this is a reasonably close estimate of the aircraft noise alone because, in this example, the background noise is low enough to contribute only a little to the overall DNL value during the period of observation.

Where the basic element of sound measurement is Leq, DNL is calculated from:

$$L_{dn} = 10 \log \frac{1}{24} \left(\sum_{d=1}^{15} 10^{[Leq(d)]/10} + \sum_{n=1}^9 10^{[Leq(n)+10]/10} \right)$$

where DNL is represented mathematically as Ldn, and Leq(d) and Leq(n) are the daytime and nighttime hour values combined. This expression is convenient where Leq values for only a few hours are available and the values for the remainder of the day can be predicted from a knowledge of day/night variation in levels. The hourly Leq values are summed for the 15 hours from 0700 to 2200 and added to the sum of hourly Leq figures for the 9 nighttime hours with a 10 dB penalty added to the nighttime Leqs.

Another way of computing DNL is described in this equation:

$$L_{dn} = 10 \log \frac{1}{86400} \left(\int_{\text{day}} 10^{LA/10} dt + \int_{\text{night}} 10^{(LA+10)/10} dt \right)$$

where LA is the time-varying, A-weighted sound level, measured with equipment meeting the requirements for sound level meters (as specified in a standard such as ANSI S1.4-1971), and dt is the duration of time in seconds. The averaging constant of 86,400 is the number of seconds in a day. The integrals are taken over the daytime (0700 - 2200) and the nighttime (2200 - 0700) periods, respectively. If the sound level is sampled at a rate of once per second rather than measured continuously, the equation still applies if the samples replace LA and the integrals are changed to summations.





The DNL developed over a long period of time, for example one year, defines the noise environment of the area, allowing us to make predictions about the average response of people living in areas exposed to various DNL levels.


Use of the DNL metric to describe aircraft noise is required for all airport noise studies developed under the regulations of F.A.R. Part 150. In addition, DNL is preferred by all federal agencies as the appropriate single measure of cumulative sound exposure. These agencies include the FAA, the Federal Highway Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Defense, and Department of Housing and Urban Development.

One might think of the DNL metric as a summary description of the “noise climate” of an area. DNL accumulates the noise energy from passing aircraft in the same way that a precipitation gauge accumulates rain from passing storms. This analogy is presented in **Exhibit D**. Rain usually starts as a light sprinkle, building in intensity as the squall line passes over, then diminishing as the squall moves on. At the end of a 24-hour period, a rain gauge indicates the total rainfall received for that day, although the rain fell only during brief, sometimes intense, showers. Over a year, total precipitation is summarized in inches. When snow falls, it is converted to its equivalent measure as water. Although the total volume of precipitation during the year may be billions or trillions of gallons of water, its volume is expressed in inches because it provides for easier summation and description. We have learned how to use total annual precipitation to describe the climate of an area and make predictions about the environment.

Aircraft noise is similar to precipitation. The noise level from a single overflight begins quietly and builds in intensity as the aircraft draws closer. The sound of the aircraft is loudest as it passes over the receiver, diminishing as it passes. The total noise occurring during the event is accumulated and described as a Sound Exposure Level (SEL). Over a 24-hour period, the SELs can be summed, adding a special 10-decibel factor for nighttime noise, yielding a DNL value. The DNL developed over a long period of time, for example one year, defines the noise environment of the area, allowing us to make predictions about the average response of people living in areas exposed to various DNL levels.



PRECIPITATION AND NOISE MEASUREMENT COMPARISON



Source: Coffman Associates 1990



HELPFUL RULES-OF-THUMB

Despite the complex mathematics involved in noise analysis, several simple rules-of-thumb can help in understanding the noise evaluation process.

- *When sound events are averaged, the loud events dominate the calculation.*
- *A 10 decibel change in noise is equal to a tenfold change in sound energy. For example, the noise from ten aircraft is ten decibels louder than the noise from one aircraft of the same type, operated in the same way.*
- *Most people perceive an increase of 10 decibels as a relative doubling of the sound level.*
- *The DNL metric assumes one nighttime operation (between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.) is equal in impact to ten daytime operations by the same aircraft.*
- *A doubling of aircraft operations results in a three decibel noise increase if done by the same aircraft operated in the same way.*

References

Kryter, K.D. 1984. *Physiological, Psychological, and Social Effects of Noise*, NASA Reference Publication 1115.

Newman, Steven J. and Kristy R. Beattie, 1985. *Aviation Noise Effects*. Prepared for U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Environment and Energy, Washington, D.C., Report No. FAA-EE-85-2, March 1985.

HUD (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) 1985. *The Noise Guidebook*, HUD-953-CPD Washington, D.C., Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1985.





TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

Effects of Noise Exposure

TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

EFFECTS OF NOISE EXPOSURE



Studies which examined hearing loss among people living near airports found that, under normal circumstances, people in the community near an airport are at no risk of suffering hearing damage from aircraft noise.



Aircraft noise can affect people both physically and psychologically. It is difficult, however, to make sweeping generalizations about the impacts of noise on people because of the wide variations in individual reactions. While much has been learned in recent years, some physical and psychological responses to noise are not yet fully understood and continue to be debated by researchers.

EFFECTS ON HEARING

Hearing loss is the major health danger posed by noise. A study published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1974) found that exposure to noise of 70 Leq or higher on a continuous basis, over a very long time, at the human ear's most damage-sensitive frequency, may result in a very small but permanent loss of hearing. (Leq is a pure noise dosage metric, measuring cumulative noise energy over a given time.)

In *Aviation Noise Effects* (Newman and Beattie, 1985, pp. 33-42), three studies are cited which examined hearing



Airport noise in areas off airport property is far too low to be considered potentially damaging to hearing. Those most at risk [of hearing loss] are personnel in the transportation industry, especially airport ground staff.



loss among people living near airports. They found that, under normal circumstances, people in the community near an airport are at no risk of suffering hearing damage from aircraft noise.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has established standards for permissible noise exposure in the work place to guard against the risk of hearing loss. Hearing protection is required when noise levels exceed the legal limits. The standards, shown in **Table 1**, establish a sliding scale of permissible noise levels by duration of exposure. The standards permit noise levels of up to 90 dBA for eight hours per day without requiring hearing protection. The regulations also require employers to establish hearing conservation programs where noise levels exceed 85 Leq during the 8-hour workday. This involves the monitoring of work place noise, the testing of employees' hearing, the provision of hearing protectors to employees at risk of hearing loss, and the establishment of a training program to inform employees about the effects of work place noise on hearing and the effectiveness of hearing protection devices.

TABLE 1

PERMISSIBLE NOISE EXPOSURE - OSHA STANDARDS

DURATION PER DAY, HOURS	SOUND LEVEL dBA SLOW RESPONSE	DURATION PER DAY, HOURS	SOUND LEVEL dBA SLOW RESPONSE
8	90	1 1/2	102
6	92	1	105
4	95	1/2	110
3	97	1/4 or less	115
2	100		

Source: 29 CFR Ch. XVII, Section 1910.95(b)

Experience at other airports has shown that even at sites with cumulative noise exposure near 75 DNL, the total time noise levels exceed 80 dBA typically ranges from 10 to 20 minutes, far below the critical hearing damage thresholds (Coffman Associates 1993, pp. 2-11). This supports the conclusion that airport noise in areas off airport property is far too low to be considered potentially damaging to hearing.

With respect to the risk of hearing loss, the authors of an authoritative summary of the research conclude: "Those



There is no strong evidence that noise has a direct causal effect on such health outcomes as cardiovascular disease, reproductive abnormality, or psychiatric disorder.



most at risk [of hearing loss] are personnel in the transportation industry, especially airport ground staff. Beyond this group, it is unlikely that the general public will be exposed to sustained high levels of transportation noise sufficient to result in hearing loss. Transportation noise control in the community can therefore not be justified on the grounds of hearing protection.” (See Taylor and Wilkins 1987.)

NON-AUDITORY HEALTH EFFECTS

It is sometimes claimed that aviation noise can harm the general physical and mental health of airport neighbors. Effects on the cardiovascular system, mortality rates, birth weights, achievement scores, and psychiatric admissions have been examined in the research literature. The question of pathological effects remains unsettled because of conflicting findings based on differing methodologies and uneven study quality. It is quite possible that the contribution of noise to pathological effects is so low that it has not been clearly isolated. While research is continuing, there is insufficient scientific evidence to support these concerns (Newman and Beattie 1985, pp. 59-62). Taylor and Wilkins (1987, p. 4/10) offer the following conclusions in their review of the research.

The evidence of non-auditory effects of transportation noise is more ambiguous, leading to differences of opinion regarding the burden of prudence for noise control. There is no strong evidence that noise has a direct causal effect on such health outcomes as cardiovascular disease, reproductive abnormality, or psychiatric disorder. At the same time, the evidence is not strong enough to reject the hypothesis that noise is in some way involved in the multi-causal process leading to these disorders. . . . But even with necessary improvements in study design, the inherent difficulty of isolating the effect of a low dose agent such as transportation noise within a complex aetiological system will remain. It seems unlikely, therefore, that research in the near future will yield findings which are definitive in either a positive or negative direction. Consequently, arguments for transportation noise control will probably continue to be based primarily on welfare criteria such as annoyance and activity disturbance.



Reviews of laboratory research on sleep disturbance report that the level of noise which can cause awakenings or interfere with falling asleep ranges from 35 dBA to 80 dBA, depending on the sleep stage and variability among individuals.



Recent case studies on mental illness and hypertension indicate that this conclusion remains valid. Yoshida and Nakamura (1990) found that long-term exposure to sound pressure levels above 65 DNL may contribute to reported ill effects on mental well-being. This case study, however, concluded that more research is needed because the results also contained some contrary effects, indicating that in some circumstances, ill effects were negatively correlated with increasing noise.

Griefahn (1992) studied the impact of noise exposure ranging from 62 dBA to 80 dBA on people with hypertension. She found that there is a tendency for vasoconstriction to increase among untreated hypertensive people as noise levels increase. However, she also found that beta-blocking medication prevented any increase in vasoconstriction attributable to noise. She concluded that while noise may be related to the onset of hypertension, especially in the presence of other risk factors, hypertensive people do not run a higher risk of ill-health effects if they are properly treated.

SLEEP DISTURBANCE

There is a large body of research documenting the effect of noise on sleep disturbance, but the long-range effects of sleep disturbance caused by nighttime airport operations are not well understood. It is clear that sleep is essential for good physical and emotional health, and noise can interfere with sleep, even when the sleeper is not consciously awakened. While the long-term effect of sleep deprivation on mental and physical function is not clear, it is known to be harmful. It is also known that sleepers do not fully adjust to noise disruption over time. Although they may awaken less often and have fewer conscious memories of disturbance, noise-induced shifts in sleep levels continue to occur.

Reviews of laboratory research on sleep disturbance report that the level of noise which can cause awakenings or interfere with falling asleep ranges from 35 dBA to 80 dBA, depending on the sleep stage and variability among individuals (Newman and Beattie 1985, pp. 51-58; Kryter 1984, pp. 422-431). There is evidence that older people tend to be much more sensitive to noise-induced awakenings than younger people.



Research has shown that, when measured through awakenings, people tend to become somewhat accustomed to noise.



Research has shown that, when measured through awakenings, people tend to become somewhat accustomed to noise. On the other hand, electroencephalograms, which reveal information about sleep stages, show little habituation to noise. Kryter describes these responses to noise as “alerting responses.” He suggests that because they occur unconsciously, they may simply be reflexive responses, reflecting normal physiological functions which are probably not a cause of stress to the organism.

Most studies of sleep disturbance have been conducted under controlled laboratory conditions. The laboratory studies do not allow generalizations about the potential for sleep disturbance in an actual airport setting, and, more importantly, the impact of these disturbances on the residents. Furthermore, the range of sound levels required to cause sleep disturbance, ranging from a whisper to a shout (35 dB to 80 dB), and the prevalence of sleep disruption in the absence of any noise, greatly complicates the making of reasonable generalizations about the effect of noise on sleep.


Fortunately, some studies have examined the effect of nighttime noise on sleep disturbance in actual community settings. One report summarizes the results of eight studies conducted in homes (Fields 1986). Four studies examined aircraft noise, the others highway noise. In all of them, sleep disturbance was correlated with cumulative noise exposure metrics such as Leq and L10. All studies showed a distinct tendency for increased sleep disturbance as cumulative noise exposure increased. The reviewer notes, however, that sleep disturbance was very common, regardless of noise levels, and that many factors contributed to it. He points out that, “the prevalence of sleep disturbance in the absence of noise means that considerable caution must be exercised in interpreting any reports of sleep disturbance in noisy areas.”

