## **Appendix E: Noise Methodology and Calculations**

This page intentionally left blank

## **DRAFT Report**

# Noise Analysis in Support of an Environmental Assessment for the Advanced Helicopter Training System at Naval Air Station Whiting Field & Navy Outlying Landing Fields, FL

May 2019

#### Prepared for:

Kathleen Riek Cardno GS, Inc. 2496 Old Ivy Rd, Suite 300 Charlottesville, VA 22905

**Prepared by**: Micah Downing, Ph.D. Ben Manning

Subcontract Number: 031029-32622

BRRC Report Number: BRRC 19-06 Blue Ridge Research and Consulting, LLC 29 N Market St, Suite 700 Asheville, NC 28801 (p) 828-252-2209 (f) 831-603-8321 <u>BlueRidgeResearch.com</u>

## List of Acronyms

AAM	Advanced Acoustic Model
AGL	Above Ground Level
AHTS	Advanced Helicopter Training System
AICUZ	Air Installation Compatible Use Zones
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
BRRC	Blue Ridge Research and Consulting, LLC
CAL	Confined Air Landing
dB	Decibel
dBA	A-Weighted Sound Level, Decibel
DNL	Day-Night Average Sound Level
DoD	Department of Defense
EA	Environmental Assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FICON	Federal Interagency Committee on Noise
FICUN	Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise
GCA	Ground Controlled Approach
Hz	Hertz
IFR	Instrument Flight Rules
kts	Knots
KIAS	Knots Indicated Airspeed
L <sub>dn</sub>	A-weighted Day-Night Average Sound Level
L <sub>eq</sub>	Equivalent Sound Level
L <sub>Aeq</sub>	Equivalent A-weighted Sound Level
L <sub>Amax</sub>	A-weighted Maximum Sound Level
L <sub>max</sub>	Maximum Sound Level
L <sub>Pk</sub>	Peak Level
NAS	Naval Air Station
NAVAIR	Naval Air System Command
NOLF	Navy Outlying Landing Field
NM	Nautical Mile
NVG	Night Vision Goggle
OLF	Outlying Landing Field
SEL	Sound Exposure Level
T&G	Touch and Go
TRAWING 5	Training Air Wing Five
TRBO	Tail Rotor/Boost Off
USN	United States Navy
VFR	Visual Flight Rules

## **Table of Contents**

Li	st of Fig	gures	;	5
Li	st of Ta	bles .		6
1	Intro	oduct	tion	8
	1.1	Purp	pose	8
	1.2	Dese	cription of Scenarios	8
2	Nois	se Me	etrics and Models	9
	2.1	Nois	se Metrics	9
	2.1.	1	Maximum Sound Level (L <sub>max</sub> )	9
	2.1.	2	Sound Exposure Level (SEL)	10
	2.1.	3	Day/Night Average Sound Level, DNL or L <sub>dn</sub>	10
	2.2	Com	nputerized Noise Exposure Models	11
3	Ope	ratio	nal Parameters	13
	3.1	NAS	S Whiting Field Airfield	13
	3.1.	1	Description	13
	3.1.	2	Annual Flight Operations and Distributions	16
	3.1.	3	Annual Static Operations	18
	3.2	Nav	y Outlying Landing Fields	19
	3.2.	1	NOLF Spencer	21
	3.2.	2	NOLF Pace	23
	3.2.	3	NOLF Site X	25
	3.2.	4	NOLF Harold	28
	3.2.	5	NOLF Santa Rosa	31
	3.3	Clim	natological Data	33
4	Nois	se Mo	odeling Results	35
	4.1	NAS	S Whiting Field South	35
	4.2	NOL	LF Spencer	38
	4.3	NOL	LF Pace	41
	4.4	NOL	LF Site X	45
	4.5	NOL	LF Harold	49

4.6	NOLF Santa Rosa	53
Reference	es	58
Appendix	A: Flight Tracks	1
Appendix	s B: Representative Flight Profiles	1
Appendix	c: Distribution of Operations	1

## **List of Figures**

Figure 1. NAS Whiting Field Located in the Milton/Pensacola Area of Northwest Florida	14
Figure 2. NAS Whiting Field South Helicopter Pad and Run-Up Locations	15
Figure 3. NOLF Spencer Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida	22
Figure 4. NOLF Pace Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida	24
Figure 5. NOLF Site X Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida	26
Figure 6. NOLF Harold Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida	29
Figure 7. NOLF Santa Rosa Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida	
Figure 8. Comparison of DNL Noise Contours at NAS Whiting Field South	
Figure 9. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Spencer	
Figure 10. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Pace	43
Figure 11. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Site X	47
Figure 12. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Harold	51
Figure 13. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Santa Rosa	55

## **List of Tables**

Table 1. NAS Whiting Field South Runway Descriptions	13
Table 2. South Field Helicopter Pads/Run-Up Locations	16
Table 3. NAS Whiting Field South Historical Annual Operations	17
Table 4. Distribution of Operations for Acoustic Day/Night Splits	17
Table 5. Distribution of Airfield Operations At South Field For The Scenarios	17
Table 6. Additional South Field Operational Distribution Parameters	18
Table 7. TH-57 Ground and Hover Operations	18
Table 8. Historical Annual Operations at the NOLFs	20
Table 9. Modeled Annual Operations at the NOLFs	20
Table 10. Training Operations Conducted at each NOLF	20
Table 11. NOLF Modeled Course Utilizations	20
Table 12. NOLF Spencer Annual Operations	23
Table 13. NOLF Pace Annual Airfield Operations	25
Table 14. NOLF Site X Annual Operations	28
Table 15. NOLF Harold Annual Airfield Operations	30
Table 16. NOLF Santa Rosa runway descriptions	33
Table 17. NOLF Santa Rosa Annual Airfield Operations	33
Table 18. Monthly Average Weather Conditions at NAS Whiting Field	34
Table 19. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations Near NAS Whiting Field South	37
Table 20. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NAS	
Whiting Field South for TH-57B/C Operations	37
Table 21. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NAS	
Whiting Field South for AHTS Operations	37
Table 22. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Spencer	40
Table 23. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF	
Spencer for TH-57B/C Operations	40
Table 24. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF	
Spencer for AHTS Operations	41
Table 25. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Pace	44
Table 26. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Pa	ace
for TH-57B/C Operations	44
Table 27. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Pa	ace
for AHTS Operations	45
Table 28. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Site X	48
Table 29. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Si	te
X for TH-57B/C Operations	48
Table 30. SEL and $L_{Amax}$ of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Si	te
X for AHTS Operations	49
Table 31. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Harold	52

Table 32. SEL and $L_{Amax}$ of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF	
Harold for TH-57B/C Operations	. 52
Table 33. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF	
Harold for AHTS Operations	. 53
Table 34. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Santa Rosa	. 56
Table 35. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF	
Santa Rosa for TH-57B/C Operations	. 56
Table 36. SEL and L <sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF	
Santa Rosa for AHTS Operations	. 57

7

## **1** Introduction

This noise analysis report supports the US Navy's (USN) preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Advanced Helicopter Training System (AHTS) at Naval Air Station (NAS) Whiting Field, Florida. This report is divided into sections: this first section provides an overview of the proposed action and current operations at NAS Whiting Field and six Navy Outlying Fields (NOLF). Section 2 summarizes the noise metrics used to describe and quantify the noise environments, with a brief description of the computer noise analysis model used to calculate the noise exposures. Section 3 describes the aircraft operational modelling parameters at NAS Whiting Field South and the six NOLFs. Section 4 provides the resulting noise contours and supplemental metrics at representative points of interest near the airfields.

## 1.1 Purpose

NAS Whiting Field is home to Training Air Wing Five (TRAWING 5) and is located in the Milton/Pensacola area of Northwest Florida, in the County of Santa Rosa. NAS Whiting Field South currently hosts a fleet of approximately 115 TH-57s, but as part of modernizing its rotary-wing and tilt-rotor integrated pilot production training program, the USN is transitioning to a new helicopter as part of the AHTS. The primary purpose of this report is to present the helicopter noise exposure for Baseline, Proposed Action, and future No Action scenarios at NAS Whiting Field South and six of its associated NOLFs: Spencer, Pace, Site X, Harold, Santa Rosa, and Choctaw.

## 1.2 Description of Scenarios

This noise analysis report evaluates three scenarios: Baseline, Proposed Action, and No Action. The Baseline is based on a five-year average of operations and represents current operational tempos at NAS Whiting Field South and the NOLFs. The baseline scenario does not include operations at NOLF Site X since operations at this NOLF have just started after its establishment and the closure of Site 8. The Proposed Action represents the new operations for the AHTS at the main field and the NOLFs. For this scenario, the distribution of the sorties to the NOLFs are changed to account for the new operations at Site X. It also includes a 22% increase in operations compared to the Baseline tempo. For the No Action scenario, the operational levels are the same as the Baseline tempo, but the utilization of the NOLFs are the same as the Proposed Action to account for the newly established NOLF Site X.

For the Proposed Action, the actual helicopter type is unknown at the time of this analysis. Thus, a surrogate helicopter was identified for use to represent the potential noise of the AHTS. This surrogate aircraft is the UH-72 Lakota (Thompson, 2019). The UH-72 is a twin-engine aircraft and was recently selected by the U.S. Army as a primary helicopter trainer. Additionally, it has reference noise data for use in the Advanced Acoustic Model (AAM), which is used to model the operational noise in this study. Currently, it is not known whether a single engine or twin-engine commercial helicopter will be selected for AHTS. Therefore the use of a twin-engine military trainer as the noise modeling surrogate for AHTS is considered a conservative alternative for purposes of assessing potential noise impacts.

## 2 Noise Metrics and Models

Noise represents one of the most contentious environmental issues associated with aircraft operations. Although many other sources of noise are present in today's communities, aircraft noise is readily identifiable based on its uniqueness. An assessment of aircraft noise requires a general understanding of how sound affects people and the natural environment, as well as how it is measured.

Around a military or civilian airfield, the noise environment is normally described in terms of the timeaverage sound level generated by aircraft operating at that facility. In this study, operations consist of the flight activities conducted during an average annual day, including arrivals and departures at the airfields, flight patterns in the general vicinity of the airfields, and ground run up, hover, and maintenance operations.

## 2.1 Noise Metrics

A noise metric refers to a unit or quantity that measures an aspect of the received noise used in environmental noise analyses. A metric is used to relate the received noise to its various effects. To quantify these effects, the Department of Defense (DoD) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) use a series of metrics to describe the noise environment. These metrics range from simple to complex measures of the noise environment.

<u>Simple metrics</u> quantify the sound levels occurring during an individual aircraft overflight (single event) and the total noise exposure from the event. Single noise events can be described with Maximum Sound Level (L<sub>max</sub>) and Sound Exposure Level (SEL).

<u>Complex metrics</u> quantify the cumulative noise exposure using a number of different methods of analyzing the noise based on the expected flight and aircraft engine run-up maintenance schedules. Some common metrics are the Equivalent Average Sound Level ( $L_{eq}$ ) and the Day/Night Average Sound Level (DNL or  $L_{dn}$ ). The DNL is the fundamental metric used to describe the aircraft noise environment in and around an airfield and is directly related to the long-term community annoyance resulting from this noise. The other metrics (simple and descriptive) supplement this long-term characterization of the noise environment and help to clarify different aspects of the noise effects.

During an aircraft overflight, the noise level starts at the ambient or background noise level, rises to the maximum level as the aircraft flies closest to the observer, and returns to the background level as the aircraft recedes into the distance. The following metrics describe different aspects of this transient noise event.

#### 2.1.1 Maximum Sound Level (L<sub>Amax</sub>)

The highest A-weighted integrated sound level measured during a single noise event in which the sound level changes value with time (e.g., an aircraft overflight) is called the maximum A-weighted sound level or maximum sound level. The term A-weighted refers to the adjustment of the spectral content to approximate the human ear's sensitivities to the range of audible sound frequencies. All metrics in this document reflect A-weighting, and thus, A-weighting is not indicated in the text or tables.

L<sub>Amax</sub> indicates the maximum sound level occurring for a fraction of a second during the event. For aircraft noise, the "fraction of a second" over which the maximum level is defined is generally 1/8th of a second. The maximum sound level is important in judging the interference caused by a noise event with conversation, TV listening, sleep, or other common activities. Although it provides some measure of the intrusiveness of the event, it does not completely describe the total event, because it does not include the period of time over which the sound is heard.

### 2.1.2 Sound Exposure Level (SEL)

SEL is a metric that represents both the intensity of a sound and its duration. Individual time-varying noise events (e.g., aircraft overflights) have two main characteristics: a sound level that changes throughout the event and a period of time during which the event is heard. SEL provides a measure of the net exposure of the entire acoustic event, but it does not directly represent the sound level heard at any given time. During an aircraft flyover, SEL would include both the maximum sound level and the lower sound levels produced during onset and recess periods of the overflight.

SEL is a logarithmic measure of the total acoustic energy transmitted to the listener during the event. Mathematically, it represents the sound level of a constant sound that would, in one second, generate the same acoustic energy as the actual time-varying noise event. For sound from aircraft overflights, which typically last more than one second, the SEL is usually greater than the  $L_{Amax}$  because an individual overflight takes seconds and the  $L_{Amax}$  occurs in a fraction of a second. SEL also provides the best measure to compare noise levels from different aircraft and/or operations.

#### 2.1.3 Day/Night Average Sound Level, DNL or L<sub>dn</sub>

Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL or  $L_{dn}$ ) is a complex metric that accounts for the SEL of all noise events in a 24-hour period. To account for increased human sensitivity to noise at night (2200 to 0700), a 10 dB adjustment is applied to nighttime events. The adjustment incorporated into the DNL metric accounts for the added intrusiveness of sounds that occur during normal sleeping hours, both because of the increased sensitivity to noise during those hours and because ambient sound levels during nighttime are typically about 10 dB lower than during daytime hours.

DNL is an average quantity mathematically representing the continuous A-weighted sound level that would be present if all of the variations in sound level that occur over a 24-hour period were smoothed out so as to contain the same total sound energy. DNL accounts for the maximum noise levels, the duration of the events (operations), the number of events and the timing of their occurrence over a 24-hour period. Like SEL, DNL does not represent the sound level heard at any particular time, but it quantifies the total sound energy received. While it is normalized as an average, it represents all of the sound energy, and is therefore a cumulative measure.

Although DNL provides a single measure of the overall noise impact, it does not provide specific information on the number of noise events or the individual sound levels that occur during the 24-hour period. For example, a daily average sound level of 65 dB could result from very few noisy events or a large number of quieter events.

In 1979, the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise (FICUN) was established, and they published "Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land-Use Planning and Control" (FICUN,1980). These guidelines complement federal agency criteria by providing for the consideration of noise in all land-use planning and interagency/intergovernmental processes. The FICUN established Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL), which is the most appropriate descriptor for all noise sources. In 1982, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published "Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis" to provide all types of decision-makers with analytic procedures to uniformly express and quantify noise impacts (EPA, 1982). The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) endorsed DNL in 1990 as the "acoustical measure to be used in assessing compatibility between various land uses and outdoor noise environment" (ANSI, 2003). In 1992, the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) reaffirmed the use of DNL as the principal aircraft noise descriptor in the document entitled "Federal Agency Review of Selected Airport Noise Analysis Issues" (FICON, 1992). In general, scientific studies and social surveys have found a high correlation between the percentages of groups of people highly annoyed and the level of average noise exposure measured in DNL (Schultz, 1974; Fidell et al., 1991; Finegold et al., 1994).

## 2.2 Computerized Noise Exposure Models

Analyses of aircraft noise exposure around airfield facilities are normally accomplished by using NoiseMap (Czech & Plotkin, 1998) and AAM (Bradley, Hobbs, Wilmer, & Czech, 2016). NoiseMap is a suite of computer programs that were developed by the US Air Force. AAM is a suite of computer programs developed by NASA for both single event and cumulative helicopter flight noise analysis. AAM is the DoD recommended noise model for helicopter flyover noise modeling. It should be noted that hover and static helicopter operations are currently modeled with NoiseMap. Together, NoiseMap and AAM allow noise predictions without the actual implementation of noise monitoring of those actions.

The latest NoiseMap package of computer programs consists of BASEOPS Version 7, OMEGA10, OMEGA11, NoiseMap Version 7.3, NMPLOT Version 4.6, and the latest issue of NOISEFILE. NOISEFILE is the DoD noise database originating from noise measurements of controlled flyovers at prescribed power, speed, and drag configurations for many models of aircraft. AAM is also incorporated into this suite of programs through the integration of the data input module BASEOPS. With BASEOPS, the user enters the runway coordinates, airfield information, flight tracks, flight profiles along each track by each aircraft, numbers of flight operations, run-up coordinates, run-up profiles, and run-up operations. After the operational parameters are defined, both NoiseMap and AAM calculate DNL values on a grid of ground locations on and around the facility. The NMPLOT program draws contours of equal DNL for overlay onto land-use maps. For noise studies, as a minimum, DNL contours of 60, 65, 70, 75, and 80 dBA are developed.

NoiseMap and AAM also have the flexibility of calculating SEL, L<sub>Amax</sub>, and DNL values at specified points so that noise values at representative locations around an airfield can be described in more detail. NoiseMap and AAM are most accurate for comparing "before-and-after" community noise effects, which would result from the implementation of proposed changes or alternative noise control actions when the calculations are made in a consistent manner. It allows noise predictions for such proposed actions

11

without the actual implementation and noise monitoring of those actions. Results of these computer programs and noise impact guidelines provide a relative measure of noise effects around air facilities.

## **3 Operational Parameters**

The noise modeling process involves distributing the flight operations to the nominal flight tracks. A detailed description of the flight tracks, flight profiles, and the distribution of operations can be found in Appendices A-1, B, and C-1, respectively. For this analysis, the flight tracks and flight profiles will not change among the scenarios. The other change will be the use of UH-72 reference source noise for the Proposed Action. The Baseline and No Action Scenarios will use the TH-57B reference source noise.

## 3.1 NAS Whiting Field Airfield

### 3.1.1 Description

NAS Whiting Field is home to TRAWING 5 and is located in the Milton/Pensacola area of Northwest Florida, in the County of Santa Rosa. NAS Whiting Field currently hosts a fleet of T-6 and TH-57 aircraft. NAS Whiting Field is composed of two separate fully-operational airfields: North Field and South Field. Primary and intermediate fixed-wing flight training is conducted at North Field, and South Field is used for all phases of helicopter training. Additional transient aircraft operate out of South Field as an Aviation Park. These transient operations are grouped into three categories according to aircraft type: multiple-engine propeller aircraft, multiple-engine propeller cargo aircraft, and corporate jets. These aircraft groups are represented in the noise modeling by the T-44 (King Air), C-130, and C-21A (Learjet), respectively. The operations associated with the Aviation Park will remain unchanged. Runways at NAS Whiting Field are depicted in Figure 1 and described in Table 1. This noise study will only include operations at the South Field.

#### Table 1. NAS Whiting Field South Runway Descriptions

Runway Pair	Width (ft)	Length (ft)	Heading	Runway	Latitude Longitude	Runway	Latitude Longitude
			NAS Wh	iting Field	- South Field		
05/22	200	6 122	10/220	E	30.694616° N	22	30.705842° N
05/25	200	0,152	48/228	5	87.019329° W	25	87.005354° W
11/22	200	6 000	120/210	1/	30.702963° N	27	30.690873° N
14/32	200	0,009	120/210	14	87.022967° W	52	87.009974° W

South Field helicopter pads and run-up locations are depicted in Figure **2** and described in Table 2. Note that the modeled static pads in the parking areas are representative of general locations where ground starts and hovers are conducted.



Figure 1. NAS Whiting Field Located in the Milton/Pensacola Area of Northwest Florida

14



Figure 2. NAS Whiting Field South Helicopter Pad and Run-Up Locations

S	outh Field Helicopter P	ads/Run-up Loc	ations
Name	Description	Latitude	Longitude
SAC1	A & B & C Rows	30.705582° N	87.014206° W
SAC2	A & B & C Rows	30.703370° N	87.014299° W
SCC	Crew Change Center	30.700440° N	87.015979° W
SDE1	D & E Rows	30.706493° N	87.012135° W
SDE2	D & E Rows	30.703741° N	87.012230° W
SFG1	F & G Rows	30.702402° N	87.018539° W
SFG2	F & G Rows	30.702330° N	87.016342° W
SFP1	Fuel Pit 1	30.700746° N	87.018550° W
SFP2	Fuel Pit 2	30.700724° N	87.017899° W
SH1	H Row	30.701693° N	87.017941° W
SH2	H Row	30.701617° N	87.015715° W
SHPad_A	Helipad A	30.697015° N	87.019596° W
SHPad_B	Helipad B	30.693390° N	87.015698° W
SHPad_C	Helipad C	30.696700° N	87.011576° W
SHPad_D	Helipad D	30.698824° N	87.010807° W
SHPad_E	Helipad E	30.701057° N	87.008021° W
SHPad_F	Helipad F	30.702831° N	87.005779° W
SMaint1	Maintenance Pad	30.702997° N	87.019151° W
SMaint2	Maintenance Pad	30.702990° N	87.018817° W
SMaint3	Maintenance Pad	30.702980° N	87.018509° W
SMaint4	Maintenance Pad	30.702971° N	87.018189° W
SMaint5	Maintenance Pad	30.702959° N	87.017877° W

#### Table 2. South Field Helicopter Pads/Run-Up Locations

#### 3.1.2 Annual Flight Operations and Distributions

For annual aircraft operations at NAS Whiting Field South, data were obtained from airfield activity reports from 2014 to 2018. Table 3 shows the number of annual operations conducted at the airfield for the years 2014 to 2018 along with the average. The breakout between helicopter and fixed-wing operations is based on data from noise analyses from the recent Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) study (Downing & Salton, 2015). For calculation of DNL, the operations need to be split between "Acoustic Day" and "Acoustic Night." "Acoustic Day" refers to the hours between 0700 and 2200, and "Acoustic Night" refers to the hours from 2200 to 0700. The modeled day/night splits are provided in Table 4.

Table 5 describes the breakdown of the total operations by operation type and day/night splits. Note that additional breakdown information for NAS Whiting Field South is presented in Table 6.

Voar	Total				
ioui	Total	Helicopter*	Fixed-wing*		
2014	96,823	75,846	20,977		
2015	96,706	75,754	20,952		
2016	101,033	79,144	21,889		
2017	96,404	75,518	20,886		
2018	97,528	76,398	21,130		
Average	97,699	76,532	21,167		
* Estimat	ed breakout fo ns	r NAS White F	ield South		

#### Table 3. NAS Whiting Field South Historical Annual Operations

#### Table 4. Distribution of Operations for Acoustic Day/Night Splits

	Day (0700 to 2200)	Night (2200 to 0700)
Departures	98%	2%
Arrivals	94%	6%
Patterns	90%	10%
T-6 GCA	99%	1%
Aviation Park	100%	0%

#### Table 5. Distribution of Airfield Operations At South Field For The Scenarios

Operation	Average Annual Operations			
Туре	Baseline	Proposed Action	No Action	
	Navy Aircraft			
Departure	28,404	34,652	28,404	
Instrument Departure	3,945	4,813	3,945	
Arrival	32,349	39,465	32,349	
Pattern	11,835	14,438	11,835	
T-6 GCA	2,367	2,367	2,367	
	<b>Aviation Park</b>			
Departure	9,400	9,400	9,400	
Arrival	9,400	9,400	9,400	
TOTAL	97,699	114,536	97,699	

Departure Waypoints	Utilization	Arrival Waypoints	Utilization
Able	40%	Bell	15%
Baker	60%	Cypress	34%
		lgor	51%
Pad	Utilization	T-6 GCA Runway	Utilization
Pad Along Runway	Utilization	T-6 GCA Runway Rwy 23	Utilization 50%
Pad Along Runway Depart to SW from Spot 1	Utilization 75%	T-6 GCA Runway Rwy 23 Rwy 32	Utilization 50% 50%
Pad Along Runway Depart to SW from Spot 1 Offset Parallel to Runway	Utilization 75%	T-6 GCA Runway Rwy 23 Rwy 32	Utilization 50% 50%

#### **Table 6. Additional South Field Operational Distribution Parameters**

#### 3.1.3 Annual Static Operations

For aircraft static operations at NAS Whiting Field South, the modeling parameters from the AICUZ noise data were utilized with the only adjustments based on the annual average operations. Table 7 describes the TH-57 run-up, hover, and maintenance operations conducted at NAS Whiting Field South. For the Proposed Action, the same tempo and type of run-up, hover, and maintenance operations is assumed.

Static Profile	Events/	Mode	Duration	Profile	Total	Acoustic	Acoustic	% within
Statie Frome Sortie		woue	(sec)	Name	Operations	Day	Night	group
				SAC1	31.402	98%	2%	19%
				SAC2	31.402	98%	2%	19%
		Low Idle		SDE1	26.725	98%	2%	16%
Due Eliebt	1 00	(1200 s)/	1000	SDE2	26.725	98%	2%	16%
Pre-Fiight	1.00	High Idle	1800	SFG1	17.371	98%	2%	10%
		(600 s)		SFG2	17.371	98%	2%	10%
				SH1	9.354	98%	2%	6%
				SH2	9.354	98%	2%	6%
Evel Dite	0.50	Low Idle	600	SFP1	42.426	98%	2%	50%
Fuel Pits	0.50			SFP2	42.426	98%	2%	50%
Crew Swap	0.25	Low Idle	600	SCC	42.426	100%	0%	100%
		Low Idle (600 s)/ High Idle (600 s)		SMaint 1	3.394	100%	0%	20%
				SMaint 2	3.394	100%	0%	20%
Maintenance Pads	0.10		1200	SMaint 3	3.394	100%	0%	20%
				SMaint 4	3.394	100%	0%	20%
				Smaint 5	3.394	100%	0%	20%

#### Table 7. TH-57 Ground and Hover Operations

## 3.2 Navy Outlying Landing Fields

TRAWING 5 utilizes twelve NOLFs located in two states and five counties. The NOLFs are primarily used by TRAWING 5 aircraft originating from NAS Whiting Field. Six of the NOLFs are included in this study: Spencer, Pace, Site X, Harold, Santa Rosa, and Choctaw. For this analysis, detailed modeling is provided at Spencer, Pace, Site X, Harold, and Santa Rosa since the helicopter operations are the only ones being conducted at these NOLFs. For NOLF Choctaw, military jets also utilize the airfield for pattern training (United States Air Force, 2014). Thus, the contribution of helicopter operations to the overall noise exposure at NOLF Choctaw is negligible, and they are not modeled.

In addition to arrival and departure operations, helicopter pattern operations at these airfields include:

- **Standard Patterns** (basic race track with 500 ft above ground level (AGL) downwind at 70 knotsindicated airspeed [KIAS]),
- 90° Auto-rotation Patterns (race track with descent initiated at mid-point of the turn to final),
- 180° Auto-rotation Patterns (race track with descent initiated at turn to final),
- Tactical Low Altitude Patterns (TLA) (low altitude, high speed),
- High-Speed Tactical Patterns (HST) (race track with increased speed),
- Tail Rotor/Boost Off (TRBO) Patterns (race track with increased initial climb rate),
- Confined Air Landing (CAL) Patterns,
- External Load Patterns, and
- Pinnacle Patterns (approach and land on an elevated platform).

For aircraft operations at the six NOLFs, data were obtained from airfield activity reports as shown in Table 8. It should be noted that NOLF Site X replaced former NOLF Site 8 as part of a Congressionally-authorized land transfer with Escambia County. For the historical data, operations from Site 8 are included to provide an overall view of current operational tempos. Table 9 shows a summary of the total projected annual operations conducted at each NOLF, and Table 10 indicated the associated pattern types conducted at each NOLF. Helicopters conduct standard and autorotation patterns at all six helicopter NOLFs. External Load and Pinnacle patterns are conducted at NOLFs Site X and Harold. Eighty percent (80%) of the Night Vision Goggle (NVG) training is distributed between three NOLFs: 40% of NVG training is conducted at NOLF Santa Rosa, and the remaining 40% is split evenly between NOLF Site X and NOLF Harold. The NVG training utilizes the standard pattern. The five modeled NOLFs use the same course distribution based on the local wind patterns as provided in Table 11.

The following sections provide a brief description of each NOLF, and the annual operations for each scenario. Refer to Appendices A, B, and C for a detailed description of modeled flight tracks, flight profiles, and distribution of operations.

Annual Operations for NAS Whiting Field South NOLFs								
Voar		NOLFs						
Tear	Spencer	Pace	Site 8	Site X	Harold	Santa Rosa	Choctaw	
2014	257,883	147,961	66,744		102,642	231,838	17,090	
2015	289,366	126,954	59,860		111,533	221,149	10,365	
2016	316,096	127,495	58,780		94,747	215,935	2,088	
2017	272,363	114,944	75,006		47,319	192,347	7,087	
2018	211,046	132,380	28,178		84,946	162,853	6,508	
Average	269,351	129,947	57,714		88,237	204,824	8,628	

#### Table 8. Historical Annual Operations at the NOLFs

#### Table 9. Modeled Annual Operations at the NOLFs

Rotary Wing TH-57 Operations			
Airfield	Baseline	Proposed	No Action
NOLF Spencer	269,351	306,495	251,221
NOLF Pace	129,947	153,250	125,611
NOLF Site 8	57,714		
NOLF Site X		136,145	111,593
NOLF Harold	88,237	75,911	62,221
NOLF Santa Rosa	204,824	247,022	202,472
NOLF Choctaw	8,628	6,811	5,583
TOTAL	758,701	925,634	758,701

#### Table 10. Training Operations Conducted at each NOLF

Airfield	Standard	90° Auto	180° Auto	TLA	HST	Tail Rotor/ Boost Off	Confined Air Landing	External Load	Pinnacle
NOLF Spencer	х	Х	Х		Х	Х			
NOLF Pace	Х	Х	Х						
NOLF Site X	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	х	Х
NOLF Harold	х	Х	Х	Х	Х		Х	х	Х
NOLF Santa Rosa	Х	Х	Х	Х	х	Х			
NOLF Choctaw	х	Х	Х						

**Table 11. NOLF Modeled Course Utilizations** 

Course	Utilization
North	30.8%
South	24.9%
West	27.6%
East	16.7%

#### 3.2.1 NOLF Spencer

#### 3.2.1.1 Description of Airfield

NOLF Spencer, shown in Figure 3, is located approximately 9 NM southwest of NAS Whiting Field, in Santa Rosa County, Florida. The field operates according to one of four courses, depending on airfield conditions. The field is divided into two identical sides, depending on the course in use, by splitting the field directly over the centerline. The low work areas at NOLF Spencer are inbound of the duty runways and upwind of the infield. Helicopter pad locations are modeled to represent low work in these areas. The refueling and crew change area are located in the infield. Two fuel pads are available at NOLF Spencer, for all courses.

#### 3.2.1.2 Annual Airfield Helicopter Operations

For the Proposed Action scenario, the overall operations will increase by 14% from 269,351 to 306,495 operations. For the No Action scenario, the overall operations will decrease by 7% from 269,351 to 251,221. Table 12 shows the modeled distribution of these annual operations by operational type. All operations are conducted during the acoustic day, between the hours of 0700 to 2200. The operations in Table 12 are distributed to the four courses by the utilization values in Table 11.

Aircraft arrive in the direction that aligns with the course in use via point SNAKE, however all courses require aircraft to depart from the northeast or southeast corners. Arrival operations are distributed between right- and left-hand pattern entry scenarios, with a 60%/40% split between the operations turning to the eastern and western side, respectively, for courses 180 and 360, and to the southern side and northern side, respectively, for courses 090 and 270. Although aircraft normally depart from the southeast corner (90%), they may depart from the northeast corner for flights proceeding to the north, west, or towards NOLF Pace.

Pattern operations at NOLF Spencer include standard patterns, 180° and 90° autorotation patterns, and TRBO patterns. Standard and autorotation patterns are conducted in a lane parallel to the respective centerline. TRBO operations are conducted on the duty runway. For courses 360 and 180, pattern operations are distributed 60% to the eastern side and 40% to the western side. For courses 090 and 270, pattern operations are distributed 60% to the southern side and 40% to the northern side.

Refer to Appendices A-2, B, and C-2 for a detailed description of the flight tracks, flight profiles, and distribution of operations at NOLF Spencer.



Figure 3. NOLF Spencer Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida

**Table 12. NOLF Spencer Annual Operations** 

NOLF Spencer	Baseline	Proposed	No Action
Departure	6,413	7,298	5,981
Arrival	6,413	7,298	5,981
Standard Pattern	153,915	175,140	143,555
180° Autorotation	25,653	29,190	23,926
90° Autorotation	25,653	29,190	23,926
Tail Rotor/Boost Off	25,652	29,190	23,926
High-Speed Tactical	25,652	29,190	23,926
TOTAL	269,351	306,495	251,221

#### 3.2.1.3 Annual Low Work and Refueling Operations

The low work areas at NOLF Spencer are inbound of the duty runways and upwind of the infield. Helicopter pad locations are modeled to represent low work in these areas. Low work operations are estimated to occur for 75% of the projected annual sorties. The operations are distributed based on the course utilization and equally distributed between the three modeled pad locations. Overall, the amount of low work is expected to increase from 4,810 to 5,473 annual operations for the Proposed Action scenario and to decrease to 4,486 annual operations for the No Action scenario.