A recent review of the literature, Pearsons, et al. (1990), compared the data and findings of laboratory and field studies conducted in the homes of subjects. They found that noise-induced awakenings in the home were much less prevalent than in the laboratory. They also found that much higher noise levels were required to induce awakenings in the home than in the laboratory. **Exhibit A**

compares the percentage of people awakened at different sound levels in laboratory and field studies. The graph clearly shows a marked tendency for people in laboratory settings to be much more sensitive to noise than in their homes. The reason for the large difference is apparently that people in their homes are fully habituated to their environment, including the noise levels.

EXHIBIT A

**COMPARISON OF AWAKENING DUE TO NOISE
EVENTS FROM LABORATORY VERSUS FIELD STUDIES**



Source: Pearson, K.S. et al. 1990.

Finegold et al. (1994) reviewed the data in the Pearsons report of 1990 and developed a regression analysis. As shown in **Exhibit B**, an exponential curve was found to fit the categorized data reasonably well. They recommend that this curve be used as a provisional means of predicting potential sleep disturbance from aircraft






The findings of many of these sleep disturbance studies are of little usefulness to policy-makers and airport residents. For them, the important question is, "When does sleep disturbance caused by environmental noise become severe enough to constitute a problem in the community?"



noise. They caution that because the curve was derived using Pearsons' laboratory, as well as in-home data, the predictions of sleep disruption in an actual community setting derived from this curve are likely to be high.

EXHIBIT B

FINEGOLD'S SLEEP DISTURBANCE CURVE



Source: Finegold et al. 1994.

Note: Based on laboratory and field data reported in Pearsons et al. 1989.

The findings of many of these sleep disturbance studies, while helping to answer basic research questions, are of little usefulness to policy-makers and airport residents. For them, the important question is, "When does sleep disturbance caused by environmental noise become severe enough to constitute a problem in the community?" Kryter (1984, pp. 434-443) reviews in detail one important study that sheds light on this question. The Directorate of Operational Research and Analysis (DORA) of the British Civil Aviation Authority conducted an in-depth survey of 4,400 residents near London's Heathrow and Gatwick Airports over a four-month period in 1979 (DORA 1980). The study was intended to answer two policy-related questions: "What is the level of aircraft noise which will disturb a sleeping person?" and "What level of aircraft noise prevents people from getting to sleep?"



The 65 DNL contour defines a noise impact envelope which encompasses all of the area within which significant sleep disturbance may be expected.

Analysis of the survey results indicated that the best correlations were found using cumulative energy dosage metrics, namely Leq. Kryter notes that support for the use of the Leq metric is provided by the finding that some respondents could not accurately recall the time association of a specific flight with an arousal from sleep. This suggests that the noise from successive overflights increased the general state of arousability from sleep.

With regard to difficulty in getting to sleep, the study found 25 percent of the respondents reporting this problem at noise levels of 60 Leq, 33 percent at 65 Leq, and 42 percent at 70 Leq. The percentage of people who reported being awakened at least once per week by aircraft noise was 19 percent at 50 Leq, 24 percent at 55 Leq, and 28 percent at 60 Leq. The percentage of people bothered "very much" or "quite a lot" by aircraft noise at night when in bed was 22 percent at 55 Leq and 30 percent at 60 Leq. Extrapolation of the trend line would put the percentage reporting annoyance at 65 Leq well above 40 percent.

DORA concluded with the following answers to the policy-related questions: (1) A significant increase in reports of sleep arousal will occur at noise levels at or above 65 Leq; (2) A significant increase in the number of people reporting difficulty in getting to sleep will occur at noise levels at or above 70 Leq. Kryter disagrees with these findings. He believes that a more careful reflection upon the data leads to the conclusion that noise levels approximately 10 decibels lower would represent the appropriate thresholds — 55 and 60 Leq.

At any airport, the 65 DNL contour developed from total daily aircraft activity will be larger than the 55 Leq developed from nighttime activity only. (At an airport with only nighttime use, the 65 DNL contour will be identical with the 55 Leq contour because of the effect of the 10 dB penalty in the DNL metric.) Thus, the 65 DNL contour defines a noise impact envelope which encompasses all of the area within which significant sleep disturbance may be expected based on Kryter's interpretation of the DORA findings discussed above.

A recent study was conducted by the British Civil Aviation Authority to examine the relationship of nighttime aircraft noise and sleep disturbance near four major airports —






Researchers found that for aircraft noise events below 90 SEL, as measured outdoors, there was likely to be no measurable increase in rates of sleep disturbance.

Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, and Manchester (Ollerhead, et al. 1992). A total of 400 subjects were monitored for a total of 5,742 subject-nights. Nightly awakenings were found to be very common as part of natural sleep patterns. Researchers found that for aircraft noise events below 90 SEL, as measured outdoors, there was likely to be no measurable increase in rates of sleep disturbance. (The indoor level can be roughly estimated as approximately 20 to 25 decibels less than the outdoor level.) Where noise events ranged from 90 to 100 SEL, a very small rate of increase in disturbance was possible. Overall, rates of sleep disturbance were found to be more closely correlated with sleep stage than with periods of peak aircraft activity. That is, sleep was more likely to be disrupted, from any cause, during light stages than during heavy stages.

Exhibit C shows the relationship between arousal from sleep and outdoor sound exposure levels (SELs) found in the 1992 British study. The results have been statistically adjusted to control for the effects of individual variability in sleep disturbance. The study found that the arousal rate for the average person, with no aircraft noise, was 5.1 percent. Aircraft noise of less than SEL 90 dBA was

EXHIBIT C

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AVERAGE SLEEP DISTURBANCE AND AIRCRAFT NOISE LEVEL



Source: Ollerhead, J.B. et al. 1992, p. 25.

Note: Estimates controlled for the effects of individual arousability.





While vibration contributes to annoyance reported by residents near airports, especially when it is accompanied by high audible sound levels, it rarely carries enough energy to damage safely constructed structures.



found not to be statistically significant as a cause of sleep disturbance. (According to the study, this would correspond to an L_{max} of approximately 81 dBA. L_{max} is the loudest sound the human ear would actually hear during the 90 SEL noise event. The interior L_{max} would be approximately 20 to 25 decibels less — roughly 56 to 61 dBA.) The 95 percent prediction interval is shown on the graph not to rise above the 5.1 percent base arousal rate until it is above 90 dBA. Again, it should be emphasized that these conclusions relate to the average person. More easily aroused people will be disturbed at lower noise levels, but they are also more likely to be aroused from other sources (Ollerhead, et al. 1992).

STRUCTURAL DAMAGE

Structural vibration from aircraft noise in the low frequency ranges is sometimes a concern of airport neighbors. While vibration contributes to annoyance reported by residents near airports, especially when it is accompanied by high audible sound levels, it rarely carries enough energy to damage safely constructed structures. High-impulse sounds such as blasting, sonic booms, and artillery fire are more likely to cause damage than continuous sounds such as aircraft noise. A document published by the National Academy of Sciences suggested that one may conservatively consider noise levels above 130 dB lasting more than one second as potentially damaging to structures (CHABA 1977). Aircraft noise of this magnitude occurs on the ramp and runway and seldom, if ever, occurs beyond the boundaries of a commercial or general aviation airport.

The risk of structural damage from aircraft noise was studied as part of the environmental assessment of the Concorde supersonic jet transport. The probability of damage from Concorde overflights was found to be extremely slight. Actual overflight noise from the Concorde at Sully Plantation near Dulles International Airport in Fairfax County, Virginia was recorded at 115 dBA. No damage to the historic structures was found, despite their age. Since the Concorde causes significantly more vibration than conventional commercial jet aircraft, the risk of structural damage caused by aircraft noise near airports is considered to be negligible (Hershey et al. 1975; Wiggins 1975).



The psychological impact of aircraft noise is a more serious concern than direct physical impact.


OTHER ANNOYANCES

The psychological impact of aircraft noise is a more serious concern than direct physical impact. Studies conducted in the late 1960s and early 1970s found that the interruption of communication, rest, relaxation, and sleep are important causes for complaints about aircraft noise. Disturbance of television viewing, radio listening, and telephone conversations are also sources of serious annoyance.

Exhibit D shows the relationship between sound levels and communicating distance for different voice levels. Assuming a communicating distance of 2 meters, communication becomes unsatisfactory with a steady

EXHIBIT D

MAXIMUM DISTANCES OUTDOORS OVER WHICH CONVERSATION IS SATISFACTORILY INTELLIGIBLE IN STEADY NOISE



Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1974. Cited in Caltrans, 1993.




noise level above approximately 65 decibels. At 65 decibels, a raised voice is required to maintain satisfactory conversation. Another way to interpret this is that a raised voice would be interrupted by a sound event above 65 decibels. A normal voice would be interrupted, at 2 meters, by a sound event of 60 decibels.

Exhibit E shows the impact of aircraft noise on conversation and radio or television listening. These results, summarized by Schultz (1978), were derived from surveys conducted in London, France, Munich, and Switzerland. Differences in the amount of disturbance reported in each study are based on how each survey defined disturbance. The British study counted mild disturbance, the French moderate disturbance, and the German and Swiss great disturbance.

EXHIBIT E

INTERFERENCE BY AIRCRAFT NOISE WITH VARIOUS ACTIVITIES



Note: Differences in amount of interference reported are related to how individual surveys defined interference. London counted mild disturbance, France moderate disturbance, and Munich and Switzerland great disturbance.

Source: Shultz, T.J. 1978.



In the case of conversation disruption, nine percent were greatly annoyed by noise of 60 DNL in the Swiss study. About 12 to 16 percent of those in the Swiss and German studies considered themselves to be greatly disturbed by aircraft noise of 65 DNL. At 75 DNL, 40 to 50 percent



Individual human response to noise is highly variable and is influenced by many emotional and physical factors.



considered themselves greatly disturbed. In the French study, 23 percent considered themselves moderately disturbed by aircraft noise at 60 DNL, 35 percent at 65 DNL, and 75 percent at 75 DNL. In the British study, 37 percent were mildly disturbed by aircraft noise at 60 DNL, 50 percent at 65 DNL, and about 72 percent at 75 DNL.

Regarding interference with television and radio listening, about 13 percent in the Swiss study were greatly disturbed by aircraft noise above 60 DNL, 21 percent at 65 DNL, and 40 percent at 75 DNL. In the British and French studies, 42 to 45 percent were mildly to moderately disturbed by noise at 60 DNL, 55 percent at 65 DNL, and 75 to 82 percent at 75 DNL.

In some cases, noise is only an indirect indicator of the real concern of airport neighbors — safety. The sound of approaching aircraft may cause fear in some people about the possibility of a crash. This fear is a factor motivating some complaints of annoyance in neighborhoods near airports around the country. (See Richards and Ollerhead 1973; FAA 1977; Kryter 1984, p. 533.) This effect tends to be most pronounced in areas directly beneath frequently used flight tracks (Gjestland 1989).

The EPA has also found that continuous exposure to high noise levels can affect work performance, especially in high-stress occupations. Based on the FAA's land use compatibility guidelines, discussed in the Technical Information Paper on Noise and Land Use Compatibility, these adverse affects are most likely to occur within the 75 DNL contour.

Individual human response to noise is highly variable and is influenced by many factors. These include emotional variables, feelings about the necessity or preventability of the noise, judgments about the value of the activity creating the noise, an individual's activity at the time the noise is heard, general sensitivity to noise, beliefs about the impact of noise on health, and feelings of fear associated with the noise. Physical factors influencing an individual's reaction to noise include the background noise in the community, the time of day, the season of the year, the predictability of the noise, and the individual's control over the noise source.


AVERAGE COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO NOISE

Although individual responses to noise can vary greatly, the average response among a group of people is much less variable. This enables us to generalize about the average impacts of aircraft noise on a community despite the wide variations in individual response.

Many studies have examined average residential community response to noise, focusing on the relationship between annoyance and noise exposure. (See DORA 1980; Fidell et al. 1989; Finegold et al. 1992 and 1994; Great Britain Committee on the Problem of Noise 1963; Kryter 1970; Richards and Ollerhead 1973; Schultz 1978; U.S. EPA 1974.) These studies have produced similar results, finding that annoyance is most directly related to cumulative noise exposure, rather than single-event exposure.

EXHIBIT F

PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION HIGHLY ANNOYED BY GENERAL TRANSPORTATION NOISE



PERCENT HIGHLY ANNOYED AT SELECTED NOISE LEVELS

DNL	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90
%HA	0.8%	1.6%	3.1%	6.1%	11.6%	20.9%	34.8%	51.7%	68.4%	81.3%

Source: Finegold et al. 1992 and 1994.