The refueling and crew change area are located in the infield. Two fuel pads are available at NOLF Spencer, for all courses. The amount of fuel pit operations is also estimated at 75% of the annual sorties. Thus, these static operations will have the same annual operations as the low work operations. The operations are equally distributed between the two fuel pads.

#### 3.2.2 NOLF Pace

#### 3.2.2.1 Description of Airfield

NOLF Pace, shown in Figure 4, is located approximately 11 NM west of NAS Whiting Field, in Santa Rosa County, Florida. The field operates according to one of four courses, depending on airfield conditions. The field is divided by the centerline into two identical sides, depending on the course in use. Low work areas at NOLF Pace extend 50 ft from each side of the centerline on the upwind half of the field. Helicopter pad locations are modeled to represent areas where low hover work is performed.

#### 3.2.2.2 Annual Airfield Helicopter Operations

For the Proposed Action scenario, the overall operations will increase by 18% from 129,947 to 153,250 annual operations. For the No Action scenario, the overall operations will decrease by 3% from 129,947 to 125,611. Table 13 shows the modeled distribution of these annual operations by operational type. All operations are conducted during the acoustic day, between the hours of 0700 to 2200. The operations in Table 13 are distributed to the four courses by the utilization values in Table 11.



Figure 4. NOLF Pace Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida

Aircraft arrive in the direction that aligns with the course in use via Tree Field, however all courses require aircraft to depart from the southeast corner. Arrival operations are distributed between right- and left-hand pattern entry scenarios, with a 60%/40% split between the operations turning to the eastern and western side, respectively, for courses 180 and 360, and to the southern and northern side, respectively, for courses 090 and 270.

Pattern operations at NOLF Pace include standard patterns, 180° autorotation patterns, and 90° autorotation patterns. Standard patterns and autorotations are conducted in a numbered lane parallel to the respective centerline. For courses 360 and 180, pattern operations are distributed 60% to the eastern side and 40% to the western side. For courses 090 and 270, pattern operations are distributed 60% to the southern side and 40% to the northern side. Each side is divided into three lanes: the normal lane, the 90° autorotation lane, and the 180° autorotation lane. Operations are prohibited south of the access road located along the eastern field boundary and in the northwest corner of the field.

Refer to Appendices A-3, B, and C-3 for a detailed description of the flight tracks, flight profiles, and distribution of operations at NOLF Pace.

NOLF Pace	Baseline	Proposed	No Action
Departure	3,094	3,649	2,991
Arrival	3,094	3,649	2,991
Standard Pattern	92,819	109,464	89,722
180° Autorotation	12,376	14,595	11,963
90° Autorotation	12,376	14,595	11,963
Tail Rotor/Boost Off	6,188	7,298	5,981
TOTAL	129,947	153,250	125,611

#### Table 13. NOLF Pace Annual Airfield Operations

#### 3.2.2.3 Annual Low Work and Refueling Operations

Low work areas at NOLF Pace extend 50 ft from each side of the centerline on the upwind half of the field. Helicopter pad locations are modeled to represent low work in these areas, shown in Figure 4. Low work operations are estimated to occur for 75% of the projected annual sorties. The operations are distributed based on the course utilization and equally distributed between the three modeled pad locations. Overall, the amount of low work is expected to increase from 2,320 to 2,737 annual operations for the Proposed Action scenario and to decrease to 2,243 annual operations for the No Action scenario.

#### 3.2.3 NOLF Site X

#### 3.2.3.1 Description of Airfield

NOLF Site X, shown in Figure 5, is located approximately 10 NM northwest of NAS Whiting Field, in Santa Rosa County, Florida. The field operates according to one of four courses, depending on airfield conditions. The field has four inboard runways, which brackets the refueling and parking spots in the center of the field. The field has four out-board lanes, of which two are paved. The field also includes 16



Figure 5. NOLF Site X Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida

helicopter pads that lie between the inboard and out-board lanes. The field is divided by the centerline into two sides: normal and tactics. The normal side includes the paved out-board runways, and the tactics side is the opposite side. Low work areas at NOLF Site X are inboard and upwind of the inboard duty lanes. Thirteen helicopter static locations are modeled to represent areas where low hover work is performed.

#### 3.2.3.2 Annual Airfield Helicopter Operations

No Baseline scenario exists for Site X since it is a new airfield. For the Proposed Action scenario, the overall operations will increase by 22% compared to the No Action scenario. The Proposed Action scenario is estimated to have 136,145 annual operations, and the No Action scenario will have 111,593 annual operations. Table 13 shows the modeled distribution of these annual operations by operational type. The operations in Table 13 are distributed to the four courses by the utilization values in Table 11.

The majority of the operations are conducted during the acoustic day, between the hours of 0700 to 2200. However, around 6% of the annual operations are projected to occur during the acoustic night, between the hours of 2200 and 0700. This percentage includes 40% of the NVG sorties being conducted during acoustic nighttime.

Aircraft arrive from the south and the west in the direction that aligns with the course in use. The southern arrivals are 25% of the sorties, and western arrivals are 75%. Departures are evenly distributed from the northwest and southwest corners. Arrival operations are distributed between right- and left-hand pattern entry scenarios, with a 60%/40% split between the operations turning to the normal and tactics side, respectively.

Pattern operations at NOLF Site X include the following patterns: standard, 180° and 90° auto-rotations, TRBO, tactical low altitude, tactical high speed, confined area landing, external load, and pinnacle. Standard patterns are conducted to the helicopter pads. The autorotation patterns are conducted along the paved out-board runways to the east and south of the field. TRBO, high speed tactical, and external load pattern operations are conducted along the inboard runways. Tactical low altitude operations are conducted along the normal side, and the helicopter spots on the tactics side. The CAL zone is located in the northwest corner of the field, and two pinnacle locations are in the northeast and southwest corners. The pinnacle operations are equally distributed between the two spots.

Refer to Appendices A-4, B, and C-4 for a detailed description of the flight tracks, flight profiles, and distribution of operations at NOLF Site X.

Table 14. NOLF Site X Annual Operations

NOLF Site X	Proposed	No Action
Departure	4,379	3,589
Arrival	4,379	3,589
Standard Pattern	69,510	56,975
180° Autorotation	9,630	7,894
90° Autorotation	9,630	7,894
Tail Rotor/ Boost Off	9,630	7,894
Tactical Low Altitude	14,993	12,289
High-Speed Tactical	3,748	3,072
Confined Air Landing	4,998	4,096
Ext Load	250	205
Pinnacle	4,998	4,096
TOTAL	136,145	111,593

#### 3.2.3.3 Annual Low Work and Refueling Operations

Low work areas at NOLF Site X are inboard and upwind of the inboard duty runways. Three helicopter Static operation locations, for each course, are modeled to represent low work in these areas. The amount of low work is projected to reach 1,589 operations for the Proposed Action and 1,302 operations for the No Action. The operations are distributed based on the course utilization, course side utilization, and equally distributed between the representative modeled pad locations located on each side.

The fuel pits and crew change area are located in the center of the field. A single fuel pit spot, for all courses, are modeled to represent the fuel pit operations in this area. The amount of fuel pit operations is expected to be reach 1,806 operations for the Proposed Action and 1,480 for the No Action.

#### 3.2.4 NOLF Harold

#### 3.2.4.1 Description of Airfield

NOLF Harold, shown in Figure 6 is located approximately 8 NM southeast of NAS Whiting Field, in Santa Rosa County, Florida. The field operates according to one of four courses, depending on airfield conditions. The field is divided into two sides, depending on the course in use. For courses 360 or 180, the field is divided between the base and the top of the "T." For courses 090 or 270, the field is divided by the white gravel centerline.



Figure 6. NOLF Harold Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida

29

#### 3.2.4.2 Annual Airfield Helicopter Operations

For the Proposed Action scenario, the overall operations will decrease by 14% from 88,237 to 75,911 annual operations. For the No Action scenario, the overall operations will decrease by 29% from 88,237 to 62,221. Table 15 shows the modeled distribution of these annual operations by operational type. The majority of the operations are conducted during the acoustic day, between the hours of 0700 to 2200. However, 40% of the NVG training annual operations at NOLF Harold are projected to occur during the acoustic night, between the hours of 2200 and 0700. The operations in Table 15 are distributed to the four courses by the utilization values in Table 11.

Aircraft arrive in the direction that aligns with the course in use, however all courses require aircraft to depart from the northeast corner. Arrival operations are equally distributed between the traffic pattern entries arriving via point HOTEL and point RACETRACK. Additionally, arrival operations are equally distributed between right- and left-hand pattern entry scenarios.

Pattern operations at NOLF Harold include the following patterns: standard, 180° and 90° autorotations, tactical low altitude, high speed tactical, external load, pinnacle, and confined area landings. Standard, autorotation, and high speed tactical patterns are conducted in a numbered lane parallel to the respective centerline on the eastern side for courses 360 and 180, and the southern side for courses 090 and 270. Pattern operations on the eastern side of the airfield are distributed between four lanes, with 80% conducted on lanes 3 and 4, closest to the centerline, and 20% on lanes 1 and 2 closest to the eastern boundary. Pattern operations on the eastern side of the airfield are equally distributed between three lanes. Confined area, external load, and pinnacle operations are conducted in the northwest quadrant of the airfield. Tactical low altitude operations may use either side of the airfield, and are equally distributed between three locations in the northeast corner, southeast corner, and near the western border.

Refer to Appendices A-5, B, and C-5 for a detailed description of the flight tracks, flight profiles, and distribution of operations at NOLF Harold.

NOLF Harold	Baseline	Proposed	No Action
Departure	2,827	2,433	1,994
Arrival	2,827	2,433	1,994
Standard	54,176	46,609	38,203
180° Autorotation	6,545	5,630	4,615
90° Autorotation	6,545	5,630	4,615
Tactical Low Altitude	6,808	5,856	4,800
High-Speed Tactical	1,702	1,464	1,200
CAL	2,269	1,952	1,600
Ext Load	2,269	1,952	1,600
Pinnacle	2,269	1,952	1,600
TOTAL	88,237	75,911	62,221

#### **Table 15. NOLF Harold Annual Airfield Operations**

#### 3.2.5 NOLF Santa Rosa

#### 3.2.5.1 Description of Airfield

NOLF Santa Rosa, shown in Figure 7, is located approximately 8 NM southeast of NAS Whiting Field, in Santa Rosa County, Florida. The field operates according to one of four courses, depending on airfield conditions. The field is divided into two sides, depending on the course in use, by splitting the field directly over the Maltese cross. NOLF Santa Rosa contains two active runway pairs, Runway 9/27 and Runway 18/36 depicted in Figure 7 and described in Table 16. The low work area at NOLF Santa Rosa is located in the southwest quadrant of the field, near the end of Runway 9, for all courses. Two helicopter static locations are modeled to represent low work in these areas.

#### 3.2.5.2 Annual Airfield Helicopter Operations

For the Proposed Action scenario, the overall operations will increase by 21% from 204,824 to 247,022 annual operations. For the No Action scenario, the overall operations will decrease by 1% from 204,824 to 202,472. Table 17 shows the modeled distribution of these annual operations by operational type. The majority of the operations are conducted during the acoustic day, between the hours of 0700 to 2200. However, 40% of the NVG training annual operations at NOLF Santa Rosa are projected to occur during the acoustic night, between the hours of 2200 and 0700. The operations in Table 17 are distributed to the four courses by the utilization values in Table 11.

Aircraft arrive from the north in the direction that aligns with the course in use, however all courses require aircraft to depart from the northwest corner. Arrival operations are equally distributed between right- and left-hand pattern entry scenarios. Departure operations are distributed with 75% departing to point ECHO and the remaining 25% of operations departing north.

Pattern operations at NOLF Santa Rosa include standard patterns, 180° and 90° autorotation patterns, TRBO patterns, tactical low altitude patterns, and high-speed tactical patterns. Standard patterns are conducted in a numbered lane parallel to the respective centerline on the eastern side for courses 360 and 180 and the southern side for courses 090 and 270. Standard pattern operations are equally distributed between five lanes. Autorotation pattern, tactical pattern, and TRBO pattern operations are conducted on the western side for courses 360 and 180 and the northern side for courses 090 and 270. Tactical operations are equally distributed between two locations in the corners of the respective course side. The duty runway is used for TRBO approaches. The high-speed tactical patterns are flown just parallel to the runways. For 360/180 flows, the arrival portion is to the east of runway 36/18. For 090/270 flows, the landing portion of the pattern is to the south of runway 9/27.

Refer to Appendices A-6, B, and C-6 for a detailed description of the flight tracks, flight profiles, and distribution of operations at NOLF Santa Rosa.



Figure 7. NOLF Santa Rosa Located in Santa Rosa County, Florida

32

Runway Pair	Width (ft)	Length (ft)	Heading	Runway	Lat, Long	Runway	Lat, Long
9/27	150	4,403	92/272	9	30.613169° N 86.945539 W	27	30.612838° N 86.93155° W
18/36	150	4,499	182/2	18	30.614944° N 86.94181° W	36	30.602577° N 86.942078° W

#### Table 16. NOLF Santa Rosa runway descriptions

#### Table 17. NOLF Santa Rosa Annual Airfield Operations

NOLF Sant Rosa	Baseline	Proposed	No Action
Departure	5,039	6,078	4,981
Arrival	5,039	6,078	4,981
Standard Pattern	128,246	154,668	126,774
180° Autorotation	17,578	21,199	17,376
90° Autorotation	17,578	21,199	17,376
Tail Rotor/Boost Off	17,578	21,199	17,376
Tactical Low Altitude	11,013	13,281	10,886
High-Speed Tactical	2,753	3,320	2,722
TOTAL	204,824	247,022	202,472

#### 3.2.5.3 Annual Low Work and Refueling Operations

The low work area at NOLF Santa Rosa is located in the southwest quadrant of the field, near the end of Runway 9, for all courses (Figure 7). Two helicopter static locations are modeled to represent low work in these areas. Low work operations are estimated to occur for 75% of the projected annual sorties. The operations are equally distributed between the two modeled static locations. Overall, the amount of low work is expected to increase from 3,779 to 4,558 annual operations for the Proposed Action scenario and to decrease to 3,736 annual operations for the No Action scenario.

#### 3.3 Climatological Data

NoiseMap and AAM utilize the daily average temperatures and relative humidity for each month to determine the appropriate values to represent the nominal acoustic absorption. Table 18 displays the monthly average temperatures and relative humidity for NAS Whiting Field, where the selected nominal values (in red) are 66.5°F (19.2°C), 72.4% relative humidity and 30.00 in Hg (1,015.8 hPa) barometric pressure. It should be noted that these values represent the mean acoustic absorption conditions of the atmosphere and not the average weather conditions for the area.

	Temperature	Humidity
Wonth	°F	%
Jan	44.5	73.3
Feb	45.0	73.7
Mar	54.7	71.3
Apr	66.5	72.4
Мау	76.2	78.6
Jun	81.3	80.8
Jul	82.5	81.5
Aug	82.4	85.6
Sep	77.9	78.9
Oct	67.5	71.3
Nov	58.1	79.4
Dec	51.3	76.3

Table 18. Monthly Average Weather Conditions at NAS Whiting Field
### 4 Noise Modeling Results

The resulting DNL noise contours are compared among the three scenarios for NAS Whiting Field South and the five NOLFs. The comparison figure provides the DNL contours for values ranging from 60 dBA to 80 dBA in 5 dB increments. The Proposed Action contours are plotted as solid lines; the Baseline is plotted as dashed lines; and the No Action (if it is different from Baseline) is plotted with dotted lines.

### 4.1 NAS Whiting Field South

Figure 8 provides the comparison plot of the three scenarios for NAS Whiting Field South. For the main airfield the Baseline and No Action scenarios are the same. The Proposed Action scenario includes the replacement of the TH-57B/C with the new AHTS along with a 22% increase in airfield operations. For Baseline (and No Action), the 60 dBA DNL noise contour, shown in blue in Figure 8, stays within the airfield boundaries. For the Proposed Action, the 60 dBA DNL contour, shown in green in Figure 8, does extend beyond the airfield boundary in a few locations to the southeast and the west. However, the contour's area outside of the boundary appears to contain no housing/structures. The 65 dBA DNL contour remains within the boundary for the Proposed Action. The outermost 60 and 65 dBA DNL contour lobes primarily follow the path of arrival operations to the various operating spots.