Annoyance has been found to increase along an S-shaped or logistic curve as cumulative noise exposure increases, as shown in **Exhibit F**. Developed by Finegold et al. (1992 and 1994), it is based on data derived from a



The updated Schultz Curve shows that annoyance is measurable beginning at 45 DNL, where 0.8 percent of people are highly annoyed. It increases gradually to 6.1 percent at 60 DNL. Starting at 65 DNL, the percentage of people expected to be highly annoyed increases steeply from 11.6 percent up to 68.4 percent at 85 DNL.



number of studies of transportation noise (Fidell 1989). It shows the relationship between DNL levels and the percentage of people who are highly annoyed. Known as the “updated Schultz Curve” because it is based on the work of Schultz (1978), it represents the best available source of data for the noise dosage-response relationship (FICON 1992, Vol. 2, pp. 3-5; Finegold et al. 1994, pp. 26-27).

The updated Schultz Curve shows that annoyance is measurable beginning at 45 DNL, where 0.8 percent of people are highly annoyed. It increases gradually to 6.1 percent at 60 DNL. Starting at 65 DNL, the percentage of people expected to be highly annoyed increases steeply from 11.6 percent up to 68.4 percent at 85 DNL. Note that this relationship includes only those reported to be “highly annoyed.” Based on other research, the percentages would be considerably higher if they also included those who were “moderately or mildly annoyed” (Richards and Ollerhead 1973; Schultz 1978).

SUMMARY

The effects of noise on people include hearing loss, other ill health effects, and annoyance. While harm to physical health is generally not a problem in neighborhoods near airports, annoyance is a common problem. Annoyance is caused by sleep disruption, interruption of conversations, interference with radio and television listening, and disturbance of quiet relaxation.

Individual responses to noise are highly variable, making it very difficult to predict how any person is likely to react to environmental noise. The average response among a large group of people, however, is much less variable and has been found to correlate well with cumulative noise dosage metrics such as Leq, DNL, and CNEL. The development of aircraft noise impact analysis techniques has been based on this relationship between average community response and cumulative noise exposure.



References

Caltrans 1993. *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. Prepared for California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics by Hodges & Shutt. Sacramento: California Department of Transportation, December 1993.

CHABA 1977. *Guidelines for Preparing Environmental Impact Statements on Noise, Report of Working Group 69 on Evaluation of Environmental Impact of Noise*. Committee on Hearing, Bioacoustics, and Biomechanics, Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.

Coffman Associates, Inc. 1993. *General Mitchell International Airport, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, F.A.R. Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study, Noise Compatibility Program*.

Directorate of Operational Research and Analysis (DORA) 1980. *Aircraft Noise and Sleep Disturbance: Final Report*. DORA Rep. 8008, Civil Aviation Authority, London, 1980. Cited in Kryter 1984, p. 434.

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) 1977. *Impact of Noise on People*. U.S. Department of Transportation, FAA, May 1977.

Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise (FICUN) 1980. *Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land Use Planning and Control*.

Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) 1992. *Federal Agency Review of Selected Airport Noise Analysis Issues*.

Fidell, S. et al. 1989. *Updating a Dosage-Effect Relationship for the Prevalence of Annoyance Due to General Transportation Noise*. HSD-TR-89-009. Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio: U.S. Air Force, Noise and Sonic Boom Impact Technology. Cited in FICON 1992.

Fields, J.M. 1986. *Cumulative Airport Noise Exposure Metrics: An Assessment of Evidence for Time-of-Day Weightings*, Report No. DOT/FAA/EE-86/10, FAA, Washington, D.C.





Finegold, L.S. et al. 1992. "Applied Acoustical Report: Criteria for Assessment of Noise Impacts on People." Submitted to *Journal of Acoustical Society of America*. June 1992. Cited in FICON 1992.

Finegold, L.S. et al. 1994. "Community Annoyance and Sleep Disturbance: Updated Criteria for Assessing the Impacts of General Transportation Noise on People." *Noise Control Engineering Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1994.

Gjestland, T. 1989. "Aircraft Noise Annoyance." 1989 *International Conference On Noise Control Engineering*, Vol. 2, pp. 903-908.

Great Britain Committee on the Problem of Noise, 1963. *Noise, Final Report*. Presented to Parliament by Lord Minister for Science by Command of Her Majesty. H.M. Stationery Office, London, July 1963. Cited in Newman and Beattie 1985, p. 23.

Griefahn, B. 1989. "Critical Loads For Noise Exposure At Night." 1990 *International Conference On Noise Control Engineering*, Vol. 2, pp. 1163-1166.

Griefahn, B. 1992. "Hypertension — A Particular Risk For Noise Exposure." 1992 *International Conference On Noise Control Engineering*, Vol. 2, pp. 1123-1126.

Hershey, R.L., et al. 1975. *Analysis of the Effect of Concorde Aircraft Noise on Historic Structures*. Report No. FAA-RD-75-118, July 1975. Cited in Newman and Beattie 1985, p. 70.

Kryter, K.D. 1970. *The Effects of Noise on Man*. Academic Press, New York. Cited in Newman and Beattie 1985, p. 22.

Kryter, K.D. 1984. *Physiological, Psychological, and Social Effects of Noise*, NASA Reference Publication 1115.

Newman, Steven J. and Kristy R. Beattie, 1985. *Aviation Noise Effects*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Environment and Energy, Washington, D.C., Report No. FAA-EE-85-2, March 1985.





Ollerhead, J.B. et al., 1992. *Report of a Field Study of Aircraft Noise and Sleep Disturbance*. A study commissioned by the Department of Transport from the Department of Safety, Environment and Engineering, Civil Aviation Authority (United Kingdom).

Pearsons, K.S. et al., 1990. *Analyses of the Predictability of Noise-induced Sleep Disturbance*, U.S. Air Force Report HSD-TR-89-029. Cited in Ollerhead, et al. 1992, p. 2.

Richards, E.J. and J.B. Ollerhead, 1973. "Noise Burden Factor — A New Way of Rating Noise," *Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 7, No. 12, December.

Schuller W.M. and van der Ploeg F.D., 1993. "Recent Developments With Respect to Aircraft Noise And Sleep Disturbance." *1993 International Conference On Noise Control Engineering*, Vol. 1, pp. 155-160.

Schultz, T.J. 1978. "Synthesis of Social Surveys on Noise Annoyance." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 64, No. 2, pp. 377-405. Cited in FICON 1992.

Taylor, S.M. and P.A. Wilkins, 1987. "Health Effects." In *Transportation Noise Reference Book*, Ed. P.M. Nelson. Butterworths.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1974. *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*. EPA, Office of Noise Abatement and Control, Washington, D.C., March 1974.

Wiggins, J.H. 1975. *The Influence of Concorde Noise on Structural Vibrations*. Report No. FAA-75-1241-1, July 1975. Cited in Newman and Beattie 1985, p. 70.

Yoshida T. and Nakamura S., 1990. "Community and Health of Inhabitants." *1990 International Conference On Noise Control Engineering*, Vol. 2, pp. 1125-1128.





TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

Measuring the Impact of Noise on People

TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

MEASURING THE IMPACT OF NOISE ON PEOPLE



In aircraft noise analysis, the effect of noise on residents near airports is often the most important concern.



In aircraft noise analysis, the effect of noise on residents near airports is often the most important concern. While certain public institutions and, at very high noise levels, some types of businesses may also be disturbed by noise, people in their homes are typically the most vulnerable to noise problems.

The most common way to measure the impact of noise on residents is to estimate the number of people residing within the noise contours. This is done by overlaying noise contours on census block maps or on maps of dwelling units. The number of people within each 5 DNL range (e.g., from 65 to 70 DNL, from 70 to 75 DNL, etc.) is then estimated.

This is the approach required in F.A.R. Part 150 noise compatibility studies. While it has the advantage of simplicity, it has one disadvantage: it implicitly assumes that all people are equally affected by noise, regardless of the noise level they experience. Clearly, however, the louder the noise, the greater the noise problem. As noise increases, more people become concerned about it, and the concerns of each individual become more serious.

AVERAGE COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO NOISE



Although individual responses to noise can vary greatly, the average response among a group of people is much less variable. This enables us to generalize about the average impacts of aircraft noise on a community despite the wide variations in individual response.

Individual human response to noise is highly variable and is influenced by many factors. These include emotional variables, feelings about the necessity or preventability of the noise, judgments about the value of the activity creating the noise, an individual's activity at the time the noise is heard, general sensitivity to noise, beliefs about the impact of noise on health, and feelings of fear associated with the noise.

Physical factors influencing an individual's reaction to noise include the background noise in the community, the time of day, the season of the year, the predictability of the noise, and the individual's control over the noise source.

Although individual responses to noise can vary greatly, the average response among a group of people is much less variable. This enables us to generalize about the average impacts of aircraft noise on a community despite the wide variations in individual response.


Many studies have examined average community response to noise, focusing on the relationship between annoyance and noise exposure. (See DORA 1980; Fidell et al. 1989; Finegold et al. 1992 and 1994; Great Britain Committee on the Problem of Noise 1963; Kryter 1970; Richards and Ollerhead 1973; Schultz 1978; U.S. EPA 1974.) These studies have produced similar results, finding that annoyance is most directly related to cumulative noise exposure, rather than single-event exposure.

Annoyance has been found to increase along an S-shaped or logistic curve as cumulative noise exposure increases, as shown in **Exhibit A**. This graph shows the percentage of residents either somewhat annoyed or seriously annoyed by noise of varying DNL levels. It was developed from research in the early 1970s (Richards and Ollerhead 1973). It is interesting that the graph indicates that at even extremely low noise levels, below 45 DNL, a very small percentage of people remain annoyed by aircraft noise. Conversely, the graph shows that while the percentage of people annoyed by noise exceeds 95 percent at 75 DNL, it only approaches, and does not reach, 100 percent even at the extremely high noise level of 85 DNL.



EXHIBIT A

ANNOYANCE CAUSED BY AIRCRAFT NOISE IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS



Source: Richards and Ollerhead 1973, p.31




Starting at 65 DNL, the percentage of people expected to be highly annoyed increases steeply from 11.6 percent up to 68.4 percent at 85 DNL.



A similar graph is shown in **Exhibit B**. Developed by Finegold et al. (1992 and 1994), it is based on data derived from a number of studies of transportation noise (Fidell 1989). It shows the relationship between DNL levels and the percentage of people who are highly annoyed. Known as the “updated Schultz Curve” because it is based on the work of Schultz (1978), it represents the best available source of data for the noise dosage-response relationship (FICON 1992, Vol. 2, pp. 3-5; Finegold et al. 1994, pp. 26-27).

The updated Schultz Curve shows that annoyance is measurable beginning at 45 DNL, where 0.8 percent of people are highly annoyed. It increases gradually to 6.1 percent at 60 DNL. Starting at 65 DNL, the percentage of people expected to be highly annoyed increases steeply from 11.6 percent up to 68.4 percent at 85 DNL. Note that this relationship includes only those reported to be “highly annoyed.” Based on the findings shown in **Exhibit A**, the percentages would be considerably higher if they also included those who were “moderately annoyed.”

PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION HIGHLY ANNOYED BY GENERAL TRANSPORTATION NOISE



PERCENT HIGHLY ANNOYED AT SELECTED NOISE LEVELS

DNL	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90
%HA	0.8%	1.6%	3.1%	6.1%	11.6%	20.9%	34.8%	51.7%	68.4%	81.3%

Source: Finegold et al. 1992 and 1994.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WEIGHTING FUNCTIONS

Recognizing the tendency of annoyance response rates to increase systematically as noise increases, researchers in the 1960s began developing weighting functions to help estimate the total impact of noise on a population (CHABA 1977, p. B-1). The population impacted by noise at a given level would be multiplied by the appropriate weighting function. The higher the noise level, the higher the weighting function. The results for all noise levels would be added together. The sum would be a single number purported to represent the net impact of noise on the affected population.

The CHABA report (p. VII-5) recommended the use of the original Schultz Curve as the basis for developing weighting functions. It recommended that weighting functions be developed by calculating the percentage





Based on the response curve shown in Exhibit A, the weighting functions can be considered as roughly equivalent to the proportion of people likely to be either highly annoyed or somewhat annoyed by noise.

of people likely to be highly annoyed by noise at various DNL levels. These values were then converted to weighting functions by arbitrarily setting the function for 75 DNL at 1.00. Functions for the other noise levels were set in proportion to the percent highly annoyed. The results of applying these weighting functions to a population was known as the “sound level-weighted population” impacted by noise, or the “level-weighted population.”

UPDATED LEVEL-WEIGHTED POPULATION FUNCTIONS

As discussed above, the original Schultz Curve has been updated to take into account additional studies of community response to noise. The updated curve is shown in **Exhibit B**. Coffman Associates has updated the weighting functions developed by CHABA (1977, p. B-7) to correspond with the updated Schultz Curve. **Table 1** shows the percentage of people likely to be highly annoyed by aircraft noise for 5 DNL increments ranging from 45 to 80 DNL. It also shows weighting functions for use in calculating level-weighted population. These were developed by setting the function for the 75 to 80 DNL range at unity (1.000). The other functions were computed in proportion to the values for “percent highly annoyed.”

TABLE 1

PERCENT HIGHLY ANNOYED AND WEIGHTED FUNCTION BY DNL RANGE

DNL RANGE	AVERAGE PERCENT HIGHLY ANNOYED	WEIGHTING FUNCTION
45-50	1.19%	0.028
50-55	2.36%	0.055
55-60	4.63%	0.107
60-65	8.87%	0.205
65-70	16.26%	0.376
70-75	27.83%	0.644
75-80	43.25%	1.000

Based on the response curve shown in **Exhibit A**, the weighting functions can be considered as roughly equivalent to the proportion of people likely to be either highly annoyed or somewhat annoyed by noise.





The response to noise among a group of people varies systematically with changes in noise levels. As noise increases, the proportion of people disturbed by noise increases.

EXAMPLE USE OF LEVEL-WEIGHTED POPULATION

In airport noise compatibility planning, the level-weighted population (LWP) methodology is particularly useful in comparing the results of different noise analysis scenarios. Since the percentage of people who are highly annoyed increases with increasing noise levels, the LWP values may differ between operating scenarios even though the total population within the noise impact boundary is equal. An example below illustrates the LWP methodology. Scenarios A and B show the effects of two airport operating scenarios. While the population subject to noise above 65 DNL is the same for both, Scenario B has a lower LWP because fewer people are impacted by the higher noise levels.

TABLE 2

LEVEL-WEIGHTED POPULATION METHODOLOGY - EXAMPLE

DNL Range	SCENARIO A			SCENARIO B		
	LWP Factor	Population	LWP	LWP Factor	Population	LWP
65-70	.376	x 2,000	= 752	.376	x 3,000	= 1,128
70-75	.644	x 1,400	= 902	.644	x 700	= 451
75+	1.000	x 600	= 600	1.000	x 300	= 300
Total		4,000	2,254		4,000	1,879

SUMMARY

The response to noise among a group of people varies systematically with changes in noise levels. As noise increases, the proportion of people disturbed by noise increases. This relationship has been estimated and is presented in the “updated Schultz Curve” shown in **Exhibit B**.

The data in the updated Schultz Curve can be used to develop weighting functions for computing the numbers of people likely to be annoyed by noise. This is especially useful in comparing the net impact of different noise scenarios.





References

CHABA 1977. *Guidelines for Preparing Environmental Impact Statements on Noise, Report of Working Group 69 on Evaluation of Environmental Impact of Noise*. Committee on Hearing, Bioacoustics, and Biomechanics, Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC.

Directorate of Operational Research and Analysis (DORA) 1980. *Aircraft Noise and Sleep Disturbance: Final Report*. DORA Rep. 8008, Civil Aviation Authority, London, 1980. Cited in Kryter 1984, p. 434.

Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) 1992. *Federal Agency Review of Selected Airport Noise Analysis Issues*.

Fidell, S. et al. 1989. *Updating a Dosage-Effect Relationship for the Prevalence of Annoyance Due to General Transportation Noise*. HSD-TR-89-009. Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio: U.S. Air Force, Noise and Sonic Boom Impact Technology. Cited in FICON 1992.

Finegold, L.S. et al. 1992. "Applied Acoustical Report: Criteria for Assessment of Noise Impacts on People." Submitted to *Journal of Acoustical Society of America*. June 1992. Cited in FICON 1992.

Finegold, L.S. et al. 1994. "Community Annoyance and Sleep Disturbance: Updated Criteria for Assessing the Impacts of General Transportation Noise on People." *Noise Control Engineering Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 1, January - February 1994.

Great Britain Committee on the Problem of Noise, 1963. *Noise, Final Report*. Presented to Parliament by Lord Minister for Science by Command of Her Majesty. H.M. Stationery Office, London, July 1963. Cited in Newman and Beattie 1985, p. 23.

Kryter, K.D. 1970. *The Effects of Noise on Man*. Academic Press, New York. Cited in Newman and Beattie 1985, p. 22.

Kryter, K.D. 1984. *Physiological, Psychological, and Social Effects of Noise*, NASA Reference Publication 1115.





Newman, Steven J. and Kristy R. Beattie, 1985. *Aviation Noise Effects*. Prepared for U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Environment and Energy, Washington, D.C., Report No. FAA-EE-85-2, March 1985.

Richards, E.J. and J.B. Ollerhead, 1973. "Noise Burden Factor — A New Way of Rating Noise," *Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 7, No. 12, December.

Schultz, T.J. 1978. "Synthesis of Social Surveys on Noise Annoyance." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 64, No. 2, pp. 377-405. Cited in FICON 1992.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1974. *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*. EPA, Office of Noise Abatement and Control, Washington, DC, March 1974.





TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

Aircraft Noise and Land Use Compatibility Guidelines

TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

AIRCRAFT NOISE AND LAND USE COMPATIBILITY GUIDELINES



DNL accumulates the total noise occurring over a 24-hour period, with a 10 decibel penalty applied to noise occurring between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

In past years, noise has become a recognized factor in the land use planning process for cities, metropolitan planning organizations, counties, and states. Significant strides have been made in the reduction of noise at its source; however, noise cannot be entirely eliminated. Local, state, and federal agencies, in recognition of this fact, have developed guidelines and regulations to address noise within the land use planning process.

The fundamental variability in the way individuals react to noise makes it impossible to accurately predict how any one individual will respond to a given noise level. However, when one considers the community as a whole, trends emerge which relate noise to annoyance. This enables us to make reasonable evaluations of the average impacts of aircraft noise on a community.

According to scientific research, noise response is most readily correlated with noise as measured with cumulative noise metrics. A variety of cumulative noise exposure metrics have been used in research studies over the years. In the United States, the DNL (day-night noise level) metric has been widely used. DNL accumulates the total noise occurring over a 24-hour period, with a 10 decibel penalty applied to noise occurring between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. DNL correlates well with average community response to





Research has shown that even at extremely high noise levels, there are at least some people, albeit a small percentage, who are not annoyed. Conversely, it also shows that at even very low noise levels, at least some people will be annoyed.



noise. (For more information on noise measurement, see the TIP entitled, "The Measurement and Analysis of Sound.")

In California, the CNEL (community noise equivalent level) metric is used instead of the DNL metric. The two metrics are very similar. DNL accumulates the total noise occurring during a 24-hour period, with a 10 decibel penalty applied to noise occurring between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. The CNEL metric is the same except that it also adds a 4.77 decibel penalty for noise occurring between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. There is little actual difference between the two metrics in practice. Calculations of CNEL and DNL from the same data generally yield values with less than a 0.7 decibel difference (Caltrans 1983, p. 37).

The results of studies on community noise impacts show that the number of people expressing concerns with noise increases as the noise level increases. The level of concern increases along an S-shaped curve, as shown in **Exhibit A**. Research has shown that even at extremely high noise levels, there are at least some people, albeit a small percentage, who are not annoyed. Conversely, it also shows that at even very low noise levels, at least some people will be annoyed.

AMBIENT NOISE LEVEL AS A FACTOR OF ANNOYANCE LEVEL


Noise analysts have speculated that the overall ambient noise level in an environment determines to what degree people will be annoyed by a given level of aircraft noise. That is, in a louder environment it takes a louder level of aircraft noise to generate complaints than it does in a quieter environment.

Kryter (1984, p. 582) reviewed some of the research on this question. He noted that the effects of laboratory tests and attitude surveys on this question are somewhat inconclusive. A laboratory test he reviewed found that recordings of aircraft noise were judged to be less intrusive as the background road traffic noise was increased. On the other hand, an attitude survey in the Toronto Airport area found that the effects of background noise were not significant.

ANNOYANCE CAUSED BY AIRCRAFT NOISE IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS




Noise analysts have speculated that the overall ambient noise level in an environment determines to what degree people will be annoyed by a given level of aircraft noise.



Source: Richards and Ollerhead 1973, p.31

UPDATED SCHULTZ CURVE



$$\text{Equation for Curve: } \%HA = \frac{100}{1 + e^{(11.13 - .14 \text{Ldn})}}$$

Source: Finegold et al. 1992 and 1994.

The studies reviewed by Kryter were intended to evaluate whether or not background noise provided some degree of masking of aircraft noise. They did not, however, take into consideration the subjects' rating of the overall quality of the noise environment.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has provided guidelines to address the question of background noise and its relationship to aircraft noise.





The degree of annoyance which people suffer from aircraft noise varies depending on their activities at any given time.



The EPA has determined that complaints can be expected when the intruding DNL exceeds the background DNL by more than 5 decibels (U.S. EPA 1974). The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans 2000, pp. 7- 24 - 7-25) notes that the level of background (ambient) noise should be used in determining the suitable aircraft noise contour of significance. Specifically, adjustments have been made in areas with quiet background noise levels of 50 to 55 CNEL. In those cases, aircraft CNEL contours are prepared down to 55 or 60 CNEL, and land use compatibility criteria are adjusted to apply to those areas. The State of Oregon Department of Aviation (Oregon 2003) also requires the preparation of noise contours down to the 55 DNL level. This noise contour is used to establish the noise impact boundary for air carrier airports within the state.

The Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON 1992, p. 2-6) examined the question of background noise and its relationship to perceptions of aircraft noise. It reviewed the research in this field, concluding that there was a basis for believing that, in addition to the magnitude of aircraft noise, the difference between background noise and aircraft noise was in some way related to human perceptions of noise disturbance. It noted, however, that there was insufficient scientific data to provide authoritative guidance on the consideration of these effects. FICON advocated further research in this area.

LAND USE COMPATIBILITY GUIDELINES

The degree of annoyance which people suffer from aircraft noise varies depending on their activities at any given time. People rarely are as disturbed by aircraft noise when they are shopping, working, or driving as when they are at home. Transient hotel and motel residents seldom express as much concern with aircraft noise as do permanent residents of an area. The concept of "land use compatibility" has arisen from this systematic variation in human tolerance to aircraft noise. Since the 1960s, many different sets of land use compatibility guidelines have been proposed and used. This section reviews some of the more well known guidelines.

FEDERAL LAND USE COMPATIBILITY GUIDELINES

FAA-DOD Guidelines

In 1964, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) published similar documents setting forth guidelines to assist land use planners in areas subjected to aircraft noise from nearby airports. These guidelines, presented in **Table 1**, establish three zones and the expected responses to aircraft noise from residents of each zone. In Zone 1, areas exposed to noise below 65 DNL, essentially no complaints would be expected although noise could be an occasional annoyance. In Zone 2, areas exposed to noise between 65 and 80 DNL, individuals may complain, perhaps vigorously. In Zone 3, areas in excess of 80 DNL, vigorous complaints would be likely and concerted group action could be expected.

TABLE 1

CHART FOR ESTIMATING RESPONSE OF COMMUNITIES EXPOSED TO AIRCRAFT NOISE - 1964 FAA-DOD GUIDELINES

NOISE LEVEL	ZONE	DESCRIPTION OF EXPECTED RESPONSE
Less than 65 DNL	1	No complaints would be expected. The noise may, however, interfere occasionally with certain activities of the residents.
65 to 80 DNL	2	Individuals may complain, perhaps vigorously. Concerted group action is possible.
Greater than 80 DNL	3	Individual reactions would likely include repeated, vigorous complaints. Concerted group action might be expected.

Source: U.S. DOD 1964. Cited in Kryter 1984, p. 616.

HUD Guidelines

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) first published noise assessment requirements in 1971 for evaluating the acceptability of sites for housing assistance. These requirements contained standards for exterior noise levels along with policies for approving HUD-supported or assisted housing projects in high noise areas. In general, the requirements established three zones: an acceptable zone where all projects could be approved, a normally unacceptable zone where



The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) first published noise assessment requirements in 1971 for evaluating the acceptability of sites for housing assistance.





mitigation measures would be required and where each project would have to be individually evaluated for approval or denial, and an unacceptable zone in which projects would not, as a rule, be approved.

In 1979, HUD issued revised regulations which kept the same basic standards, but adopted new descriptor systems which were considered advanced over the old system. **Table 2** summarizes the revised HUD requirements.

TABLE 2

**SITE EXPOSURE TO AIRCRAFT NOISE
1979 HUD REQUIREMENTS**

ACCEPTABLE CATEGORY	DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE SOUND LEVEL	SPECIAL APPROVALS AND REQUIREMENTS
Acceptable	Not exceeding 65 dB	None
Normally Unacceptable	Above 65 dB but not exceeding 75 dB	Special approvals, environmental review, attenuation
Unacceptable	Above 75 dB	Special approvals, environmental review, attenuation

Source: U.S. HUD 1979

Veterans Administration Guidelines

The Veterans Administration has established policies and procedures for the appraisal and approval of VA loans relative to residential properties located near major civilian airports and military air bases. The agency's regulations, contained within M26-2, Change 15, state that "the VA must recognize the possible unsuitability for residential use of certain properties and the probable adverse effect on livability and/or value of homes in the vicinity of major airports and air bases. Such adverse effects may be due to a variety of factors including noise intensity." **Table 3** contains the VA's noise zones and associated development requirements and limitations.