For all of the scenarios, the 70 dB DNL noise contours are somewhat centered along the runways end points. The higher DNL contour levels are concentrated in the northwest quadrant of the airfield, north of Runway 23 and east of Runway 14. The concentration of noise in this area is generated by the operations conducted on the helicopter pads, maintenance pads, fuel pit pads, and crew change center clustered in this region.

To supplement the DNL results, Table 19 provides a comparison of the DNL values at two locations identified in Figure 8. At these locations, the DNL values increases range from 3.8 to 7.5 dBA DNL, but they remain under 65 dBA. In addition to the DNL, Table 20 and Table 21 provide the SEL and  $L_{Amax}$  values for top five operations contributing to the DNL at their location for T-57B/C and AHTS operations, respectively. These tables provide more detail into the actual operations that are primary drivers on the overall noise environment for both the current TH-57B/C and proposed AHTS operations.



Figure 8. Comparison of DNL Noise Contours at NAS Whiting Field South

location	Б	Namo	Baseline	Proposed Action DNL Change*	d Action	No
Location		Nallie	DNL Change*		Action	
			dBA	dBA	Δ dBA	dBA
South	1	Trinity Church Rd	44.0	51.5	7.5	44.0
Field	2	Brake Rd.	49.0	52.8	3.8	49.0

Table 19. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations Near NAS Whiting Field South

\* Change is relative to No Action Scenario

Table 20. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NAS Whiting Field South for TH-57B/C Operations

Point	Rank	Operation Type	Track ID	Annual A Daily I Acoustic Day	Average Events Acoustic Night	SEL	Lmax	Baseline DNL	No Action DNL
				700-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Arrival	SP2W_AB	3.461	0.221	78.4	65.8		
	2	Departure	SP4W_DA	12.232	0.25	74.1	60.0		
1	3	Arrival	SP4E_AB	3.758	0.24	76.0	62.4	44.0	44.0
	4	Arrival	SP3N_AB	1.737	0.111	76.2	62.6		
	5	Departure	SP1S_DA	6.337	0.129	71.8	56.7		
	1	Departure	SP4W_DA	12.232	0.25	77.9	64.5		
	2	Departure	SP1S_DA	6.337	0.129	77.5	63.8		
2	3	Arrival	SP2W_AB	3.461	0.221	77.5	65.0	49.0	49.0
	4	Arrival	SP4E_AC	8.519	0.544	73.2	58.3		
	5	Arrival	SP2W_AC	7.846	0.501	73.3	58.5		

Table 21. SEL and LAmax of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NAS Whiting FieldSouth for AHTS Operations

		Orientian		Annual / Daily I	Average Events	SEI	Imax	Proposed
Point	Rank	Туре	Track ID	Acoustic Day	Acoustic Night	SEL	LIIIdX	Action DNL
				700-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Departure	SP4W_DA	14.924	0.305	77.3	62.0	
	2	Arrival	SP2W_AB	4.223	0.269	81.4	68.2	
1	3	Arrival	SP4E_AB	4.585	0.293	79.0	64.6	51.5
	4	Departure	SP1S_DA	7.732	0.158	75.7	59.0	
	5	Arrival	SP3N_AB	2.119	0.135	79.1	64.7	
	1	Departure	SP4W_DA	14.924	0.305	80.9	66.3	
	2	Departure	SP1S_DA	7.732	0.158	81.4	66.0	
2	3	Arrival	SP2W_AB	4.223	0.269	81.2	67.2	52.8
-	4	Arrival	SP2W_AC	9.572	0.611	77.4	61.4	
	5	Arrival	SP4E_AC	10.393	0.663	76.5	61.2	

### 4.2 NOLF Spencer

Figure 9 provides the comparison plot of the three scenarios for NOLF Spencer. The Proposed Action scenario includes the replacement of the TH-57B/C with the new AHTS along with a 14% increase in airfield operations relative to Baseline. For the Proposed Action contours, the 60 dBA DNL noise contour, shown in blue in Figure 9, extends outside of the airfield boundary. Its 65 dBA DNL contour overlay the Baseline and No Action 60 dBA DNL contours and falls outside of the boundary along the corners and the western side. Some of these areas do appear to include potential populated areas. The 70 dB contours are close to the middle of the western boundary. These higher-level DNL noise contours are concentrated in the low work areas, which are inbound of the duty runways and upwind of the infield. The low work operations result in higher-level contour bulging to the north and west. Additionally, Spencer Field has two Fuel pads located infield, whose associated operations result in higher-level noise contours in this area.

Four representative location are provided to supplement the DNL results; Table 22 provides a comparison of the DNL values at four locations identified in Figure 9. For these locations which are close to the boundary, the increased DNL values range from 4.6 to 6.0 dBA, and the resulting DNL values range from 63.5 to 65.7dBA DNL. In addition to the DNL, Table 23 and Table 24 provide the SEL and  $L_{Amax}$  values for top five operations contributing to the DNL at their location for T-57B/C and AHTS operations, respectively. These tables provide more detail into the actual operations that are primary drivers on the overall noise environment for both the current TH-57B/C and proposed AHTS operations.



Figure 9. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Spencer

I costi co	10		Baseline	Propose	No	
Location	טו	Name		DNL	Change*	Action
			dBA	dBA	Δ dBA	dBA
	3	Southest Corner	61.1	65.7	4.9	60.8
NOLF	4	Wilma Dr.	58.5	64.2	6.0	58.2
Spencer	encer 5 Murray Rd		59.2	63.5	4.6	58.9
	6	East Side	59.3	63.6	4.6	59.0

### Table 22. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Spencer

\* Change is relative to No Action Scenario

Table 23. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Spencer for TH-57B/C Operations

				Annual Daily I	Average Events			Baseline	No
Point	Rank	Operation Type	Track ID	Acoustic Day	Acoustic Night	SEL	Lmax	DNL	Action DNL
				700-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Std. Pattern	C4N	19.482	0	91.0	78.4		
	2	Std. Pattern	C3N	19.482	0	89.4	78.5		
3	3	Autorotation	AR180N2	6.494	0	92.4	82.5	61.1	60.8
	4	Std. Pattern	C4W	10.563	0	90.0	76.8		
	5	Departure	D1_SE	15.813	0	88.2	81.8		
	1	Std. Pattern	C3E	17.458	0	89.5	78.7		
	2	Std. Pattern	C4E	17.458	0	85.8	74.2		
4	3	Std. Pattern	C1N	12.988	0	86.2	71.8	58.5	58.2
	4	Std. Pattern	C1S	10.5	0	86.4	76.1		
	5	Std. Pattern	C2N	12.988	0	84.8	72.6		
	1	Std. Pattern	C4N	19.482	0	86.8	74.9		
	2	Std. Pattern	C3N	19.482	0	86.2	75.2		
5	3	Std. Pattern	C4S	15.75	0	87.1	72.9	59.2	58.9
	4	Std. Pattern	C2W	7.042	0	90.4	78.2		
	5	Std. Pattern	C3S	15.75	0	85.7	71.6		
	1	High Speed Tactical	HST_W2	2.347	0	98.1	93.0		
	2	Std. Pattern	C4N	19.482	0	85.0	69.8		
6	3	Std. Pattern	C4S	15.75	0	85.9	72.6	59.3	59.0
	4	Std. Pattern	C3N	19.482	0	84.9	73.3		
	5	Std. Pattern	C3S	15.75	0	85.0	73.6		

Table 24. SEL and LAmax of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Spencer forAHTS Operations

				Annual / Daily I	Average Events	SEI	Imax	Proposed
Point	Rank	Operation Type	Track ID	Acoustic	Acoustic	JLL	LIIIdA	Action DNL
				Day	Night			
				/00-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Std. Pattern	C4N	23.768	0	93.4	81.2	
	2	Std. Pattern	C3N	23.768	0	93.3	83.4	
3	3	Autorotation	AR180N2	7.923	0	97.4	87.1	65.7
	4	Std. Pattern	C4W	12.887	0	94.2	82.0	
	5	Std. Pattern	C3W	12.887	0	93.8	85.0	
	1	Std. Pattern	C3E	21.299	0	95.7	86.9	
	2	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBO2E	7.099	0	94.6	87.3	
4	3	Std. Pattern	C4E	21.299	0	89.6	77.5	64.2
	4	Autorotation	AR90E2	7.099	0	93.8	84.3	
	5	Std. Pattern	C1N	15.845	0	89.8	76.7	
	1	Std. Pattern	C2W	8.591	0	96.5	86.1	
	2	Std. Pattern	C4S	19.215	0	90.3	74.5	
5	3	Std. Pattern	C4N	23.768	0	88.6	75.4	63.5
	4	Std. Pattern	C3S	19.215	0	89.4	76.5	
	5	Std. Pattern	C3N	23.768	0	88.1	77.0	
	1	High Speed Tactical	HST_W2	2.863	0	100.7	94.8	
	2	Autorotation	AR90W2	2.863	0	98.9	90.7	
6	3	Std. Pattern	C3N	23.768	0	89.1	78.2	63.6
	4	Std. Pattern	C4N	23.768	0	88.5	74.5	
	5	Std. Pattern	C4S	19.215	0	88.2	75.1	

### 4.3 NOLF Pace

Figure 10 provides the comparison plot of the three scenarios for NOLF Pace. The Proposed Action scenario includes the replacement of the TH-57B/C with the new AHTS along with a 18% increase in airfield operations relative to Baseline. For the Proposed Action contours, the 60 dBA DNL noise contour, shown in blue in Figure 10, lies completely outside of the airfield boundary, the 65 dBA DNL lies primarily along the boundary and it is loosely aligned with the Baseline and No Action 60 dBA DNL contours. The Proposed Action 65 dBA contour does not appear to overlay any housing/structures. For all of the scenarios, the higher-level DNL noise contours are concentrated in the low work areas in the northwest quadrant. Although the contour features are driven by the standard and autorotation pattern lanes, as is more clearly seen on the southeastern side of the airfield, the low work operations result in higher level contour bulging to the north and west.

Four representative location are provided to supplement the DNL results; Table 25 provides a comparison of the DNL values at four locations, three of which are identified in Figure 10. At these locations, the DNL values increases range from 4.5 to 6.3 dBA, but they remain under 65 dBA. In addition to the DNL, Table 26 and Table 27 provide the SEL and  $L_{Amax}$  values for top five operations contributing to the DNL at their location for T-57B/C and AHTS operations, respectively. These tables provide more detail into the actual

operations that are primary drivers on the overall noise environment for both the current TH-57B/C and proposed AHTS operations. These tables provide more detail into the actual operations that are primary drivers on the overall noise environment for both the current TH-57B/C and proposed AHTS operations.



Figure 10. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Pace

Location	5	Nome	Baseline	Propose	d Action	No	
Location	שו	Name		DNL	Change*	Action	
			dBA	dBA	Δ dBA	dBA	
	18	Northeast (Willard Norris Rd.)	49.6	54.7	5.2	49.5	
NOLF	19	Southwest	56.1	62.3	6.3	56.0	
Pace	Pace 20 South (off map)		36.2	42.3	6.2	36.1	
	21	Mahogany Dr.	44.4	48.8	4.5	44.3	

### Table 25. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Pace

\* Change is relative to No Action Scenario

# Table 26. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Pace for TH-57B/C Operations

				Annual Daily	Average Events			Baseline	No
Point	Rank	Operation Type	Track ID	Acoustic	Acoustic	SEL	Lmax	DNL	Action
				Day	Night				
				700-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Std. Pattern	C2S	18.996	0	78.4	66.2		
	2	Std. Pattern	C2N	23.497	0	77.4	67.3		
18	3	Std. Pattern	C1E	14.037	0	78.8	67.8	49.6	49.5
	4	Std. Pattern	C1W	8.494	0	79.6	67.1		
	5	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBON2	1.566	0	81.3	71.2		
	1	Std. Pattern	C2E	21.056	0	87.0	79.3		
	2	Std. Pattern	C1N	15.665	0	86.1	75.9	56.1	56.0
19	3	Std. Pattern	C2W	12.74	0	84.7	74.0		
	4	Std. Pattern	C1S	12.664	0	83.4	74.3		
	5	Autorotate	AR180E2	2.807	0	86.7	73.5		
	1	Std. Pattern	C1N	15.665	0	65.3	54.2		
	2	Std. Pattern	C2E	21.056	0	63.6	49.3		
20	3	Departure	D_SE	8.477	0	65.7	50.2	36.2	36.1
	4	Std. Pattern	C2W	12.74	0	63.5	49.4		
	5	Std. Pattern	C2N	23.497	0	59.9	47.7		
	1	Departure	D_SE	8.477	0	82.7	73.7		
	2	Std. Pattern	C2N	23.497	0	68.4	55.5		
21	3	Std. Pattern	C2E	21.056	0	66.9	54.9	44.4	44.3
	4	Std. Pattern	C2S	18.996	0	66.4	54.4		
	5	Std. Pattern	C2W	12.74	0	67.6	55.4		

Table 27. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Pace for AHTS Operations

				Annual A Daily I	Average Events	SEI	Imax	Proposed
Point	Rank	Operation Type	Track ID	Acoustic	Acoustic	SEL	Lmax	Action DNL
				Day 700-2200	Night 2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Std. Pattern	C2S	27.33	0	83.3	71.2	
	2	Std. Pattern	C1W	12.221	0	85.2	73.4	
18	3	Std. Pattern	C2N	33.806	0	80.6	68.4	54.7
	4	Std. Pattern	C1E	20.196	0	81.5	70.4	]
	5	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBON2	2.253	0	86.7	77.6	
	1	Std. Pattern	C2E	30.294	0	94.0	85.0	
	2	Std. Pattern	C1N	22.537	0	92.3	82.0	
19	3	Std. Pattern	C2W	18.331	0	87.3	76.3	62.3
	4	Std. Pattern	C1S	18.221	0	86.6	77.2	
	5	Autorotate	AR180E2	4.039	0	92.9	83.5	
	1	Std. Pattern	C1N	22.537	0	71.2	59.9	
	2	Std. Pattern	C2E	30.294	0	69.0	55.9	
20	3	Std. Pattern	C2N	33.806	0	67.5	54.4	42.3
	4	Std. Pattern	C2W	18.331	0	68.1	53.9	
	5	Departure	D_SE	12.195	0	68.9	52.8	
	1	Departure	D_SE	12.195	0	85.4	75.8	
	2	Std. Pattern	C2N	33.806	0	74.7	61.4	
21	3	Std. Pattern	C2W	18.331	0	73.5	59.7	48.8
	4	Std. Pattern	C2E	30.294	0	70.6	59.5	
	5	Std. Pattern	C2S	27.33	0	70.3	58.4	

### 4.4 NOLF Site X

Figure 11 provides the comparison plot of the three scenarios for NOLF Site X. The Proposed Action scenario includes the replacement of the TH-57B/C with the new AHTS along with a 22% increase in airfield operations relative to No Action. Overall, the noise is skewed to the normal sides of the airfield since most operations occur in these areas. For the Proposed Action contours, the 60 dBA DNL noise contour, shown in blue in Figure 11, lies partially outside of the airfield boundary. The 65 dBA DNL contour extends just outside the airfield boundary at the southwest corner. For the No Action contours, the 60 dBA DNL contour, The Proposed Action the western boundary, and the 65 dBA DNL contour lies within the airfield boundary. The Proposed Action 60 dBA contour does not appear to overlay any housing/structures. For all of the scenarios, the higher-level DNL noise contours are concentrated in the low work areas in the southeast quadrant.

Three representative locations are provided to supplement the DNL results; Table 28 provides a comparison of the DNL values at three locations identified in Figure 11. At these locations the change in the DNL values increase range from 3.7 to 11.3 dBA, but they remain under 65 dBA DNL. In addition to the DNL, Table 29 and Table 30 provide the SEL and  $L_{Amax}$  values for top five operations contributing to the DNL at their location for T-57B/C and AHTS operations, respectively. These tables provide more detail into

the actual operations that are primary drivers on the overall noise environment for both the current TH-57B/C and proposed AHTS operations.