EPA Guidelines

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency published a document in 1974 suggesting maximum noise exposure levels to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety. These are shown in **Table 4**. They note that the risk of hearing loss may become a concern with exposure



**VETERANS ADMINISTRATION NOISE GUIDELINES
NOVEMBER 23, 1992**

NOISE ZONE	CNR (Composite Noise Rating)	NEF (Noise Exposure Forecasts)	DNL (Day/Night Average Sound Level)
1	Under 100	Under 30	Under 65
2	100-115	30-40	65-75
3	Over 115	Over 40	Over 75

Specific Limitations:

- (1) Proposed or existing properties located in zone 1 are generally acceptable as security for VA-guaranteed loans.
- (2) Proposed construction to be located in zone 2 will be acceptable provided:
 - (a) Sound attenuation features are built into the dwelling to bring the interior DNL of the living unit to 45 decibels or below.
 - (b) There is evidence of market acceptance of the subdivision.
 - (c) The veteran-purchaser signs a statement which indicates his/her awareness that (1) the property being purchased is located in an area adjacent to an airport, and (2) the aircraft noise may affect normal livability, value, and marketability of the property.
- (3) Proposed subdivisions located in zone 3 are not generally acceptable. The only exception is a situation in which VA has previously approved a subdivision, and the airport noise contours are subsequently changed to include the subdivision in zone 3. In such cases, VA will continue to process loan applications provided the requirements in the above subparagraphs (2) are met.
- (4) Existing dwellings in zones 2 and 3 are not to be rejected because of airport influence if there is evidence of acceptance by a fully informed veteran.

Source: Veterans Administration, M26-2, June 1992

TABLE 4

**SUMMARY OF NOISE LEVELS IDENTIFIED AS REQUISITE TO
PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE WITH AN ADEQUATE
MARGIN OF SAFETY - 1974 EPA GUIDELINES**

EFFECT	LEVEL	AREA
Hearing loss	75 DNL and above	All areas
Outdoor activity interference and annoyance	55 DNL and above	Outdoors in residential areas and farms and other outdoor areas where people spend widely varying amounts of time and other places in which quiet is a basis of use.
	59 DNL and above	Outdoor areas where people spend limited amounts of time, such as school years, playgrounds, etc.
Indoor activity interference and annoyance	45 DNL and above	Indoor residential areas
	49 DNL and above	Other indoor areas with human activities such as schools, etc.

Note: All Leq values from EPA document were converted by FAA to DNL for ease of comparison. (DNL=Leq(24) + 4 dB).

Source: U.S. EPA 1974. Cited in FAA 1977a, p. 26.



LAND USE GUIDANCE CHART I: AIRPORT NOISE INTERPOLATION

LAND USE GUIDANCE ZONES (LUG)	NOISE EXPOSURE CLASS	INPUTS: AIRCRAFT NOISE ESTIMATING METHODOLOGIES				HUD NOISE ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES (1977)	SUGGESTED NOISE CONTROLS
		Ldn DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE SOUND LEVEL	NEF NOISE EXPOSURE FORECAST	CNR COMPOSITE NOISE RATING	CNEL COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL		
A	MINIMAL EXPOSURE	0 TO 55	0 TO 20	0 TO 90	0 TO 55	"CLEARLY ACCEPTABLE"	NORMALLY REQUIRES NO SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS
B	MODERATE EXPOSURE	55 TO 65	20 TO 30	90 TO 100	55 TO 65	"NORMALLY ACCEPTABLE"	LAND USE CONTROLS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED
C	SIGNIFICANT EXPOSURE	65 TO 75	30 TO 40	100 TO 115	65 TO 75	"NORMALLY UNACCEPTABLE"	NOISE EASEMENTS, LAND USE, AND OTHER COMPATIBILITY CONTROLS RECOMMENDED
D	SEVERE EXPOSURE	75 & HIGHER	40 & HIGHER	115 & HIGHER	75 & HIGHER	"CLEARLY UNACCEPTABLE"	CONTAINMENT WITHIN AIRPORT BOUNDARY OR USE OF POSITIVE COMPATIBILITY CONTROLS RECOMMENDED

Source: FAA 1977b, p. 12.

to noise above 74 DNL. Interference with outdoor activities may become a problem with noise levels above 55 DNL. Interference with indoor residential activities may become a problem with interior noise levels above 45 DNL. If we assume that standard construction attenuates noise by about 20 decibels, with doors and windows closed, this corresponds to an exterior noise level of 65 DNL.

FAA Land Use Guidance System

In 1977, FAA issued an advisory circular on airport land use compatibility planning (FAA 1977b). It describes land use guidance (LUG) zones corresponding to aircraft noise of varying levels as measured by four different noise metrics (**Exhibit B**). It also includes suggested land use noise sensitivity guidelines (**Exhibit C**).

In **Exhibit B**, LUG Chart I, four land use guidance zones are described, corresponding to DNL levels of 55 or less (A), 55 to 65 (B), 65 to 75 (C), and 75 and over (D). LUG Zone





In 1979, the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise (FICUN), including representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, the Housing and Urban Development Department, the Department of Defense, and the Veterans Administration, was established to coordinate various federal programs relating to the promotion of noise-compatible development.



A is described as minimal exposure, normally requiring no special noise control considerations. LUG Zone B is described as moderate exposure where land use controls should be considered. LUG Zone C is subject to significant exposure, and various land use controls are recommended. In LUG Zone D, severe exposure, containment of the area within airport property, or other positive control measures, are suggested.

In LUG Chart II, **Exhibit C**, most noise-sensitive uses are suggested as appropriate only within LUG Zone A. These include single-family and two-family dwellings, mobile homes, cultural activities, places of public assembly, and resorts and group camps. Uses suggested for Zones A and B include multi-family dwellings and group quarters; financial, personal, business, governmental, and educational services; and manufacturing of precision instruments. In Zones C and D, various manufacturing, trade, service, resource production, and open space uses are suggested.

Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise

In 1979, the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise (FICUN), including representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, the Housing and Urban Development Department, the Department of Defense, and the Veterans Administration, was established to coordinate various federal programs relating to the promotion of noise-compatible development. In 1980, the Committee published a report which contained detailed land use compatibility guidelines for varying DNL noise levels (FICUN 1980). The work of the Interagency Committee was very important as it brought together for the first time all federal agencies with a direct involvement in noise compatibility issues and forged a general consensus on land use compatibility for noise analysis on federal projects.

The Interagency guidelines describe the 65 DNL contour as the threshold of significant impact for residential land uses and a variety of noise-sensitive institutions (such as hospitals, nursing homes, schools, cultural activities, auditoriums, and outdoor music shells). Within the 55 to 65 DNL contour range, the guidelines note that cost and

**LAND USE GUIDANCE CHART II:
LAND USE NOISE SENSITIVITY INTERPOLATION**

LAND USE			LUG ZONE ¹	LAND USE			LUG ZONE ¹	
SLUCM No.	Name	Suggested	SLUCM No.	Name	Suggested	SLUCM No.	Name	Suggested
10 Residential			A-B	50 Trade⁴				
11	Household units.		51	Wholesale trade.	C-D			
11,11	Single units - detached.	A	52	Retail trade-building materials, hardware, and farm equipment.	C			
11,12	Single units - semi attached.	A	53	Retail trade-general merchandise.	C			
11,13	Single units - attached row.	B	54	Retail trade-food.	C			
11,21	Two units - side-by-side.	A	55	Retail trade-automotive, marine craft, aircraft and accessories.	C			
11,22	Two units - one above the other.	A	56	Retail trade-apparel and accessories.	C			
11,31	Apartments - walk up.	B	57	Retail trade-furniture, home furnishings, and equipment.	C			
11,32	Apartments - elevator.	B-C	59	Retail trade-eating and drinking. Other retail trade.	C-D			
12	Group quarters.	A-B	60 Services⁴					
13	Residential hotels.	B	61	Financial, insurance, and real estate services.	B			
14	Mobile home parks or courts.	A	62	Personal services.	B			
15	Transient lodgings.	C	63	Business services.	B			
19	Other residential.	A-C	64	Repair services.	C			
20 Manufacturing²			C-D	65	Professional services.	B-C		
21	Food and kindred products-manufacturing.		66	Contract construction services.	C			
22	Textile mill products-manufacturing.	C-D	67	Governmental services.	B			
23	Apparel and other finished products made from fabrics, leather, and similar materials-manufacturing.	C-D	68	Educational services.	A-B			
24	Lumber and wood products (except furniture)-manufacturing.	C-D	69	Miscellaneous services.	A-C			
25	Furniture and fixtures-manufacturing.	C-D	70 Cultural, entertainment, and recreational					
26	Paper and allied products-manufacturing.	C-D	71	Cultural activities and nature exhibitions.	A			
27	Printing, publishing, and allied industries.	C-D	72	Public assembly.	A			
28	Chemicals and allied products-manufacturing.	C-D	73	Amusements.	C			
29	Petroleum refining and related industries. ³	C-D	74	Recreational activities. ⁵	B-C			
30 Manufacturing²				75	Resorts and group camps.	A		
31	Rubber and miscellaneous plastic products-manufacturing.	C-D	76	Parks.	A-C			
32	Stone, clay, and glass products-manufacturing.	C-D	79	Other cultural, entertainment, and recreational. ⁵	A-B			
33	Primary metal industries.	D	80 Resource production and extraction					
34	Fabricated metal products-manufacturing.	D	81	Agriculture.	C-D			
35	Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments: photographic and optical goods; watches and clocks-manufacturing.	B	82	Agricultural related activities.	C-D			
39	Miscellaneous manufacturing.	C-D	83	Forestry activities and related services.	D			
40 Transportation, communications, and utilities				84	Fishing activities and related services.	D		
41	Railroad, rapid rail transit, and street railway transportation.	D	85	Mining activities and related services.	D			
42	Motor vehicle transportation.	D	89	Other resource production and extraction.	C-D			
43	Aircraft transportation.	D	90 Undeveloped land and water areas					
44	Marine craft transportation.	D	91	Undeveloped and unused land area (excluding noncommercial forest development).	D			
45	Highway and street right-of-way.	D	92	Noncommercial forest development.	D			
46	Automobile parking.	D	93	Water areas.	A-D			
47	Communication.	A-D	94	Vacant floor area.	A-D			
48	Utilities.	D	95	Under construction.	A-D			
49	Other transportation communications and utilities.	A-D	99	Other undeveloped land and water areas.	A-D			

¹ Refer to Land Use Guidance Chart I, Exhibit C-1.
² Zone "C" suggested maximum except where exceeded by self generated noise.
³ Zone "D" for noise purposes; observe normal hazard precautions.
⁴ If activity is not in substantial, air-conditioned building, go to next higher zone.
⁵ Requirements likely to vary - individual appraisal recommended.

SLUCM: *Standard Land Use Coding Manual*, U.S. Urban Renewal Administration and Bureau of Public Roads, 1965.



The ANSI standard acknowledges the potential for noise effects below the 65 DNL level, describing several uses as "marginally compatible" with noise below 65 DNL.



feasibility factors were considered in defining residential development and several of the institutions as compatible. In other words, the guidelines are not based solely on the effects of noise. They also consider the cost and feasibility of noise control.

ANSI Guidelines

In 1980, the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) published recommendations for land use compatibility with respect to noise (ANSI 1980). Kryter (1984, p. 621) notes that no supporting data for the recommended standard is provided.

The ANSI guidelines are shown in **Exhibit D**. While generally similar to the Federal Interagency guidelines, there are some important differences. First, ANSI's land use classification system is less detailed. Second, the ANSI standard acknowledges the potential for noise effects below the 65 DNL level, describing several uses as "marginally compatible" with noise below 65 DNL. These include single-family residential (from 55 to 65 DNL), multi-family residential, schools, hospitals, and auditoriums (60 to 65 DNL), and outdoor music shells (50 to 65 DNL). Other outdoor activities, such as parks, playgrounds, cemeteries, and sports arenas, are described as marginally compatible with noise levels as low as 55 or 60 DNL.

F.A.R. Part 150 Guidelines

The FAA adopted a revised and simplified version of the Federal Interagency guidelines when it promulgated F.A.R. Part 150 in the early 1980s. (The Interim Rule was adopted on January 19, 1981. The final rule was adopted on December 13, 1984, published in the Federal Register on December 18, and became effective on January 18, 1985.) Among the changes made by FAA include the use of a coarser land use classification system and the deletion of any reference to any potential for noise impacts below the 65 DNL level.

The determination of the compatibility of various land uses with various noise levels, however, is very similar to the Interagency determinations.

LAND USE COMPATIBILITY WITH YEARLY DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE SOUND LEVEL AT A SITE FOR BUILDINGS AS COMMONLY CONSTRUCTED

LAND USE	Yearly Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) in Decibels			
	50-60	60-70	70-80	80-90
Residential - Single Family, Extensive Outdoor Use	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Residential - Multiple Family, Moderate Outdoor Use	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Residential - Multi-Story, Limited Outdoor Use	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Transient Lodging	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
School Classrooms, Libraries, Religious Facilities	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Hospitals, Clinics, Nursing Homes, Health-Related Facilities	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Auditoriums, Concert Halls	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Music Shells	with Insulation	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Neighborhood Parks	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Playgrounds, Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Rec., Cemeteries	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Office Buildings, Personal Services, Business and Professional	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Commercial - Retail, Movie Theaters, Restaurants	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Commercial - Wholesale, Some Retail, Ind., Mfg., Utilities	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Livestock Farming, Animal Breeding	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Agriculture (Except Livestock)	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible
Extensive Natural Wildlife and Recreation Areas	Compatible	with Insulation	Marginally Compatible	Incompatible

LEGEND			
	Compatible		with Insulation
	Marginally Compatible		Incompatible

Source: ANSI 1980. Cited in Kryter 1984, p. 624.



Exhibit E lists the F.A.R. Part 150 land use compatibility guidelines. These are only guidelines. Part 150 explicitly states that determinations of noise compatibility and regulation of land uses are purely local responsibilities.

F.A.R. PART 150 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY GUIDELINES

LAND USE	Yearly Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) in Decibels					
	Below 65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	Over 85
RESIDENTIAL						
Residential, other than mobile homes and transient lodgings	Y	N ¹	N ¹	N	N	N
Mobile home parks	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Transient lodgings	Y	N ¹	N ¹	N ¹	N	N
PUBLIC USE						
Schools	Y	N ¹	N ¹	N	N	N
Hospitals and nursing homes	Y	25	30	N	N	N
Churches, auditoriums, and concert halls	Y	25	30	N	N	N
Government services	Y	Y	25	30	N	N
Transportation	Y	Y	Y ²	Y ³	Y ⁴	Y ⁴
Parking	Y	Y	Y ²	Y ³	Y ⁴	N
COMMERCIAL USE						
Offices, business and professional	Y	Y	25	30	N	N
Wholesale and retail-building materials, hardware and farm equipment	Y	Y	Y ²	Y ³	Y ⁴	N
Retail trade-general	Y	Y	25	30	N	N
Utilities	Y	Y	Y ²	Y ³	Y ⁴	N
Communication	Y	Y	25	30	N	N
MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTION						
Manufacturing, general	Y	Y	Y ²	Y ³	Y ⁴	N
Photographic and optical	Y	Y	25	30	N	N
Agriculture (except livestock) and forestry	Y	Y ⁶	Y ⁷	Y ⁸	Y ⁸	Y ⁸
Livestock farming and breeding	Y	Y ⁶	Y ⁷	N	N	N
Mining and fishing, resource production and extraction	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RECREATIONAL						
Outdoor sports arenas and spectator sports	Y	Y ⁵	Y ⁵	N	N	N
Outdoor music shells, amphitheaters	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Nature exhibits and zoos	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Amusements, parks, resorts, and camps	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Golf courses, riding stables, and water recreation	Y	Y	25	30	N	N



The designations contained in this table do not constitute a federal determination that any use of land covered by the program is acceptable under federal, state, or local law. The responsibility for determining the acceptable and permissible land uses and the relationship between specific properties and specific noise contours rests with the local authorities. FAA determinations under Part 150 are not intended to substitute federally-determined land uses for those determined to be appropriate by local authorities in response to locally-determined needs and values in achieving noise compatible land uses.

See other side for notes and key to table.

F.A.R. PART 150 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY GUIDELINES**KEY**

Y (Yes)	Land Use and related structures compatible without restrictions.
N (No)	Land Use and related structures are not compatible and should be prohibited.
NLR	Noise Level Reduction (outdoor-to-indoor) to be achieved through incorporation of noise attenuation into the design and construction of the structure.
25, 30, 35	Land Use and related structures generally compatible; measures to achieve NLR of 25, 30, or 35 dB must be incorporated into design and construction of structure.

NOTES

- 1 Where the community determines that residential or school uses must be allowed, measures to achieve outdoor-to-indoor Noise Level Reduction (NLR) of at least 25 dB and 30 dB, respectively, should be incorporated into building codes and be considered in individual approvals. Normal residential construction can be expected to provide a NLR of 20 dB; thus, the reduction requirements are often stated as 5, 10, or 15 dB over standard construction and normally assume mechanical ventilation and closed windows year round. However, the use of NLR criteria will not eliminate outdoor noise problems.
- 2 Measures to achieve NLR of 25 dB must be incorporated into the design and construction of portions of these buildings where the public is received, office areas, noise-sensitive areas, or where the normal noise level is low.
- 3 Measures to achieve NLR of 30 dB must be incorporated into the design and construction of portions of these buildings where the public is received, office areas, noise-sensitive areas, or where the normal noise level is low.
- 4 Measures to achieve NLR of 35 dB must be incorporated into the design and construction of portions of these buildings where the public is received, office areas, noise-sensitive areas, or where the normal noise level is low.
- 5 Land use compatible provided special sound reinforcement systems are installed.
- 6 Residential buildings require a NLR of 25.
- 7 Residential buildings require a NLR of 30.
- 8 Residential buildings not permitted.

Source: *F.A.R. Part 150*,
Appendix A, Table 1.

**SELECTED STATE LAND USE
COMPATIBILITY GUIDELINES****State of Oregon**

The State of Oregon's Airport Planning Rule (APR) establishes a series of local government requirements and rules which pertain to aviation facility planning. These requirements are intended to promote land use compatibility around airports as well as promote a convenient and economic system of airports in the state. To assist local governments and airports in meeting the requirements of the APR, the Oregon Department of Aviation published the *Airport Land Use Compatibility Guidebook* in January 2003.





The State of Oregon recognizes that, in some instances, land use controls and restrictions that apply to the 65 DNL may be appropriate for applications to areas impacted by noise levels above 55 DNL.

The Oregon guidelines contained within the guidebook, as they relate to land use compatibility around airports, are based on administrative regulations of the Department of Environmental Quality, adopted by the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission in 1979 (Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 340, Division 35, Section 45). Although the FAA regards the 65 DNL contours and above as significant, the State of Oregon considers the 55 and 60 DNL contours as significant. The state recognizes that, in some instances, land use controls and restrictions that apply to the 65 DNL may be appropriate for applications to areas impacted by noise levels above 55 DNL. For example, a rural area exposed to 55 to 65 DNL noise levels may be more affected by these levels than an urban area. This is because there is typically a higher level of background noise associated with an urban area (Oregon 2003). Air carrier airports are required to do studies defining the airport impact boundary, corresponding to the 55 DNL contour. Where any noise-sensitive property occurs within the noise impact boundary, the airport must develop a noise abatement program.

An Oregon airport noise abatement program may include many different recommendations for promoting land use compatibility. These include changes in land use planning, zoning, and building codes within the 55 DNL contour. In addition, disclosure of potential noise impacts may be required and purchase of land for non-noise sensitive public uses may be permitted within the 55 DNL contour.

Within the 65 DNL contour, purchase assurance, voluntary relocation, soundproofing, and purchase of land is permitted.

State of California

California law sets the standard for the acceptable level of aircraft noise for persons residing near airports at 65 CNEL (California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Division 2.5, Chapter 6). The 65 CNEL criterion was chosen for urban residential areas where houses are of typical construction with windows partially open. Four types of land uses are defined as incompatible with noise above 65 CNEL: residences, schools, hospitals and convalescent





The guidelines contained within the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook suggest that no new residential uses should be permitted within the 65 CNEL noise contour.



homes, and places of worship. These land uses are regarded as compatible if they have been insulated to assure an interior sound level, from aircraft noise, of 45 CNEL. They are also to be considered compatible if an aviation easement over the property has been obtained by the airport operator.

California noise insulation standards apply to new hotels, motels, apartment buildings, and other dwellings, not including detached single-family homes. They require that "interior noise levels attributable to outdoor sources shall not exceed 45 decibels (based on the DNL or CNEL metric) in any habitable room." In addition, any of these residential structures proposed within a 60 CNEL noise contour requires an acoustical analysis to show that the proposed design will meet the allowable interior noise level standard. (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2, Appendix Chapter 35.)

In the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* (Caltrans 2002), land use compatibility guidelines are suggested for use in the preparation of comprehensive airport land use plans. The guidelines suggest that no new residential uses should be permitted within the 65 CNEL noise contour. In quiet communities, it is recommended that the 60 CNEL should be used as the maximum permissible noise level for residential uses. At rural airports, it is noted that 55 CNEL may be suitable for use as a maximum permissible noise level for residential uses.

These guidelines are similar to those proposed in earlier editions of the *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. However, the 2003 handbook provides much more definitive guidance for compatible land use planning around airports.

State of Florida

In 1990, the State of Florida passed legislation which created the Airport Safety and Land Use Compatibility Study Commission. The charge to this commission was to assure that airports in Florida will have the capacity to accommodate future growth without jeopardizing public health, safety, and welfare. One of the Commissions' recommendations was to require the Florida Department



Within the State of Florida's Airport Compatible Land Use Guidance for Florida Communities, it was requested that each local government prohibit new residential development and other noise-sensitive uses for areas within the 65 DNL contour. Where practical, new residential development should be limited in areas down to the 55 DNL contour.



of Transportation (FDOT) to establish guidelines regarding compatible land use around airports. In 1994, FDOT responded to this recommendation by publishing a guidance document entitled *Airport Compatible Land Use Guidance for Florida Communities*.

As part of this document's conclusions, it was recommended that all commercial service airports, or airports with significant numbers of general aviation operations, establish a noise compatibility planning program in accordance with the provisions of F.A.R. Part 150. All communities within the airport environs should participate in the preparation of this program. It was requested that each local government prohibit new residential development and other noise-sensitive uses for areas within the 65 DNL contour. Where practical, new residential development should be limited in areas down to the 55 DNL contour.

State of Wisconsin

Wisconsin State Law 114.136 was established to give local governments the authority to regulate land uses within three miles of the airport boundary. These land use controls supercede any other applicable zoning limits by other jurisdictions that may apply to the area surrounding the airport. To assist airports with the development of land use controls, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) published a document titled *Land Use Planning Around Airports in Wisconsin* in 2001. Various land use tools such as aviation easements, noise overlay zones, height and hazard zoning, and subdivision regulations are presented within the land use planning guide. WisDOT has recognized that the types of airport compatible land uses depend on the location and size of the airport as well as the type and volume of aircraft using the facility. The 65 DNL contour should be used as a starting point for land use regulations, but lesser contours should be considered if deemed necessary.

The 1985 Wisconsin Act 136 takes State Law 114.136 one step further by requiring counties and municipalities to depict airport locations and areas affected by aircraft operations on official maps. The law also requires the zoning authority to notify the airport owner of any proposed zoning changes within the airport environs.



Within the Airports and Compatible Land Use document, jurisdictions are encouraged to work with airports to ensure that airport noise is factored into land use decisions for the protection of the health, safety, and welfare of its residents.

State of Washington

In 1996, Washington State Senate Bill 6442 was passed. This bill requires that every city, town, and county, having a general aviation airport in its jurisdiction, discourage the siting of land uses that are incompatible with airport operations. Policies protecting airport facilities must be implemented within the comprehensive plan and development regulations. Formal consultation with the aviation community is required and all plans must be filed with the Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Division (WADOT). To assist jurisdictions with establishing appropriate land use planning tools and regulations, WADOT published a revised *Airports and Compatible Land Use* document in February 1999. Within this planning document, jurisdictions are encouraged to work with airports to ensure that airport noise is factored into land use decisions for the protection of the health, safety, and welfare of its residents.

TRENDS IN LAND USE COMPATIBILITY GUIDELINES

In recent years, citizen activists, anti-noise groups, and environmental organizations have become concerned that the current methods of assessing aircraft noise are not sufficient. Among the concerns is that 65 DNL does not adequately represent the true threshold of significant noise impact. It has been argued that the impact threshold should be lowered to 60 or even 55 DNL, especially in areas of quiet background noise and in areas impacted by large increases in noise (ANR, V. 4, N. 12, p. 91; V. 5, No. 3, p. 21; V. 5, N. 11, p. 82). The purpose of this section is to provide a time line of events which, taken together, indicate a distinct movement toward the consideration of airport noise impacts below the 65 DNL level.