Figure 11. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Site X

Location	10		Baseline	Propose	d Action	No
Location	U	Name		DNL	DNL Change*	
			dBA	dBA	Δ dBA	dBA
		Southwest (Intersection of				
NOLF	7	Ard Field and A D Kelly Rds.)	-	52.2	4.4	47.8
Site X	Site X 8 Northwest (Ard Field Rd.)		-	48.0	3.7	44.3
	9	North (Hwy 178)	-	46.0	11.3	34.7

### Table 28. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Site X

\* Change is relative to No Action Scenario

# Table 29. SEL and LAmax of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Site X for TH-57B/C Operations

		Orantian		Annual / Daily I	Average Events	SEL	Imov	Baseline	No
Point	Rank	Type	Track ID	Acoustic Day	Acoustic Night	SEL	LIIIAX	DNL	DNL
				700-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Arrival	ARRW_360N	1.284	0.078	83.4	71.8		
	2	Arrival	ARRW_090N	1.151	0.07	83.6	71.8		
7	3	Arrival	ARRW_180N	1.038	0.063	83.0	71.6	-	47.8
	4	Arrival	ARRW_360T	0.856	0.052	83.6	72.2		
	5	Pinnacle	PINNB_270	0.442	0.027	85.9	73.5		
	1	Departure	DEPWOA	4.634	0.283	78.4	65.9		
	2	Arrival	ARRW_360N	1.284	0.078	80.5	69.1		
8	3	Arrival	ARRW_180N	1.038	0.063	80.4	69.0	-	44.3
	4	Arrival	ARRW_360T	0.856	0.052	80.9	69.4		
	5	Arrival	ARRW_180T	0.692	0.042	80.8	69.5		
	1	Departure	DEPWOA	4.634	0.283	64.3	52.4		
	2	Arrival	ARRW_360N	1.284	0.078	68.9	58.1		
9	3	Arrival	ARRW_360T	0.856	0.052	69.2	58.1	-	34.7
	4	Arrival	ARRW_180N	1.038	0.063	67.5	57.6		
	5	Std. Pattern	STD360_SP1	5.664	0.346	59.3	46.7		

Table 30. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Site X for AHTS Operations

				Annual . Daily I	Average Events	SEI	Imay	Proposed
Point	Rank	Operation Type	Track ID	Acoustic	Acoustic	JLL	LIIIGA	Action DNL
				Day	Night			
				700-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Autorotate	AR_270	2.533	0.155	85.8	77.2	
	2	Autorotate	AR_270	2.533	0.155	85.8	77.2	
7	3	Arrival	ARRW_360N	1.912	0.117	86.2	74.7	52.2
	4	Arrival	ARRW_090N	1.713	0.105	86.6	75.1	
	5	Arrival	ARRW_180N	1.546	0.094	85.9	75.1	
	1	Departure	DEPWOA	6.897	0.421	81.2	70.1	
	2	Arrival	ARRW_360N	1.912	0.117	83.6	71.9	
8	3	Arrival	ARRW_180N	1.546	0.094	83.4	71.8	48.0
	4	Arrival	ARRW_360T	1.275	0.078	84.1	72.3	
	5	Arrival	ARRW_180T	1.031	0.063	84.0	72.2	
	1	Departure	DEPTF	6.897	0.421	85.0	75.0	
	2	Arrival	ARRW_360N	1.912	0.117	72.5	61.6	
9	3	Departure	DEPWOA	6.897	0.421	66.5	54.1	46.0
	4	Arrival	ARRW_360T	1.275	0.078	72.9	61.5	
	5	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBO_360	4.673	0.285	66.5	54.0	

### 4.5 NOLF Harold

Figure 12 provides the comparison plot of the three scenarios for NOLF Harold. The Proposed Action scenario includes the replacement of the TH-57B/C with the new AHTS along with a 14% decrease in airfield operations relative to Baseline. For the Proposed Action contours, the 60 dBA DNL noise contour, shown in blue in Figure 12, lies primarily within the airfield boundary except along the primary lanes, and the 65 dB DNL contours are within the boundary except for a small extension in the middle of the eastern boundary. The outermost 60 dBA DNL contour is centered along the standard and autorotation pattern lanes, located along the grassy "T" area. The features of the 60 dBA DNL contour are driven by the confluence of the arrivals and pattern work. The lobe located on the north part of the base of the "T" that points to the northwest, results from the confluence of pinnacle work in this area. Although the CAL zones are located in the northwest quadrant of the field, and both external load and pinnacle patterns reach this corner, the projected operations do not generate DNL levels greater than 60 dB in this area of the NOLF. The DNL noise levels are greater on the eastern side of the airfield because of the larger utilization percentages of the 180/360 Course (55.7%) than the 090/270 Course (44.3%). The Baseline and No Action contour are less than 65 dBA DNL.

Four representative locations are provided to supplement the DNL results; Table 31 provides a comparison of the DNL values at four locations identified in Figure 12. At these locations, the DNL values increases range from 5.4 to 6.2 dBA, but the levels remain under 65 dBA DNL. In addition to the DNL, Table 32 and Table 33 provide the SEL and  $L_{Amax}$  values for top five operations contributing to the DNL at their location for T-57B/C and AHTS operations, respectively. These tables provide more detail into the actual operations

that are primary drivers on the overall noise environment for both the current TH-57B/C and proposed AHTS operations.



Figure 12. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Harold

Location	10	News	Baseline	Propose	No		
Location	U	Name		DNL	Change*	e*	
			dBA	dBA	<mark>Δ d</mark> BA	dBA	
	10	Northeast Corner	56.4	60.3	5.4	54.9	
NOLF	11	Southeast Corner	57.8	62.5	6.2	56.3	
Harold	12	Waylon Dr.	50.9	55.3	5.9	49.4	
	13	Sun Up Ct.	44.7	48.6	5.4	43.2	

### Table 31. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Harold

\* Change is relative to No Action Scenario

Table 32. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Harold for TH-57B/C Operations

				Annual Average Daily Events		CT.		Baseline	No
Point	Rank	Operation Type	Track ID	Acoustic	Acoustic	SEL	Lmax	DNL	Action DNL
				Day	Night				
	1	Chall Datta we	CON	0.021	0 122			(UDA)	(UDA)
	1	Std. Pattern		9.021	0.123	80.7	70.3	56.4	54.9
	2	Std. Pattern	C3S	7.293	0.099	87.5	/5.4		
10	3	Departure	D1_NE	7.684	0.062	87.2	80.9		
	4	Std. Pattern	C4S	7.293	0.099	86.7	75.3		
	5	Std. Pattern	C4N	9.021	0.123	85.4	75.0		
	1	Std. Pattern	C3N	9.021	0.123	91.2	83.8	57.8	56.3
	2	Std. Pattern	C4N	9.021	0.123	88.5	79.0		
11	3	Std. Pattern	C3S	7.293	0.099	87.7	78.0		
	4	Std. Pattern	C2N	2.255	0.031	91.8	84.0		
	5	Std. Pattern	C4S	7.293	0.099	85.9	75.9		
	1	Std. Pattern	C3N	9.021	0.123	81.5	71.0	50.9	49.4
	2	Std. Pattern	C3S	7.293	0.099	81.6	71.2		
12	3	Std. Pattern	C4N	9.021	0.123	80.2	70.9		
	4	Std. Pattern	C4S	7.293	0.099	80.1	69.1		
	5	Std. Pattern	C1N	2.255	0.031	83.1	70.8		
	1	Std. Pattern	C3N	9.021	0.123	73.2	62.0		
	2	Std. Pattern	C4N	9.021	0.123	72.7	61.5		
13	3	Std. Pattern	C3S	7.293	0.099	73.6	61.3	44.7	43.2
	4	Arrival	A1W_L	0.53	0.004	84.6	71.0		
	5	Std. Pattern	C4S	7.293	0.099	72.9	60.3		

Table 33. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Harold for AHTS Operations

Point	Rank	Operation Type	Track ID	Annual Daily I Acoustic Day	Average Events Acoustic Night	SEL	Lmax	Proposed Action DNL
				700-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Std. Pattern	C4S	7.654	0.104	94.7	85.5	
	2	Std. Pattern	C3S	7.654	0.104	94.1	84.2	
10	3	Std. Pattern	C1S	1.914	0.026	96.7	87.2	60.3
	4	Std. Pattern	C3N	9.467	0.128	88.6	77.9	
	5	Departure	D1_NE	8.065	0.066	89.0	83.9	
	1	Std. Pattern	C3N	9.467	0.128	96.4	88.4	
	2	Std. Pattern	C4N	9.467	0.128	95.4	86.4	
11	3	Std. Pattern	C1N	2.367	0.032	97.8	89.3	62.5
	4	Std. Pattern	C2N	2.367	0.032	97.6	89.3	
	5	Tactical	T2N	1.005	0	100.3	96.2	
	1	Std. Pattern	C3N	9.467	0.128	87.9	78.8	
	2	Std. Pattern	C4N	9.467	0.128	86.3	75.5	
12	3	Std. Pattern	C1N	2.367	0.032	89.5	80.0	55.3
	4	Std. Pattern	C3S	7.654	0.104	84.4	74.5	
	5	Std. Pattern	C2N	2.367	0.032	89.2	80.5	
	1	Std. Pattern	C4N	9.467	0.128	78.7	65.9	
13	2	Std. Pattern	C3N	9.467	0.128	78.7	67.4	
	3	Std. Pattern	C3S	7.654	0.104	77.5	66.1	48.6
	4	Arrival	A1W_L	0.556	0.005	88.2	73.4	
	5	Std. Pattern	C4S	7.654	0.104	76.5	64.2	

### 4.6 NOLF Santa Rosa

Figure 13 provides the comparison plot of the three scenarios for NOLF Santa Rosa. The Proposed Action scenario includes the replacement of the TH-57B/C with the new AHTS along with a 21% increase in airfield operations relative to Baseline. For the Proposed Action contours, the 60 dBA DNL noise contour, shown in blue in Figure 13, lies mostly outside of the airfield boundary, and the 65 dBA DNL lies mostly inside of the boundary. The 65 dBA DNL contour's area outside the boundary, extending to the south and west, appears to contain no housing/structures. However, the extension of the 65 dBA DNL contour near the northeast corner does appear to encompass some houses/structures. Also, the 65 dBA DNL contour aligns with the Baseline and No Action 60 dBA DNL contours. The 70 dBA DNL contour also extends beyond the boundary in the northeast corner. For all scenarios, the higher-level DNL noise contours are concentrated in the southeast corner of the airfield because of low work operations located in this area.

Four representative locations are provided to supplement the DNL results; Table 34 provides a comparison of the DNL values at four locations identified in Figure 12. At these locations, the DNL values increases range from 2.5 to 5.5 dBA, but the levels remain under 65 dBA DN. In addition to the DNL, Table 35 and Table 36 provide the SEL and  $L_{Amax}$  values for top five operations contributing to the DNL at their location for T-57B/C and AHTS operations, respectively. These tables provide more detail into the actual operations

that are primary drivers on the overall noise environment for both the current TH-57B/C and proposed AHTS operations.



Figure 13. DNL Noise Contours at NOLF Santa Rosa

Institut	10	News	Baseline	Propose	No		
Location	שו	Name		DNL	Change*	Action	
			dBA	dBA	<mark>Δ dB</mark> A	dBA	
NOLE	14	Southeast Corner	54.7	57.1	2.5	54.6	
NOLF	Santa         15         East (Redland           16         American Farm	East (Redland Rd.)	59.1	62.1	3.1	59.0	
Basa		American Farms Rd	56.4	61.8	5.5	56.3	
Rosa	17	Cornfield Way	53.6	58.1	4.6	53.5	

### Table 34. Comparison of DNL Values at Representative Locations near NOLF Santa Rosa

\* Change is relative to No Action Scenario

## Table 35. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Santa Rosa for TH-57B/C Operations

	Rank	Operation Type		Annual Average Daily Events		SFI	Imay	Baseline	No Action
Point			Track ID	Acoustic	Acoustic	<u><u>SEE</u></u>	LINGA	DNL	DNL
				Day 700-2200	Night 2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Std. Pattern	C3W	9.544	0.156	79.0	67.7		
	2	Std. Pattern	C2W	9.544	0.156	78.9	67.4		54.6
14	3	Std. Pattern	C1W	9.544	0.156	78.5	66.1	54.7	
	4	Std. Pattern	C4W	9.544	0.156	78.5	66.3		
	5	Std. Pattern	C5W	9.544	0.156	77.7	65.8		
	1	Std. Pattern	C1N	10.651	0.174	89.3	73.9	59.1	59.0
	2	Std. Pattern	C1S	8.611	0.141	88.5	77.7		
15	3	Std. Pattern	C4N	10.651	0.174	86.9	75.1		
	4	Std. Pattern	C3N	10.651	0.174	86.5	71.1		
	5	Std. Pattern	C2N	10.651	0.174	86.4	71.2		
	1	Std. Pattern	C2N	10.651	0.174	84.1	73.4		56.3
	2	Std. Pattern	C3N	10.651	0.174	84.0	74.1		
16	3	Std. Pattern	C2S	8.611	0.141	84.7	71.4	56.4	
	4	Std. Pattern	C3S	8.611	0.141	84.7	73.1		
	5	Std. Pattern	C1S	8.611	0.141	84.6	68.5		
	1	Autorotate	AR180W	6.65	0	84.8	71.5		
17	2	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBO1W	6.65	0	83.8	72.9		53.5
	3	Autorotate	AR90W	6.65	0	83.2	69.1	53.6	
	4	Autorotate	AR180E	4.024	0	85.2	71.6		
	5	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBO1S	5.999	0	82.5	68.9		

Table 36. SEL and L<sub>Amax</sub> of Top Five Contributors to the DNL for Representative Locations near NOLF Santa Rosa for AHTS Operations

Point	Rank	Operation Type		Annual Daily	Average Events	CT I	1 mar	Proposed Action DNL
			Track ID	Acoustic	Acoustic	SEL	Lmax	
				Day	Night			
				700-2200	2200-700	(dBA)	(dBA)	(dBA)
	1	Std. Pattern	C3W	14.042	0.229	82.9	67.6	
	2	Std. Pattern	C2W	14.042	0.229	82.5	68.1	
14	3	Std. Pattern	C1W	14.042	0.229	82.2	67.6	57.1
	4	Std. Pattern	C1N	15.671	0.256	80.2	65.6	
	5	Std. Pattern	C2N	15.671	0.256	80.1	65.6	
	1	Std. Pattern	C5N	15.671	0.256	92.1	82.6	
	2	Std. Pattern	C1N	15.671	0.256	92.0	77.7	
15	3	Std. Pattern	C4N	15.671	0.256	90.2	79.1	62.1
	4	Std. Pattern	C1S	12.668	0.207	90.4	78.9	
	5	Std. Pattern	C3N	15.671	0.256	88.2	73.1	
	1	Arrival	A1W_R	2.702	0	97.9	90.4	
	2	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBO1W	9.784	0	91.9	84.0	
16	3	Autorotate	AR180W	9.784	0	91.8	84.0	61.8
	4	Std. Pattern	C3S	12.668	0.207	89.9	78.7	
	5	Std. Pattern	C2S	12.668	0.207	89.3	76.4	
	1	Autorotate	AR180W	9.784	0	88.9	76.3	
	2	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBO1W	9.784	0	88.7	77.9	58.1
17	3	Autorotate	AR180E	5.921	0	89.1	76.4	
	4	Tail Rotor/Boost Off	TRBO1E	5.921	0	88.9	78.1	
	5	Autorotate	AR90W	9.784	0	86.6	70.4	

### References

- ANSI. (2003). American National Standard Quantities and Procedures for Description and Measurement of Environmental Sound, Part 5: Sound Level Descriptors for Determination of Compatible Land Use, ANSI S12.9/Part 5-1998 (R 2003).
- Bradley, K., Hobbs, C., Wilmer, C., & Czech, J. (2016). *Advanced Acoustic Model Technical Reference and User Manual.* Wyle Report WR 15-08.
- Czech, J., & Plotkin, K. (1998). NMAP 7.0 User's Manual, Wyle Research Report, WR 98-13.
- Downing, J., & Salton, A. (2015). AICUZ Noise Analysis at Naval Air Station Whiting Field & Navy Outlying Landing Fields. BRRC 13-07.
- EPA. (1982). Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis, Report 550/9-82-105 and #PB82-219205.
- FICON. (1992). Federal Agency Review of Selected Airport Noise Analysis Issues.
- FICUN. (1980). Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land-Use Panning and Control.
- Page, J., Wilmer, C., & Plotkin, K. (2009). *Rotorcraft Noise Model Technical Reference and User Manual* (*Version 7.2*). Wyle Report, Wyle Laboratories, Inc., Arlington, VA.
- Roy, R. (2011, June 24). Electronic mail from Randy Roy, USN to Carrie Kyzar, Ecology and Environment, Inc., re: "NAS Whiting Field Data Package".
- Roy, R. (2012, December 5). Electronic mail from Randy Roy, USN to Carrie Kyzar, Ecology & Environment, Inc., re: "AICUZ Update".
- Thompson, G. (2019, March 8). Email Communication, "AHTS EA Air Quality Analysis".
- US DON, Chief of Naval Operations. (2008). OPNAV Instruction 11010.36C/MCO 11010.16, Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Program.