Y E A R

1992



In the 1992 session of Congress, a bill was introduced to lower the threshold for non-compatible land uses from 65 to 55 DNL (ANR, V. 4, N. 11, p. 83). The bill, however, was not passed. In 1995, a bill (HR 1971) was introduced in the House of Representatives to require the Department of Transportation to develop a plan to reduce the number of people residing within the 60 DNL contours around airports by 75 percent by January 1, 2001 (ANR, V. 7, N.

13, p. 101). This bill was not passed either. Nevertheless, these developments indicate concerns about aircraft noise below 65 DNL are coalescing into specific proposals to address the situation.

Also in 1992, an important arbitration proceeding between Raleigh-Durham International Airport and airport neighbors was concluded. Residents residing between the 55 and 65 DNL contours were awarded compensation for noise damages. This was apparently the first time damages had been awarded beyond the 65 DNL contour at any domestic airport (ANR V. 4, No. 14, p. 107). While, strictly speaking, this case sets no legal precedent, it provides further evidence that a change in the definition of the threshold of significant noise impact may be gathering momentum.

After the arbitration was concluded, the Raleigh-Durham Airport Authority developed a model noise ordinance that would require new housing between the 55 and 60 DNL contours to be sound-insulated to achieve an outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction of 30 dB. Between the 60 and 65 DNL contours, a 35 dB reduction would be required. The model ordinance was proposed for use by local governments exercising land use control. (See ANR, V. 6, N. 3, p. 17.)

In August 1992, the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON 1992) issued its final report. FICON included representatives of the Departments of Transportation, Defense, Justice, Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development; the Environmental Protection Agency; and the Council on Environmental Quality. FICON was formed to review federal policies for the assessment of aircraft noise in environmental studies. The Committee advocated the continued use of the DNL metric as the principal means of assessing long-term aircraft noise exposure. It further reinforced the designation of 65 DNL as the threshold of significant impact on non-compatible land use. FICON recognized, however, the potential for noise impacts down to the 60 DNL level, providing guidance for analyzing noise between 60 and 65 DNL in reports prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This includes environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. (It does not include F.A.R. Part 150 studies.) FICON offered this explanation for this action (FICON 1992, p. 3-5).



1992 (cont.)

There are a number of reasons for moving in this direction at this time. First, the Schultz Curve [see the bottom panel in **Exhibit A**] recognizes that some people will be highly annoyed at relatively low levels of noise. This is further evidenced from numerous public response forums that some people living in areas exposed to DNL values less than 65 dB believe they are substantially impacted (U.S. EPA 1991). Secondly, the FICON Technical Subgroup has shown clearly that large changes in levels of noise exposure (on the order of 3 dB or more) below DNL 65 dB can be perceived by people as a degradation of their noise environment. Finally, there now exist computational techniques that allow for cost-effective calculation of noise exposure and impact data in the range below DNL 65 dB.

The specific FICON recommendation was as follows (FICON 1992, p. 3-5):

If screening analysis shows that noise-sensitive areas will be at or above DNL 65 dB and will have an increase of DNL 1.5 dB or more, further analysis should be conducted of noise-sensitive areas between DNL 60-65 dB having an increase of DNL 3 dB or more due to the proposed airport noise exposure.

FICON further recommended that if any noise-sensitive areas between 60 and 65 DNL are projected to have an increase of 3 DNL or more as a result of the proposed airport noise exposure, mitigation actions should be included for those areas (FICON 1992, p. 3-7). The FICON recommendations represent the first uniform guidelines issued by the federal government for the consideration of aircraft noise impacts below the 65 DNL level. At this time, these remain recommendations and are not official policy.

1995



The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) released a guidance document entitled *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. Within this document, FTA cites the EPA recommendation of 55 DNL to develop their curve of impact. Further, FTA states that they use the FAA criteria of 65 DNL to define their curve of severe impact.

1996

The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) recommends 55 DNL as the criterion level for housing and similar noise-sensitive land uses within their report *ANSI Quantities and Procedures for Description and Measurement of Environmental Sounds - Part 3: Short-Term Measurements with an Observer Present*.

The International Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development suggests the following environmentally sustainable transport noise levels: 55 DNL in urban areas and 50 DNL in rural areas.

1998

Within the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) *High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, the same criteria used by the FTA is used to assess impacts of new, high-speed trains.

In this same year, the Surface Transportation Board (STB) utilizes 55 DNL as a threshold of impact within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Conrail acquisition by Norfolk Southern Railway Company.

The World Bank Group (WBG) set noise limits for general industrial projects to ensure that projects they fund, such as iron and steel manufacturing and thermal power plants, do not negatively impact noise-sensitive development. The WBG set their threshold of impact at 55 DNL.

1999

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission adopts a revision to their regulations (Part 157) which states "the noise attributable to any new compressor stations, compression added to an existing station, or any modification, upgrade, or update of an existing station, must not exceed a day-night level (Ldn) of 55 dBA at any pre-existing noise-sensitive area."

The World Health Organization's *Guidelines for Community Noise* recommends a "criteria of annoyance" daytime threshold of 55 DNL and nighttime threshold of 50 DNL for residential areas.





Early in 2003, the FAA announced the establishment of the Center of Excellence for Aircraft Noise Mitigation. This research center is a partnership between academia, industry, and government. Part of the center's focus will be on what level of noise is significant as well as other noise metrics that can be used to assess the impact of aircraft noise on individuals.



RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AT THE FAA

In the late 1990s, the Naples Airport Authority determined that the short-term viability of the airport was in jeopardy due to the noise impacts at the airport. An F.A.R. Part 150 Study determined that the majority of the noise complaints were from individuals which reside outside the 65 DNL noise contour and were, therefore, not eligible for federal mitigation funding.

For several decades, the airport authority had led efforts to balance the competing needs of airport users with those of the surrounding community and had adopted numerous measures to control noise and limit incompatible land uses surrounding the facility. The surrounding jurisdictions had gone as far as to adopt the 60 DNL noise contour as the threshold of significant impact and had limited development within this contour.


Naples adopted a ban on Stage 2 aircraft under 75,000 pounds in June 2000 pursuant to the Noise Act and its implementing regulations, commonly referred to as Part 161. The restriction at Naples is important not only because it was the first, but also because it was, and is, the subject of several challenges, the results of which may prove precedential for other airport operators' efforts to address local noise issues.

Early in 2003, the FAA announced the establishment of the Center of Excellence for Aircraft Noise Mitigation. This research center is a partnership between academia, industry, and government. Part of the center's focus will be on what level of noise is significant as well as other noise metrics that can be used to assess the impact of aircraft noise on individuals.

On March 10, 2003, the FAA ruled that the ban on Stage 2 business jet operations imposed by Naples Airport Authority violates federal grant assurance obligations. This ruling came after years of research and debate regarding the restriction at Naples Airport.

CONCLUSIONS

This technical information paper has presented information on land use compatibility guidelines with



There is a strong and long-lasting consensus among various government agencies that 65 DNL represents an appropriate threshold for defining significant impacts on non-compatible land use. Nonetheless, both research and empirical evidence suggest that noise at levels below 65 DNL is often a concern.



respect to noise. It is intended to serve as a reference for the development of policy guidelines for F.A.R. Part 150 Noise Compatibility Studies.

There is a strong and long-lasting consensus among various government agencies that 65 DNL represents an appropriate threshold for defining significant impacts on non-compatible land use. Nonetheless, both research and empirical evidence suggest that noise at levels below 65 DNL is often a concern. Increased concern about these lower levels of noise has been registered in public forums across the country. Official responses by public agencies indicate at least a partial acknowledgment of these concerns. Indeed, according to many agencies and organizations as well as in the states of Oregon, Florida, Wisconsin, and California, airport noise analysis and compatibility planning below the 65 DNL level is strongly advised or required.

In urbanized areas with relatively high background noise levels, 65 DNL continues to be a reasonable threshold for defining airport noise impacts. In suburban and rural locations, lower noise thresholds deserve consideration. Given emerging national trends and the experience at many airports, it can be important to assess aircraft noise below 65 DNL, especially in areas with significant amounts of undeveloped land where land use compatibility planning is still possible. Future planning in undeveloped areas around airports should recognize that the definition of critical noise thresholds is undergoing transition. In setting a prudent course for future land use near airports, planners and policy-makers should try to anticipate these changes.

REFERENCES

ANR (Airport Noise Report), selected issues, Ashburn, VA.

ANSI 1980. *Sound Level Descriptors for Determination of Compatible Land Use*. American National Standards Institute, ANSI S3.23 - 1980 (ASA 22-1980).

Caltrans 1983. *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook - A Reference and Guide for Local Agencies*. Prepared for California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics by the Metropolitan Transportation



Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments, July 1983.

Caltrans 1993. *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. Prepared for California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics by Hodges & Shutt, Santa Rosa, California, in association with Flight Safety Institute; Chris Hunter & Associates; and University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Transportation Studies, December 1993.

FAA 1977a. Impact of Noise on People. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, May 1977.

FAA 1977b. Airport Land Use Compatibility Planning, AC 150/5050-6. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, D.C.

FICON 1992. Federal Agency Review of Selected Airport Noise Analysis Issues. Federal Interagency Committee on Noise, Washington, D.C.

FICUN 1980. Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land Use Planning and Control. Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise, Washington, D.C.

Finegold, L.S. et al. 1992. "Applied Acoustical Report: Criteria for Assessment of Noise Impacts on People" Submitted to Journal of Acoustical Society of America. June 1992. Cited in FICON 1992.

Kryter, K.D. 1984. Physiological, Psychological, and Social Effects of Noise, NASA Reference Publication 1115.

ODOT 1981. Airport Compatibility Guidelines, Oregon Aviation System Plan, Volume VI, Oregon Department of Transportation, Aeronautics Division, Salem.

Richards, E.J. and J.B. Ollerhead, 1973. "Noise Burden Factor - A New Way of Rating Noise, Sound and Vibration," Vol. 7, No. 12, December.

Schultz, T.J. and McMahon, N.M. 1971. HUD Noise Assessment Guidelines. Report No. HUD TE/NA 171, August 1971. (Available from NTIS as PB 210 590.)





U.S. DOD 1964. Land Use Planning with Respect to Aircraft Noise. AFM 86-5, TM 5-365, NAVDOCKS P-98, U.S. Department of Defense, October 1, 1964. (Available from DTIC as AD 615 015.)

U.S. EPA 1974. Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Noise Abatement and Control, Washington, D.C., March 1974.

U.S. EPA 1991. A Review of Recent Public Comments on the Application of Aircraft Noise Descriptors. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Noise Abatement and Control, Washington, D.C. Cited in FICON 1992.





TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

Federal Aviation Noise Regulations

TECHNICAL INFORMATION PAPER

FEDERAL AVIATION NOISE REGULATIONS



As air travel expanded, residents living in close proximity to the nation's airports became increasingly concerned. Citizens began to form activist groups and take action against local policy makers and airport operators.



In the early days of commercial aviation, communities close to an airport were not greatly affected by the occasional propeller aircraft overflight. However, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the problem of aircraft noise became increasingly apparent with the beginning of the jet age. The Deregulation Act of 1978 intensified the issue of airport noise as the act allowed for a more competitive environment between air carriers and the routes that they served. The increased competition brought better and more affordable services, an increase in demand, and an increase in jet noise.

As air travel expanded, residents living in close proximity to the nation's airports became increasingly concerned. Citizens began to form activist groups and take action against local policy makers and airport operators. With the increasing concerns, complaints and environmental awareness, the airport noise issue became a serious problem between the airports, airlines, and the residents living close to the nation's airports.

From a national perspective, aircraft noise became a concern in 1970 when federal agencies began studying the problem and developing planning guidelines. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) was the first act of federal legislation that required airport operators to study and analyze aircraft noise impacts



Reduction of aircraft noise impacts is a complex issue with several parties sharing in the responsibility: the federal government, state and local governments, planning agencies, the airport proprietor, airport users, and local residents.



before undertaking major development or improvement projects. For airport operators to gain approval for major projects, they had to develop an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that outlined the potential noise impacts of any proposed project on residents surrounding the airport.

After the NEPA was passed, the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) adopted the Aviation Noise Abatement Policy (ANAP) in 1976. The ANAP clearly identified aircraft noise responsibilities for the FAA, air carriers, airport operators, and local jurisdictions.

The importance of airport noise impacts was first recognized at a national level in the *Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979*. This act required the FAA to adopt regulations establishing a single system of measuring aircraft noise and determining the exposure of individuals to noise in the vicinity of airports.

Reduction of aircraft noise impacts is a complex issue with several parties sharing in the responsibility: the federal government, state and local governments, planning agencies, the airport proprietor, airport users, airport manufacturers, and local residents. The purpose of this technical information paper is to provide a summary of the aviation noise regulations and responsibilities at the federal level.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Aviation plays a vital role in interstate commerce. Recognizing this, the federal government has assumed the role of coordinator and regulator of the nation's aviation system. Congress has assigned administrative and regulatory authority to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) whose responsibilities include:

- The regulation of air commerce in order to promote its development, safety, and to fulfill the requirements of national defense.
- The promotion, encouragement, and development of civil aeronautics.



Congress passed legislation and the FAA established regulations governing the preparation of noise compatibility programs. Laws and regulations were also implemented that required the conversion of the commercial aircraft fleet to quieter aircraft.



- The control of the use of navigable airspace and the regulation of civil and military aircraft operations to promote the safety and efficiency of both.
- The development and operation of a common system of air traffic control and navigation for both military and civil aircraft.

The FAA also administers a program of federal grants-in-aid for the development of airport master plans, the acquisition of land, and for planning, design, and construction of eligible airport improvements. In addition, Congress passed legislation and the FAA established regulations governing the preparation of noise compatibility programs. Laws and regulations were also implemented that required the conversion of the commercial aircraft fleet to quieter aircraft. The following sections summarize these regulations.

F.A.R. Part 150 Noise Compatibility Studies

The *Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979* (ASNA, P.L. 96-193), signed into law on February 18, 1980, was enacted, “. . . to provide and carry out noise compatibility programs, to provide assistance to assure continued safety in aviation, and for other purposes.” The FAA was vested with the authority to implement and administer the Act.

Federal Aviation Regulation (F.A.R.) Part 150, the administrative rule promulgated to implement the Act, sets requirements for airport operators who choose to undertake an airport noise compatibility study with federal funding assistance. Part 150 provides for the development of two final documents: the Noise Exposure Maps and the Noise Compatibility Program.

Noise Exposure Maps. The Noise Exposure Maps (NEM) document describes existing and future noise conditions at the airport. It can be thought of as a baseline analysis defining the scope of the noise situation at the airport and including maps of noise exposure for the current year, five-year, and long-range forecasts. The noise contours are depicted on various land use maps to reveal areas of non-compatible land use. Included in the document is detailed supporting information which explains the methods used to develop the maps.



Part 150 establishes guidelines for the identification of land uses which are incompatible with different noise levels.



F.A.R. Part 150 requires the use of standard methodologies and metrics for analyzing and describing noise. It also establishes guidelines for the identification of land uses which are incompatible with different noise levels. Airport proprietors are required to update noise exposure maps when changes in the operation of the airport would create any new, substantial non-compatible use. This is defined as an increase in the yearly day-night average sound level (DNL) of 1.5 decibels over non-compatible land uses.

A limited degree of legal protection can be afforded to the airport proprietor through preparation and submission of noise exposure maps. Section 107(a) of the ASNA Act provides that:

No person who acquires property or an interest therein . . . in an area surrounding an airport with respect to which a noise exposure map has been submitted . . . shall be entitled to recover damages with respect to the noise attributable to such airport if such person had actual or constructive knowledge of the existence of such noise exposure map unless . . . such person can show -

- (i) A significant change in the type or frequency of aircraft operations at the airport; or*
- (ii) A significant change in the airport layout; or*
- (iii) A significant change in the flight patterns; or*
- (iv) A significant increase in nighttime operations occurred after the date of acquisition of such property . . .*

The ASNA Act provides that “constructive knowledge” shall be attributed to any person if a copy of the noise exposure map was provided to him at the time of property acquisition, or if notice of the existence of the noise exposure map was published three times in a newspaper of general circulation in the area. In addition, Part 150 defines “significant increase” as an increase of 1.5 DNL. (See F.A.R. Part 150, Section 150.21 (d), (f), and (g); and *Airport Environmental Handbook*, Order 5050.4A, 47e(1)(a).) For purposes of this provision, FAA officials consider the term “area surrounding an airport” to mean an area within the 65 DNL contour.



A Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) includes provisions for the abatement of aircraft noise through aircraft operating procedures, air traffic control procedures, airport regulations, or airport facility modifications.



Acceptance of the noise exposure maps by the FAA is required before it will approve a noise compatibility program for the airport.

Noise Compatibility Program. A Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) includes provisions for the abatement of aircraft noise through aircraft operating procedures, air traffic control procedures, airport regulations, or airport facility modifications. It also includes provisions for land use compatibility planning and may include actions to mitigate the impact of noise on noncompatible land uses. The program must contain provisions for updates and periodic revisions.

F.A.R. Part 150 establishes procedures and criteria for FAA evaluation of noise compatibility programs. Among these, two criteria are of particular importance: the airport proprietor may take no action that imposes an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, nor may the proprietor unjustly discriminate between different categories of airport users.

With an approved noise compatibility program, an airport proprietor becomes eligible for funding through the Federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) to implement the eligible items of the program.

In 1998, the FAA established a policy for Part 150 approval and funding of noise mitigation measures which stated that the FAA will not approve measures in Noise Compatibility Programs that propose corrective noise mitigation actions for new, non-compatible development, which is allowed to occur in the vicinity of airports after October 1, 1998, the effective date of the policy. Therefore, corrective noise mitigation measures for non-compatible development that occurs after October 1, 1998 is not eligible for AIP funding under the noise set-aside regardless of previous FAA approvals under Part 150. This policy increased the incentives for airport operators to discourage the development of new non-compatible land uses around airports, and to assure the most cost-effective use of federal funds spent on noise mitigation measures.



The FAA has required reduction of aircraft noise at the source through certification, modification of engines, or replacement of aircraft.

F.A.R. Part 36 Federal Aircraft Noise Regulations

The FAA has required reduction of aircraft noise at the source through certification, modification of engines, or replacement of aircraft. F.A.R. Part 36 prohibits the further escalation of noise levels of subsonic civil turbojet and transport category aircraft and also requires new airplane types to be markedly quieter than earlier models. Subsequent amendments have extended the noise standards to include large and small, propeller-driven airplanes and supersonic transport aircraft.

F.A.R. Part 36 has three stages of certification. Stage 3 is the most rigorous and applies to aircraft certificated since November 5, 1975; Stage 2 applies to aircraft certificated between December 1, 1969 and November 5, 1975; and Stage 1 includes all previously certificated aircraft.

On December 1, 2004 the FAA issued for public review proposed Stage 4 aircraft noise certification standards for large jet aircraft which would set the standard at a total of 10 decibels below the Stage 3 standards. Within the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) FAA acknowledged that the proposed Stage 4 standard will have "minimal, if any" impact on improving airport noise problems. The new standard is intended to bring U.S. standards in line with the International Civil Aviation Organization "Chapter 4" standard. There is no planned phase-out of Stage 3 aircraft in this NPRM.

F.A.R. Part 91 Federal Aircraft Noise Regulations

F.A.R. Part 91, Subpart I, commonly known as the "Fleet Noise Rule," mandated a compliance schedule under which Stage 1 aircraft were to be retired or refitted with hush kits or quieter engines by January 1, 1988. A very limited number of exemptions have been granted by the U.S. Department of Transportation for foreign aircraft operating into specified international airports.

Pursuant to the Congressional mandate in the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 (ANCA), FAA has established amendments to F.A.R. Part 91 by setting





Neither F.A.R. Part 36 nor Part 91 apply to military aircraft. Nevertheless, many of the advances in quiet engine technology are being used by the military as they upgrade aircraft to improve performance and fuel efficiency.

December 31, 1999 as the date for discontinuing use of all Stage 2 aircraft exceeding 75,000 pounds. Stage 2 aircraft over 75,000 lbs. utilized for non-revenue flights can operate beyond the December 31, 1999 deadline for the following purposes:

- To sell, lease, or scrap the aircraft;
- To obtain modifications to meet Stage 3 standards;
- To obtain scheduled heavy maintenance or significant modifications;
- To deliver the aircraft to a lessee or return it to a lessor;
- To park or store the aircraft;
- To prepare the aircraft for any of these events; or
- To operate under an experimental airworthiness certificate.

Neither F.A.R. Part 36 nor Part 91 apply to military aircraft. Nevertheless, many of the advances in quiet engine technology are being used by the military as they upgrade aircraft to improve performance and fuel efficiency.

F.A.R. Part 161 Regulation Of Airport Noise And Access Restrictions

F.A.R. Part 161 sets forth requirements for notice and approval of local restrictions on aircraft noise levels and airport access. F.A.R. Part 161, which was developed in response to the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990, applies to local airport restrictions that would have the effect of limiting operations of Stage 2 or 3 aircraft. Restrictions regulated under F.A.R. Part 161 include direct limits on maximum noise levels, nighttime curfews, and special fees intended to encourage changes in airport operations to lessen noise.

In order to implement noise or access restrictions on Stage 2 aircraft, the airport operator must provide public notice of the proposal and provide at least a 45-day comment period. This includes notification of FAA and





Noise or access restrictions on Stage 3 aircraft can be implemented only after receiving FAA approval. Before granting approval, the FAA must find that the six conditions specified in the statute are met.



publication of the proposed restriction in the Federal Register. An analysis must be prepared describing the proposal, alternatives to the proposal, and the costs and benefits of each.

Noise or access restrictions on Stage 3 aircraft can be implemented only after receiving FAA approval. Before granting approval, the FAA must find that the six conditions specified in the statute, and listed below, are met.

- (1) The restriction is reasonable, non-arbitrary, and nondiscriminatory.
- (2) The restriction does not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce.
- (3) The proposed restriction maintains safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace.
- (4) The proposed restriction does not conflict with any existing federal statute or regulation.
- (5) The applicant has provided adequate opportunity for public comment on the proposed restriction.
- (6) The proposed restriction does not create an undue burden on the national aviation system.

In its application for FAA review and approval of the restriction, the airport operator must include an environmental assessment of the proposal and a complete analysis addressing the six conditions. Within 30 days of the receipt of the application, the FAA must determine whether the application is complete. After a complete application has been filed, the FAA publishes a notice of the proposal in the Federal Register. FAA must approve or disapprove the restriction within 180 days of receipt of the completed application. Very few Part 161 studies have been undertaken since the enactment of ANCA. **Table 1A** summarizes the studies that have been done to date. Currently, only one F.A.R. Part 161 Study, in Naples, Florida, has been deemed complete by FAA. However, FAA has also ruled that the restriction is a violation of grant assurances Naples signed when accepting federal funds.

Airport operators that implement noise and access restrictions in violation of F.A.R. Part 161 are subject to termination of eligibility for airport grant funds and authority to impose and collect passenger facility charges.

SUMMARY OF F.A.R. PART 161 STUDIES

AIRPORT	YEAR		COST	PROPOSAL, STATUS
	STARTED	ENDED		
Aspen-Pitken County Airport, Aspen, Colorado	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	The study has not yet been submitted to FAA.
Kahului Airport, Kahului, Maui, Hawaii	1991	1994	\$50,000 (est.)	Proposed nighttime prohibition of Stage 2 aircraft pursuant to court stipulation. Cost-benefit and statewide impact analysis found to be deficient by FAA. Airport never submitted a complete Part 161 Study. Suspended consideration of restriction.
Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Minneapolis, Minnesota	1992	1992	N.A.	Proposed nighttime prohibition of Stage 2 aircraft. Cost-benefit analysis was deficient. Never submitted complete Part 161 study. Suspended consideration of restriction and entered into negotiations with carriers for voluntary cooperation.
Pease International Tradeport, Portsmouth, New Hampshire	1995	N.A.	N.A.	Have not yet submitted Part 161 Study for FAA review.
San Francisco International Airport, San Francisco, California	1998	1999	\$200,000	Proposed extension of nighttime curfew on Stage 2 aircraft over 75,000 pounds. Started study in May 1998. Submitted to FAA in early 1999 and subsequently withdrawn.
San Jose International Airport San Jose, California	1994	1997	Phase 1 - \$400,000 Phase 2 - \$5 to \$10 million (est.)	Study undertaken as part of legal settlement agreement. Studied a Stage 2 restriction. Suspended study after Phase 1 report showed costs to airlines at San Jose greater than benefits in San Jose. Never undertook Phase 2, systemwide analysis. Never submitted study for FAA review.
Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport	2000	Ongoing	Phase 1 - \$1 million (est.)	Proposed curfew restricting all aircraft operations from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
Naples Municipal Airport Naples, Florida	2000	2000	Currently over \$730,000 Expect an additional cost of \$1.5 to \$3.0 million in legal fees due to litigation	Enactment of a total ban on Stage 2 general aviation jet aircraft under 75,000 pounds (the airport is currently restricted to aircraft under 75,000 pounds.) Airport began enforcing the restriction on March 1, 2002. FAA has deemed the Part 161 Study complete; however, FAA has not ruled on federal grant assurance violations.

N.A. - Not available.

Sources: Telephone interviews with Federal Aviation Administration officials and staffs of various airports.





KANSAS CITY
(816) 524-3500

237 N.W. Blue Parkway
Suite 100
Lee's Summit, MO 64063

PHOENIX
(602) 993-6999

4835 E. Cactus Road
Suite 235
Scottsdale, AZ 85254