### **Appendix A: Flight Tracks**

The future projected operations are assumed to use the same nominal flight tracks that are in use today at the airfield, per the Fixed Wing Standard Operating Procedures Manual, Rotary-Wing Operating Procedures Manual, and pilot interviews. The Site X NOLF flight tracks were derived from pilot interviews and the Rotary-Wing Operating Procedures Manual dated March 2019. The modeled flight tracks for the projected conditions at NAS Whiting Field and the five NOLFs are grouped by operational type and displayed in Appendices A-1 through A-6.

This page intentionally left blank

### Appendix A-1: NAS Whiting Field South Flight Tracks

This page intentionally left blank













## **Appendix A-2: NOLF Spencer Flight Tracks**

This page intentionally left blank
























## Appendix A-3: NOLF Pace Flight Tracks

This page intentionally left blank



















This page intentionally left blank

## Appendix A-4: NOLF Site X Flight Tracks

This page intentionally left blank
























## Appendix A-5: NOLF Harold Flight Tracks

This page intentionally left blank





































## Appendix A-6: NOLF Santa Rosa Flight Tracks

This page intentionally left blank






























## **Appendix B: Representative Flight Profiles**

The representative modeled flight profiles are depicted in the following section for each operational type. The representative profile is applicable to all tracks of the particular category (i.e. IFR Approach). These profiles were developed from the Rotary-Wing Operating Procedures Manual, the Fixed Wing Standard Operating Procedures Manual and pilot interviews. Flight profile descriptions vary between fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft. For fixed-wing aircraft, a flight profile consists of changes in aircraft power settings, altitudes above MSL, and airspeeds at defined points along a given flight track. For rotary-wing aircraft, a flight profile consists of changes in altitudes, airspeed, roll, pitch, and yaw angles along a given flight track. Site X is the location chosen for the helicopter flight profiles because all helicopter operation types are performed at Site X.





































## **Appendix C: Distribution of Operations**

Flight operation numbers are distributed among the flight tracks and corresponding flight profiles based on operational type frequencies and runway utilizations. Combining these factors together, the average annual tempo of daily flight operations was developed and are provided in the following tables.

## Appendix C-1 NAS Whiting Field South Distribution of Operations

Sout	h Wh	iting Fie	eld Annual Av	verage Dai	ly Helic	opter Fligh	nt Events	for Baseline	and No Act	ion
	Ru	nway	Trac	:k		Profile		Average	e Annual Day	Events
Track Type	15	%		%	10	%	%	Acoustic	Acoustic	Tatal
	טו	Use	U	Use	טו	Day	Night	Day	Night	Iotal
	050	10.20/	Sp1N_DA	40.00%	D01	98.00%	2.00%	5.582	0.114	5.696
	055	18.3%	Sp1N_DB	60.00%	D02	98.00%	2.00%	8.374	0.171	8.544
			Sp1E_DA	10.00%	D03	98.00%	2.00%	2.112	0.043	2.156
	140	27 70/	Sp1E_DB	15.00%	D04	98.00%	2.00%	3.169	0.065	3.233
	145	21.1%	Sp2E_DA	30.00%	D05	98.00%	2.00%	6.337	0.129	6.467
			Sp2E_DB	45.00%	D06	98.00%	2.00%	9.506	0.194	9.700
			Sp1S_DA	30.00%	D07	98.00%	2.00%	3.180	0.065	3.245
Doporturo	225	12 0%	Sp1S_DB	45.00%	D08	98.00%	2.00%	4.770	0.097	4.868
Departure	255	13.970	Sp2S_DA	10.00%	D09	98.00%	2.00%	1.060	0.022	1.082
			Sp2S_DB	15.00%	D10	98.00%	2.00%	1.590	0.032	1.623
	225	10 1%	Sp4W_DA	40.00%	D11	98.00%	2.00%	12.232	0.250	12.482
	525	40.170	Sp4W_DB	60.00%	D12	98.00%	2.00%	18.349	0.374	18.723
	05S	18.3%	Sp1N_INST	100.00%	D13	98.00%	2.00%	1.938	0.040	1.978
	14S	27.7%	Sp4E_INST	100.00%	D14	98.00%	2.00%	2.934	0.060	2.994
	23S	13.9%	Sp1S_INST	100.00%	D15	98.00%	2.00%	1.472	0.030	1.502
	32S	40.1%	Sp4W_INST	100.00%	D16	98.00%	2.00%	4.247	0.087	4.334
						Departu	ire Total	86.854	1.773	88.626
			SP1N_AB	11.25%	A01	94.00%	6.00%	1.715	0.109	1.825
			SP1N_AC	25.50%	A02	94.00%	6.00%	3.888	0.248	4.136
			SP1N_AI	38.25%	A03	94.00%	6.00%	5.831	0.372	6.204
			SP2N_AB	1.88%	A04	94.00%	6.00%	0.286	0.018	0.304
	05S	18.3%	SP2N_AC	4.25%	A05	94.00%	6.00%	0.648	0.041	0.689
			SP2N_AI	6.38%	A06	94.00%	6.00%	0.972	0.062	1.034
			SP3N_AB	1.88%	A07	94.00%	6.00%	0.286	0.018	0.304
			SP3N_AC	4.25%	A08	94.00%	6.00%	0.648	0.041	0.689
			SP3N_AI	6.38%	A09	94.00%	6.00%	0.972	0.062	1.034
			SP4E_AB	15.00%	A10	94.00%	6.00%	3.461	0.221	3.682
Arrival	14S	27.7%	SP4E_AC	34.00%	A11	94.00%	6.00%	7.846	0.501	8.347
			SP4E_AI	51.00%	A12	94.00%	6.00%	11.769	0.751	12.520
			SP4S_AB	15.00%	A13	94.00%	6.00%	1.737	0.111	1.848
	23S	13.9%	SP4S_AC	34.00%	A14	94.00%	6.00%	3.937	0.251	4.188
			SP4S_AI	51.00%	A15	94.00%	6.00%	5.906	0.377	6.283
			SP1W_AB	11.25%	A16	94.00%	6.00%	3.758	0.240	3.998
			SP1W_AC	25.50%	A17	94.00%	6.00%	8.519	0.544	9.062
	325	10 1%	SP1W_AI	38.25%	A18	94.00%	6.00%	12.778	0.816	13.594
	525	40.170	SP2W_AB	3.75%	A19	94.00%	6.00%	1.253	0.080	1.333
			SP2W_AC	8.50%	A20	94.00%	6.00%	2.840	0.181	3.021
			SP2W_AI	12.75%	A21	94.00%	6.00%	4.259	0.272	4.531
						Arri	val Total	83.308	5.318	88.626

Sout	h Wh	iting Fie	eld Annual A	verage Dai	ly Helic	opter Flig	ht Events	for Baseline	e and No Act	ion
	Ru	nway	Trac	:k		Profile		Average	e Annual Day	/ Events
Track Type	ck Type 🛛 🙀 %		ID	%		%	%	Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
		Use		Use	שו	Day	Night	Day	Night	TULdi
	05S	18.3%	Sp1N_Pat	100.00%	P01	90.00%	10.00%	5.340	0.593	5.934
Dattorn	14S	27.7%	Sp4E_Pat	100.00%	P02	90.00%	10.00%	8.083	0.898	8.981
Pattern	23S	13.9%	Sp1S_Pat	100.00%	P03	90.00%	10.00%	4.056	0.451	4.507
	32S	40.1%	Sp4W_Pat	100.00%	P04	90.00%	10.00%	11.702	1.300	13.002
						Patte	ern Total	29.182	3.242	32.424
							TOTAL	199.344	10.333	209.676

So	South Whiting Field Annual Average Daily T-6 Flight Operations for Baseline and No Action								n	
	Ru	nway	Tra	ck		Profile		Average	e Annual Day Events	
Track Type		%		%		%	%	Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	עו	Use	עו	Use	שו	Day	Night	Day	Night	TOLA
604	235	50%	SGCA1	100.00%	G01	99.00%	1.00%	3.210	0.032	3.242
GCA	32S	50%	SGCA2	100.00%	G02	99.00%	1.00%	3.210	0.032	3.242
						Patte	ern Total	6.420	0.065	6.485
			TOTAL 6.420 0.065 6.485							6.485

South W	/hitin	g Field /	Annual Avera	age Daily A	viation	Park Flight	Operati	ons for Base	eline and No	Action
	Ru	nway	Tra	ck		Profile		Average	e Annual Day	v Events
Track Type		%	10	%	10	%	%	Acoustic	Acoustic	Tetal
	שו	Use	טו	Use	U	Day	Night	Day	Night	Total
	05S	18.3%	D01	100.00%	D01	100.00%	0.00%	4.713	0.000	4.713
Doporturo	14S	27.7%	D02	100.00%	D02	100.00%	0.00%	7.134	0.000	7.134
Departure	23S	13.9%	D03	100.00%	D03	100.00%	0.00%	3.580	0.000	3.580
	32S	40.1%	D04	100.00%	D04	100.00%	0.00%	10.327	0.000	10.327
						Departu	re Total	25.753	0.000	25.753
	05S	18.3%	A01	100.00%	A01	100.00%	0.00%	4.713	0.000	4.713
Arrival	14S	27.7%	A02	100.00%	A02	100.00%	0.00%	7.134	0.000	7.134
Arrival	23S	13.9%	A03	100.00%	A03	100.00%	0.00%	3.580	0.000	3.580
	32S	40.1%	A04	100.00%	A04	100.00%	0.00%	10.327	0.000	10.327
						Arriv	al Total	25.753	0.000	25.753
							TOTAL	51.507	0.000	51.507

S	outh	Whiting	Field Annua	l Average	Daily H	elicopter F	light Eve	nts for Prop	osed Action	
	Ru	nway	Trac	k		Profile		Average	e Annual Day	Events
Track Type		%	15	%		%	%	Acoustic	Acoustic	<b>-</b> 1
	טו	Use	U	Use	U	Day	Night	Day	Night	Iotal
	050	10.20/	Sp1N_DA	40.00%	D01	98.00%	2.00%	6.810	0.139	6.949
	055	18.3%	Sp1N_DB	60.00%	D02	98.00%	2.00%	10.216	0.208	10.424
			Sp1E_DA	10.00%	D03	98.00%	2.00%	2.577	0.053	2.630
	140	27 70/	Sp1E_DB	15.00%	D04	98.00%	2.00%	3.866	0.079	3.945
	145	27.7%	Sp2E_DA	30.00%	D05	98.00%	2.00%	7.732	0.158	7.889
			Sp2E_DB	45.00%	D06	98.00%	2.00%	11.597	0.237	11.834
			Sp1S_DA	30.00%	D07	98.00%	2.00%	3.880	0.079	3.959
Donorturo	າວເ	12.00/	Sp1S_DB	45.00%	D08	98.00%	2.00%	5.820	0.119	5.938
Departure	233 13		Sp2S_DA	10.00%	D09	98.00%	2.00%	1.293	0.026	1.320
			Sp2S_DB	15.00%	D10	98.00%	2.00%	1.940	0.040	1.979
	275	10 1%	Sp4W_DA	40.00%	D11	98.00%	2.00%	14.923	0.305	15.228
	525	40.1%	Sp4W_DB	60.00%	D12	98.00%	2.00%	22.385	0.457	22.842
	05S	18.3%	Sp1N_INST	100.00%	D13	98.00%	2.00%	2.365	0.048	2.413
	14S	27.7%	Sp4E_INST	100.00%	D14	98.00%	2.00%	3.579	0.073	3.652
	23S	13.9%	Sp1S_INST	100.00%	D15	98.00%	2.00%	1.796	0.037	1.833
	32S	40.1%	Sp4W_INST	100.00%	D16	98.00%	2.00%	5.182	0.106	5.288
				· · ·		Departu	ire Total	105.961	2.162	108.124
			SP1N_AB	11.25%	A01	94.00%	6.00%	2.092	0.134	2.226
			SP1N_AC	25.50%	A02	94.00%	6.00%	4.743	0.303	5.046
			SP1N_AI	38.25%	A03	94.00%	6.00%	7.114	0.454	7.568
			SP2N_AB	1.88%	A04	94.00%	6.00%	0.349	0.022	0.371
	05S	18.3%	SP2N_AC	4.25%	A05	94.00%	6.00%	0.790	0.050	0.841
			SP2N_AI	6.38%	A06	94.00%	6.00%	1.186	0.076	1.261
			SP3N_AB	1.88%	A07	94.00%	6.00%	0.349	0.022	0.371
			SP3N_AC	4.25%	A08	94.00%	6.00%	0.790	0.050	0.841
			SP3N_AI	6.38%	A09	94.00%	6.00%	1.186	0.076	1.261
			SP4E_AB	15.00%	A10	94.00%	6.00%	4.223	0.270	4.493
Arrival	14S	27.7%	SP4E_AC	34.00%	A11	94.00%	6.00%	9.572	0.611	10.183
			SP4E_AI	51.00%	A12	94.00%	6.00%	14.358	0.916	15.275
			SP4S_AB	15.00%	A13	94.00%	6.00%	2.119	0.135	2.254
	23S	13.9%	SP4S_AC	34.00%	A14	94.00%	6.00%	4.803	0.307	5.110
			SP4S_AI	51.00%	A15	94.00%	6.00%	7.205	0.460	7.665
			SP1W_AB	11.25%	A16	94.00%	6.00%	4.585	0.293	4.878
			SP1W_AC	25.50%	A17	94.00%	6.00%	10.393	0.663	11.056
	275	10 1%	SP1W_AI	38.25%	A18	94.00%	6.00%	15.589	0.995	16.584
	525	-+0.170	SP2W_AB	3.75%	A19	94.00%	6.00%	1.528	0.098	1.626
			SP2W_AC	8.50%	A20	94.00%	6.00%	3.464	0.221	3.685
			SP2W_AI	12.75%	A21	94.00%	6.00%	5.196	0.332	5.528
						Arriv	val Total	101.636	6.487	108.124

S	outh	Whiting	Field Annua	l Average	Daily H	elicopter I	Flight Eve	nts for Prop	osed Action	
	Runway		Trac	Track Profile Average Annual Da				v Events		
Track Type	rack Type K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K			%		%	%	Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
				Use	Use		Night	Day	Night	Total
	05S	18.3%	Sp1N_Pat	100.00%	P01	90.00%	10.00%	6.515	0.724	7.239
Dattorn	14S	27.7%	Sp4E_Pat	100.00%	P02	90.00%	10.00%	9.862	1.096	10.957
Pattern	23S	13.9%	Sp1S_Pat	100.00%	P03	90.00%	10.00%	4.949	0.550	5.498
	32S	40.1%	Sp4W_Pat	100.00%	P04	90.00%	10.00%	14.276	1.586	15.863
						Patte	ern Total	35.602	3.956	39.557
							TOTAL	243.199	12.606	255.805

	Sout	h Whitii	ng Field Annual Average Daily		e Daily	T-6 Flight (				
	Ru	nway	Tra	ick	Profile			Averag	e Annual Day	/ Events
Track Type		%		%		%	%	Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	טו	Use	U	Use	טו	Day	Night	Day	Night	Total
604	235	50%	SGCA1	100.00%	G01	99.00%	1.00%	3.916	0.040	3.956
GCA	32S	50%	SGCA2	100.00%	G02	99.00%	1.00%	3.916	0.040	3.956
						Patte	ern Total	7.832	0.079	7.911
							TOTAL	7.832	0.079	7.911

Sout	h Wh	iting Fie	ld Annual A	verage Dai	ly Aviat	tion Park Fl	ight Ope	rations for F	Proposed Act	ion
	Ru	nway	Tra	ck		Profile		Average Annual Day Events		
Track Type		%	ID	%	10	%	%	Acoustic	Acoustic	Tatal
	שו	Use	שו	Use	U	Day	Night	Day	Night	Total
	05S	18.3%	D01	100.00%	D01	100.00%	0.00%	5.750	0.000	5.750
Doporturo	14S	27.7%	D02	100.00%	D02	100.00%	0.00%	8.703	0.000	8.703
Departure	23S	13.9%	D03	100.00%	D03	100.00%	0.00%	4.367	0.000	4.367
	32S	40.1%	D04	100.00%	D04	100.00%	0.00%	12.599	0.000	12.599
						Departu	re Total	31.419	0.000	31.419
	05S	18.3%	A01	100.00%	A01	100.00%	0.00%	5.750	0.000	5.750
Arrival	14S	27.7%	A02	100.00%	A02	100.00%	0.00%	8.703	0.000	8.703
Allival	23S	13.9%	A03	100.00%	A03	100.00%	0.00%	4.367	0.000	4.367
	32S	40.1%	A04	100.00%	A04	100.00%	0.00%	12.599	0.000	12.599
						Arriv	al Total	31.419	0.000	31.419
							TOTAL	62.838	0.000	62.838

Appendix C-2 NOLF Spencer Distribution of Operations

rack Type	Course Dir East North	e Flow Use 28%	ID ARR_E_01L	Profile % Use	% Day		Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	East North	28%	ARR_E_01L	% Use	96 D 1017	0/ BUILE	Dav	Night	
	East North	28%	ARR_E_01L		Jo Day	% Night	Day	wight	
	North			40%	100%	0%	1.940	0.000	1.940
	North		ARR_E_01R	60%	100%	0%	2.910	0.000	2.910
		31%	ARR_N_01L	40%	100%	0%	2.165	0.000	2.165
Arr.	-	1000	ARR_N_01R	60%	100%	0%	3.247	0.000	3.247
	South	25%	ARR_S_01L	60%	100%	0%	2.625	0.000	2.625
			ARR_S_01R	40%	100%	0%	1.750	0.000	1.750
	West	17%	ARR_W_01L	60%	100%	0%	1.761	0.000	1.761
	West	1770	ARR_W_01R	40%	100%	0%	1.174	Acoustic Night   Acoustic Night   0.000	1.174
							Arriv	al Subtotal	17.570
Dest		100%	DEP_01	10%	100%	0%	1.757	0.000	1.757
Dep.	ALL	100%	DEP_02	90%	100%	0%	15.813	0.000	15.813
							Departu	re Subtotal	17.570
		2000	CAR90_E01	40%	100%	0%	7.759	0.000	7.759
	East	28%	CAR90_E02	60%	100%	0%	11.638	0.000	11.638
	100		CAR90_N01	40%	100%	0%	8.659	0.000	8.659
90"	North	31%	CAR90_N02	60%	100%	0%	12.988	0.000	12.988
rotation			CAR90_S01	40%	100%	0%	10.500	0.000	10.500
	South	25%	CAR90_S02	60%	100%	0%	7.000	0.000	7.000
			CAR90_W01	40%	100%	0%	7.042	0.000	7.042
	West	17%	CAR90_W02	60%	100%	0%	4.695	0.000	4.695
						90°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	70.281
		2004	CAR180_E01	40%	100%	0%	7.759	0.000	7.759
	East	28%	CAR180_E02	60%	100%	0%	11.638	0.000	11.638
			CAR180_N01	40%	100%	0%	8.659	0.000	8.659
180°	North	31%	CAR180_N02	60%	100%	0%	12.988	0.000	12.988
Auto-			CAR180_S01	40%	100%	0%	10.500	0.000	10.500
a de la d	South	25%	CAR180_502	60%	100%	0%	7.000	0.000	7.000
		1	CAR180_W01	40%	100%	0%	7.042	0.000	7.042
	West	17%	CAR180 W02	60%	100%	0%	4.695	Acoustic Night   Acoustic Night   0.000	4.695
						180°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	70.281

NOLF Spancer Helicopter Annual Ave rage Daily Flight Operations for Baseline   Track Type Course Flow Dir Profile Use Acoustic 20% Acoustic Night <th></th>									
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
			CST_E_01	20%	100%	0%	23.277	0.000	23.277
	Fort	20%	CST_E_02	20%	100%	0%	23.277	0.000	23.277
	Last	2070	CST_E_03	30%	100%	0%	34.915	0.000	34.915
			CST_E_04	30%	100%	0%	34.915	0.000	34.915
			CST_N_01	20%	100%	0%	25.976	0.000	25.976
		24.04	CST_N_02	20%	100%	0%	25.976	0.000	25.976
	North	31%	CST_N_03	30%	100%	0%	38.964	0.000	38.964
			CST_N_04	30%	100%	0%	38.964	0.000	38.964
Standard			CST_S_01	20%	100%	0%	21.000	0.000	21.000
		25.04	CST_S_02	20%	100%	0%	21.000	0.000	21.000
	South	25%	CST_S_03	30%	100%	0%	31.500	0.000	31.500
			CST_S_04	30%	100%	0%	31.500	0.000	31.500
			CST_W_01	20%	100%	0%	14.084	0.000	14.084
		4.704	CST_W_02	20%	100%	0%	14.084	0.000	14.084
	West	1/%	CST_W_03	30%	100%	0%	21.126	0.000	21.126
			CST_W_04	30%	100%	0%	21.126	0.000	21.126
							Standa	rd Subtotal	421.685
	-	2004	CTRB_E_01	40%	100%	0%	7.759	0.000	7.759
	cast	28%	CTRB_E_02	60%	100%	0%	11.638	0.000	11.638
			CTRB_N_01	40%	100%	0%	8.659	0.000	8.659
Rotor/	North	31%	CTRB_N_02	60%	100%	0%	12.988	0.000	12.988
Boost			CTRB_S_01	40%	100%	0%	10.500	0.000	10.500
Off	South	25%	CTRB_S_02	60%	100%	0%	7.000	0.000	7.000
			CTRB_W_01	40%	100%	0%	7.042	0.000	7.042
	West	17%	CTRB_W_02	60%	100%	0%	4.695	0.000	4.695
						Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	70.281
	-		HST_E1	40%	100%	0%	7.759	0.000	7.759
	tast	28%	HST_E2	40%	100%	0%	11.638	0.000	11.638
		24.04	HST_N1	40%	100%	0%	8.659	0.000	8.659
High Speed	North	31%	HST_N2	40%	100%	0%	12.988	0.000	12.988
Tactical	Court.	2504	HST_S1	40%	100%	0%	10.500	0.000	10.500
	South	25%	HST_S2	40%	100%	0%	7.000	0.000	7.000
	Mart	170	HST_W1	40%	100%	0%	7.042	0.000	7.042
	west	17%	HST_W2	40%	100%	0%	4.695	0.000	4.695
						Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	70.281
							Patte	rn Subtotal	632.527
								TOTAL	667.667
	NOLF Sp	encer He	licopter Annual A	verage Da	ily Flight	Operations	for Propos	ed Action	
-------------------	---------	----------	-------------------	-----------	------------	------------	-------------	--------------	--------
rack Type	Course	Flow	L.	Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	Fast	28%	ARR_E_01L	40%	100%	0%	2.207	0.000	2.207
	COST	2070	ARR_E_01R	60%	100%	0%	3.311	0.000	3.311
	North	31%	ARR_N_01L	40%	100%	0%	2.463	0.000	2.463
Arr	North	5170	ARR_N_01R	60%	100%	0%	3.695	0.000	3.695
arr.	South	250/	ARR_S_01L	60%	100%	0%	2.987	0.000	2.987
	South	2370	ARR_S_01R	40%	100%	0%	1.991	0.000	1.991
		170	ARR_W_01L	60%	100%	0%	2.003	0.000	2.003
	west	17%	ARR_W_01R	40%	100%	0%	1.336	0.000	1.336
							Arriv	val Subtotal	19.993
-		1000	DEP_01	10%	100%	0%	1.999	0.000	1.999
Dep.	ALL	100%	DEP_02	90%	100%	0%	17.994	0.000	17.994
			_				Departu	re Subtotal	19.993
	Fact	200/	CAR90_E01	40%	100%	0%	8.829	0.000	8.829
	East	28%	CAR90_E02	60%	100%	0%	13.243	0.000	13.243
		-	CAR90_N01	40%	100%	0%	9.853	0.000	9.853
90°	North	31%	CAR90_N02	60%	100%	0%	14.779	0.000	14.779
rotation	-		CAR90_S01	40%	100%	0%	11.948	0.000	11.948
	South	25%	CAR90_502	60%	100%	0%	7.965	0.000	7.965
		4704	CAR90_W01	40%	100%	0%	8.013	0.000	8.013
	West	17%	CAR90_W02	60%	100%	0%	5.342	0.000	5.342
	-					90°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	79.973
	E	2004	CAR180_E01	40%	100%	0%	8.829	0.000	8.829
	East	28%	CAR180_E02	60%	100%	0%	13.243	0.000	13.243
		-	CAR180_N01	40%	100%	0%	9.853	0.000	9.853
180°	North	31%	CAR180_N02	60%	100%	0%	14.779	0.000	14.779
Auto- rotation			CAR180_501	40%	100%	0%	11.948	0.000	11.948
rotation	South	25%	CAR180_502	60%	100%	0%	7.965	0.000	7.965
			CAR180_W01	40%	100%	0%	8.013	0.000	8.013
	West	17%	CAR180_W02	60%	100%	0%	5.342	0.000	5.342
	-					180°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	79.973

	NOLF Sp	encer He	licopter Annual A	verage Da	ily Flight	Operations	for Propos	ed Action	
Track Type	Course	Flow	-	Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	-
			CST_E_01	20%	100%	0%	26.487	0.000	26.487
	East	28%	CST_E_02	20%	100%	0%	26.487	0.000	26.487
			CST_E_03	30%	100%	0%	39.730	0.000	39.730
			CST_E_04	30%	100%	0%	39.730	0.000	39.730
			CST_N_01	20%	100%	0%	29.558	0.000	29.558
	Marth	218/	CST_N_02	20%	100%	0%	29.558	0.000	29.558
	North	5170	CST_N_03	30%	100%	0%	44.337	0.000	44.337
Photo da und			CST_N_04	30%	100%	0%	44.337	0.000	44.337
Standard			CST_S_01	20%	100%	0%	23.896	0.000	23.896
	-		CST_S_02	20%	100%	0%	23.896	0.000	23.896
	South	25%	CST_S_03	30%	100%	0%	35.844	0.000	35.844
			CST_5_04	30%	100%	0%	35.844	0.000	35.844
			CST_W_01	20%	100%	0%	16.027	0.000	16.027
			CST_W_02	20%	100%	0%	16.027	0.000	16.027
	West	17%	CST_W_03	30%	100%	0%	24.040	0.000	24.040
			CST W 04	30%	100%	0%	24.040	0.000	24.040
-							Standa	rd Subtotal	479.83
		440	CTRB_E_01	40%	100%	0%	8.829	0.000	8.829
	East	ast 28%	CTRB_E_02	60%	100%	0%	13.243	0.000	13.243
			CTRB_N_01	40%	100%	0%	9.853	0.000	9.853
Rotor/	North	31%	CTRB_N_02	60%	100%	0%	14.779	0.000	14.779
Boost			CTRB_S_01	40%	100%	0%	11.948	0.000	11.948
Off	South	25%	CTRB_S_02	60%	100%	0%	7.965	0.000	7.965
			CTRB_W_01	40%	100%	0%	8.013	0.000	8.013
	West	17%	CTRB_W_02	60%	100%	0%	5.342	0.000	5.342
		-	1000			Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	79.973
	-	2004	HST_E1	40%	100%	0%	8.829	0.000	8.829
	East	28%	HST_E2	40%	100%	0%	13.243	0.000	13.243
			HST_N1	40%	100%	0%	9.853	0.000	9.853
High Speed	North	31%	HST_N2	40%	100%	0%	14.779	0.000	14.779
Tactical		250	HST_S1	40%	100%	0%	11.948	0.000	11.948
location .	South	25%	HST_S2	40%	100%	0%	7.965	0.000	7.965
			HST_W1	40%	100%	0%	8.013	0.000	8.013
	West	1/%	HST_W2	40%	100%	0%	5.342	0.000	5.342
						Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	79.973
						-	Patte	rn Subtotal	719.75
								TOTAL	759 740

	NOLF	Spencer	Helicopter Annua	al Average	Daily Flig	t Operati	ons for No	Action	
rack Type	Course Dir	e Flow Use	ID	Profile % Use	% Day	% Night	Acoustic Day	Acoustic Night	Total
	1000		ARR_E_01L	40%	100%	0%	1.809	0.000	1.809
	East	28%	ARR_E_01R	60%	100%	0%	2.714	0.000	2.714
			ARR_N_01L	40%	100%	0%	2.019	0.000	2.019
	North	31%	ARR_N_01R	60%	100%	0%	3.028	0.000	3.028
Arr.			ARR_S_01L	60%	100%	0%	2.448	0.000	2.448
	South	25%	ARR_S_01R	40%	100%	0%	1.632	0.000	1.632
			ARR_W_01L	60%	100%	0%	1.642	0.000	1.642
	West	17%	ARR_W_01R	40%	100%	0%	1.095	0.000	1.095
							Arriv	Arrival Subtotal	
-		YACCO	DEP_01	10%	100%	0%	1.639	0.000	1.639
Dep.	ALL	100%	DEP_02	90%	100%	0%	14.749	0.000	14.749
-	-			-			Departu	re Subtotal	16.388
	5.5	3.577	CAR90_E01	40%	100%	0%	7.237	0.000	7.237
	East	28%	CAR90_E02	60%	100%	0%	10.855	0.000	10.855
	North	1 31%	CAR90_N01	40%	100%	0%	8.076	0.000	8.076
90°			CAR90_N02	60%	100%	0%	12.114	0.000	12.114
Auto- rotation		1 au	CAR90_501	40%	100%	0%	9.793	0.000	9.793
	South	25%	CAR90_502	60%	100%	0%	6.529	0.000	6.529
			CAR90_W01	40%	100%	0%	6.568	0.000	6.568
	West	17%	CAR90_W02	60%	100%	0%	4.379	0.000	4.379
-	1					90°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	65.550
	E	200/	CAR180_E01	40%	100%	0%	7.237	0.000	7.237
	East	28%	CAR180_E02	60%	100%	0%	10.855	0.000	10.855
	New	240	CAR180_N01	40%	100%	0%	8.076	0.000	8.076
180°	North	31%	CAR180_N02	60%	100%	0%	12.114	0.000	12.114
Auto- rotation	1000		CAR180_501	40%	100%	0%	9.793	0.000	9.793
	South	25%	CAR180_502	60%	100%	0%	6.529	0.000	6.529
			CAR180_W01	40%	100%	0%	6.568	0.000	6.568
	West	17%	CAR180_W02	60%	100%	0%	4.379	0.000	4.379
-						180°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	65.550

	NOLF	Spencer	Helicopter Annu	al Average	Daily Flig	ht Operati	ons for No	Action	
frack Type	Course	Flow	10	Profile	% Day	% Night	Acoustic Dav	Acoustic Night	Total
		Use	CST E 01	20%	100%	70 Kight	21 710	0.000	21 710
			CST E 07	20%	100%	0%	21.710	0.000	21.710
	East	28%		20%	100%	0%	21.710	0.000	21.710
				30%	100%	0%	32.303	0.000	32.505
		_	CSI_E_04	30%	100%	0%	32.565	0.000	32.565
			CST_N_01	20%	100%	0%	24.227	0.000	24.227
	North	31%	CST_N_02	20%	100%	0%	24.227	0.000	24.227
			CST_N_03	30%	100%	0%	36.341	0.000	36.341
Standard			CST_N_04	30%	100%	0%	36.341	0.000	36.341
			CST_S_01	20%	100%	0%	19.586	0.000	19.586
	South	25%	CST_S_02	20%	100%	0%	19.586	0.000	19.586
			CST_S_03	30%	100%	0%	29.380	0.000	29.380
			CST_5_04	30%	100%	0%	29.380	0.000	29.380
			CST_W_01	20%	100%	0%	13.136	0.000	13.136
	West	17%	CST_W_02	20%	100%	0%	13.136	0.000	13.136
	west	1770	CST_W_03	30%	100%	0%	19.704	0.000	19.704
			CST_W_04	30%	100%	0%	19.704	0.000	19.704
							Standa	rd Subtotal	393.30
	Eact	709/	CTRB_E_01	40%	100%	0%	7.237	0.000	7.237
	Last	2070	CTRB_E_02	60%	100%	0%	10.855	0.000	10.855
Tail	North	orth 31%	CTRB_N_01	40%	100%	0%	8.076	0.000	8.076
Rotor/	North	5170	CTRB_N_02	60%	100%	0%	12.114	0.000	12.114
Boost	Co. allo	350	CTRB_S_01	40%	100%	0%	9.793	0.000	9.793
on	South	25%	CTRB_S_02	60%	100%	0%	6.529	0.000	6.529
	Wat	170/	CTRB_W_01	40%	100%	0%	6.568	0.000	6.568
	west	1/70	CTRB_W_02	60%	100%	0%	4.379	0.000	4.379
						Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	65.550
	Fact	200/	HST_E1	40%	100%	0%	7.237	0.000	7.237
	East	28%	HST_E2	40%	100%	0%	10.855	0.000	10.855
		74.04	HST_N1	40%	100%	0%	8.076	0.000	8.076
High Speed	North	31%	HST_N2	40%	100%	0%	12.114	0.000	12.114
High Speed Tactical	Co	2500	HST_S1	40%	100%	0%	9.793	0.000	9.793
	South	25%	HST_S2	40%	100%	0%	6.529	0.000	6.529
		1704	HST_W1	40%	100%	0%	6.568	0.000	6.568
	west	1/%	HST_W2	40%	100%	0%	4.379	0.000	4.379
						Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	65.550
						-	Patte	rn Subtotal	589.95
								TOTAL	622 727

Appendix C-3 NOLF Pace Distribution of Operations

_	NO	LF Pace I	lelicopter Annual	Average D	aily Flight	t Operation	is for Baseli	ne	
Track Type	Cours	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	East	28%	ARR_E_01L	40%	100%	0%	0.936	0.000	0.936
			ARR_E_01R	60%	100%	0%	1.404	0.000	1.404
	North	31%	ARR_N_01L	40%	100%	0%	1.044	0.000	1.044
Arr.			ARR_N_01R	60%	100%	0%	1.566	0.000	1.566
	South	25%	ARR_S_01L	60%	100%	0%	1.266	0.000	1.266
	Journ	23/6	ARR_S_01R	40%	100%	0%	0.844	0.000	0.844
	Wart	170/	ARR_W_01L	60%	100%	0%	0.849	0.000	0.849
	West	1/76	ARR_W_01R	40%	100%	0%	0.566	0.000	0.566
-							Arris	al Subtotal	8.477
Dep.	North	31%	CTRB_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.044	0.000	1.044
-	100						Departu	re Subtotal	1.566
1 1			CAR90_E01	40%	100%	0%	3.743	0.000	3.743
	East	28%	CAR90_E02	60%	100%	0%	5.615	0.000	5.615
			CAR90_N01	40%	100%	0%	4.177	0.000	4.177
90*	North	31%	CAR90_NO2	60%	100%	0%	6.266	0.000	6.266
Auto-	Land I		CAR90_501	40%	100%	0%	3.377	0.000	3.377
Totation	South	25%	CAR90_502	60%	100%	0%	5.066	0.000	5.066
	-		CAR90 W01	40%	100%	0%	2.265	0.000	2.265
	West	17%	CAR90 W02	60%	100%	0%	3.397	0.000	3.397
	-					90*	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	33.907
-	1	-	CAR180 E01	40%	100%	0%	3.743	0.000	3,743
	East	28%	CAR180 F02	60%	100%	0%	5.615	0.000	5.615
	-		CAP180 NO1	40%	100%	0%	A 177	0.000	A 177
180'	North	31%	CAR180_N01	60%	100%	0%	6.266	0.000	6 266
Auto-			CAR180_N02	40%	100%	0%	0.200	0.000	0.200
rotation	South	25%	CAR180_301	40%	100%	0%	5.577	0.000	5.577
	-	-	CAR180_S02	60%	100%	0%	5.066	0.000	5.066
	West	17%	CAR180_W01	40%	100%	0%	2.265	0.000	2.265
_	-	_	CAR180_W02	60%	100%	0%	3.397	0.000	3.397
-	-			1011		180	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	33.907
	East	28%	CSI_E_01	40%	100%	0%	28,075	0.000	28.075
			CST_E_02	60%	100%	0%	42.112	0.000	42.112
	North	31%	CST_N_01	40%	100%	0%	31.330	0.000	31.330
Standard	-		CST_N_02	60%	100%	0%	46.995	0.000	46.995
	South	25%	CST_S_01	40%	100%	0%	25.328	0.000	25.328
			CST_S_02	60%	100%	0%	37.992	0.000	37.992
	West	17%	CST_W_01	40%	100%	0%	16.987	0.000	16.987
	1	-	CST_W_02	60%	100%	0%	25.481	0.000	25.481
-	-	_				-	Standa	rd Subtotal	254.299
	East	28%	CTRB_E_01	40%	100%	0%	1.872	0.000	1.872
			CTRB_E_02	60%	100%	0%	2.807	0.000	2.807
	North	31%	CTRB_N_01	40%	100%	0%	2.089	0.000	2.089
Tail Rotor /			CTRB_N_02	60%	100%	0%	3.133	0.000	3.133
Boost Off	South	250	CTRB_S_01	40%	100%	0%	1.689	0.000	1.689
	3000	2.376	CTRB_S_02	60%	100%	0%	2.533	0.000	2.533
	West	1.74	CTRB_W_01	40%	100%	0%	1.132	0.000	1.132
	west	1/%	CTRB_W_02	60%	100%	0%	1.699	0.000	1.699
						Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	16.953
-							Patte	rn Subtotal	339.066
								TOTAL	240 100

	NOLF P	ace Helio	opter Annual Aver	age Daily	Flight Op	erations fo	r Proposed	Action	
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	East	28%	ARR_E_01L	40%	100%	0%	1.104	0.000	1.104
			ARR_E_01R	60%	100%	0%	1.655	0.000	1.655
	North	3.1%	ARR_N_01L	40%	100%	0%	1.232	0.000	1.232
Arr	Worth	51/6	ARR_N_01R	60%	100%	0%	1,847	0.000	1.847
	South	25%	ARR_S_01L	60%	100%	0%	1.493	0.000	1.493
	South	23/6	ARR_S_01R	40%	100%	0%	0.996	0.000	0.996
	Mart	170/	ARR_W_01L	60%	100%	0%	1.002	0.000	1.002
	west	1/70	ARR_W_01R	40%	100%	0%	0.668	0.000	0.668
-							Arriv	al Subtotal	9.997
Dep.	North	31%	CTRB_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.232	0.000	1.232
	1						Departu	re Subtotal	1.847
			CAR90_E01	40%	100%	0%	4.414	0.000	4.414
	East	28%	CAR90_E02	60%	100%	0%	6.62.2	0.000	6.622
			CAR90_N01	40%	100%	0%	4.926	0.000	4.926
90*	North	31%	CAR90_N02	60%	100%	0%	7.389	0.000	7.389
Auto-			CAR90_501	40%	100%	0%	3.983	0.000	3.983
1.5.1.1.5.1.	South	25%	CAR90_502	60%	100%	0%	5.974	0.000	5.974
			CAR90 W01	40%	100%	0%	2.671	0.000	2.671
	West	17%	CAR90 W02	60%	100%	0%	4.007	0.000	4.007
				74.0		90'	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	39.986
	1	-	CAR180_E01	40%	100%	0%	4.414	0.000	4,414
	East	28%	CAR180 E02	60%	100%	0%	6.62.2	0.000	6.622
			CAR180 N01	40%	100%	0%	4.926	0.000	4.926
180*	North	31%	CAR180 N02	60%	100%	0%	7.389	0.000	7.389
Auto			CAR180 501	40%	100%	0%	3 983	0.000	3 983
rotation	South	25%	CAR180 502	50%	100%	0%	5.974	0.000	5 974
	-		CAR180 W01	40%	100%	0%	2 671	0.000	2 671
	West	17%	CAR180_W02	60%	100%	0%	4.007	0.000	4 007
-	-		0.000_002	00.0	10010	180'	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	39.986
			CST E 01	40%	100%	0%	33 109	0.000	33 109
	East	28%	CST E 02	60%	100%	0%	49.663	0.000	49 663
			CST_N_01	40%	100%	0%	36.047	0.000	36.047
	North	31%	CST_N_01	60%	100%	0%	50.347	0.000	50.947
Standard			CST_N_02	40%	100%	0%	29.970	0.000	29.970
	South	25%	CST_5_01	40%	100%	078	44 905	0.000	44 005
			CS1_5_02	00%	100%	076	44.805	0.000	44.805
	West	1796	CST_W_01	40%	100%	0%	20.053	0.000	20.053
-			C31_W_02	00%	10076	076	Standa	d Subtatat	30.050
	-		CTDB E O1	40%	10.0%	0%	2 207	0.000	299.89/
	East	28%	CTRP E CO	40%	100%	0%	2.207	0.000	2.207
			CTRB_E_U2	00%	100%	0%	3.311	0.000	3.311
	North	31%	CTRB_N_01	40%	100%	0%	2,463	0.000	2.463
Tail Rotor / Boost Off		-	CIRB_N_02	60%	100%	0%	3.695	0.000	3.695
active of the	South	25%	CTRB_S_01	40%	100%	0%	1.991	0.000	1.991
			CTRB_S_02	60%	100%	0%	2.987	0.000	2.987
	West	17%	CTRB_W_01	40%	100%	0%	1.336	0.000	1.336
			CTRB_W_02	60%	100%	0%	2.003	0.000	2.003
	_	_		_	_	Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	ff Subtotal	19.993
							Patte	rn Subtotal	399.863
								TOTAL	411.707

	NOL	F Pace H	elicopter Annual A	werage Da	ily Flight	Operation	s for No Act	ion	
Track Type	Cours	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	East	28%	ARR_E_01L	40%	100%	0%	0.905	0.000	0.905
			ARR_E_01R	60%	100%	0%	1.357	0.000	1.357
	North	3.1%	ARR_N_01L	40%	100%	0%	1.009	0.000	1.009
Art	North	51/6	ARR_N_01R	60%	100%	0%	1.514	0.000	1.514
	South	25%	ARR_S_01L	60%	100%	0%	1.224	0.000	1.224
	Journ	23/6	ARR_S_01R	40%	100%	0%	0.816	0.000	0.816
	Wart	1.70/	ARR_W_01L	60%	100%	0%	0.821	0.000	0.821
	west	1/76	ARR_W_01R	40%	100%	0%	0.547	0.000	0.547
-			-			-	Arris	al Subtotal	8.194
Dep.	North	31%	CTRB_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.009	0.000	1.009
-	1.00						Departu	re Subtotal	1.514
1			CAR90_E01	40%	100%	0%	3.618	0.000	3.618
	East	28%	CAR90_E02	60%	100%	0%	5.428	0.000	5.428
			CAR90_N01	40%	100%	0%	4.038	0.000	4.038
90"	North	31%	CAR90_N02	60%	100%	0%	6.057	0.000	6.057
Auto- rotation			CAR90_501	40%	100%	0%	3.264	0.000	3.264
	South	25%	CAR90_502	60%	100%	0%	4.897	0.000	4.897
			CAR90_W01	40%	100%	0%	2.189	0.000	2.189
	West	17%	CAR90_W02	60%	100%	0%	3.284	0.000	3.284
	-					90*	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	32.775
			CAR180_E01	40%	100%	0%	3.618	0.000	3.618
	East	28%	CAR180_E02	60%	100%	0%	5.428	0.000	5.428
			CAR180 N01	40%	100%	0%	4.038	0.000	4.038
180*	North	31%	CAR180_N02	60%	100%	0%	6.057	0.000	6.057
Auto-			CAR180 501	40%	100%	0%	3.264	0.000	3.264
Totation	South	25%	CAR180 502	60%	100%	0%	4.897	0.000	4.897
			CAR180 W01	40%	100%	0%	2.189	0.000	2.189
	West	17%	CAR180 W02	60%	100%	0%	3.284	0.000	3.284
	-					180'	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	32.775
T.	1.50		CST_E_01	40%	100%	0%	27.138	0.000	27.138
	East	28%	CST_E_02	60%	100%	0%	40.707	0.000	40.707
			CST_N_01	40%	100%	0%	30.284	0.000	30.284
	North	31%	CST N 02	60%	100%	0%	45.426	0.000	45,426
Standard			CST S 01	40%	100%	0%	24.483	0.000	24.483
	South	25%	CST S 02	60%	100%	0%	36,725	0.000	36.725
	L.		CST W 01	40%	100%	0%	16.420	0.000	16.420
	West	17%	CST_W_02	60%	100%	0%	24.631	0.000	24.631
-							Standa	rd Subtotal	245.813
1	1.		CTRB_E_01	40%	100%	0%	1.809	0.000	1.809
	East	28%	CTRB_E 02	60%	100%	0%	2.714	0.000	2.714
			CTRB N 01	40%	100%	0%	2.019	0.000	2.019
Tail Botor	North	31%	CTRB N 02	60%	100%	0%	3.02.8	0.000	3.02.8
Boost Off			CTRB S 01	40%	100%	0%	1.632	0.000	1.632
	South	25%	CTRB S 02	60%	100%	0%	2.448	0.000	2 448
			CTER W 01	40%	100%	0%	1.095	0.000	1.095
	West	17%	CTRB W 02	60%	100%	0%	1.642	0.000	1.642
		-	CTRD_W_02	00%	100%	Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	16.399
-	-	_	_		_	100 100	Datte	ro Subtotal	10.308
							Patte	an autoral	327.751
								TOTAL	337.459

Appendix C-4 NOLF Site X Distribution of Operations

	NOL	Site X H	elicopter Annual	Average D	aily Flight	t Operation	ns for No Ac	tion	
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	-	2004	ArrE_090N	60%	94%	6%	0.384	0.023	0.407
	East	28%	ArrE_090T	40%	94%	6%	0.256	0.016	0.271
	the sh	250	ArrE_180N	60%	94%	6%	0.346	0.021	0.367
Arr. from	South	25%	ArrE_180T	40%	94%	6%	0.231	0.014	0.245
East		170	ArrE_270N	60%	94%	6%	0.232	0.014	0.246
	west	1/%	ArrE_270T	40%	94%	6%	0.155	0.009	0.164
			ArrE_360N	60%	94%	6%	0.428	0.026	0.454
	North	31%	ArrE_360T	40%	94%	6%	0.285	0.017	0.303
						Arr	ival from Ea	st Subtotal	2.458
		2004	ArrW_090N	60%	94%	6%	1.151	0.070	1.221
	East	28%	ArrW_090T	40%	94%	6%	0.767	0.047	0.814
		110	ArrW_180N	60%	94%	6%	1.038	0.063	1.102
Arr. from	from est	25%	ArrW_180T	40%	94%	6%	0.692	0.042	0.735
West			ArrW_270N	60%	94%	6%	0.696	0.042	0.739
	West	17%	ArrW_270T	40%	94%	6%	0.464	0.028	0.493
	1.1	31%	ArrW_360N	60%	94%	6%	1.284	0.078	1.363
	North	31%	ArrW_360T	40%	94%	6%	0.856	0.052	0.909
						Arri	al from We	st Subtotal	7.375
							Arriv	val Subtotal	9.833
20	1.000		DEP_TF	50%	94%	6%	4.634	0.283	4.916
Dep.	ALL	100%	DEP_WOA	50%	94%	6%	4.634	0.283	4.916
				_			Departu	re Subtotal	9.833
	East	28%	AR90_090	100%	94%	6%	2.813	0.172	2.985
90°	South	25%	AR90_180	100%	94%	6%	2.538	0.155	2.693
rotation	West	17%	AR90_270	100%	94%	6%	1.702	0.104	1.806
C.C.MILLON	North	31%	AR90_360	100%	94%	6%	3.139	0.192	3.331
						90°	Autorotati	on Subtotal	10.814
	East	28%	AR180_090	100%	94%	6%	2.813	0.172	2.985
180°	South	25%	AR180_180	100%	94%	6%	2.538	0.155	2.693
rotation	West	17%	AR180_270	100%	94%	6%	1.702	0.104	1.806
	North	31%	AR180_360	100%	94%	6%	3.139	0.192	3.331
						180°	Autorotati	on Subtotal	10.814

	NOL	Site X H	elicopter Annual	Average D	aily Flight	t Operation	s for No Ac	tion	
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	East	28%	CLA_090	100%	94%	6%	1.460	0.089	1.549
Confined	South	25%	CLA_180	100%	94%	6%	1.317	0.080	1.397
Landing Area	West	17%	CLA_270	100%	94%	6%	0.883	0.054	0.937
	North	31%	CLA_360	100%	94%	6%	1.629	0.099	1.728
						Confined	Landing Ar	ea Subtotal	5.611
	East	28%	EL_090TD	100%	94%	6%	0.073	0.004	0.078
External	South	25%	EL_180TD	100%	94%	6%	0.066	0.004	0.070
Load on Tactical Duty	West	17%	EL_270TD	100%	94%	6%	0.044	0.003	0.047
	North	31%	EL_360TD	100%	94%	6%	0.082	0.005	0.086
						li li	External Los	ad Subtutal	0.281
			HST090_N	60%	94%	6%	0.657	0.040	0.697
	East	28%	HST090_T	40%	94%	6%	0.438	0.027	0.465
	South	100	HST180_N	60%	94%	6%	0.593	0.036	0.629
High Speed		25%	HST180_T	40%	94%	6%	0.395	0.024	0.419
Tactical	West	st 17%	HST270_N	60%	94%	6%	0.397	0.024	0.422
			HST270_T	40%	94%	6%	0.265	0.016	0.281
			HST360 N	60%	94%	6%	0.733	0.045	0.778
	North	31%	HST360_T	40%	94%	6%	0.489	0.030	0.518
	-					High S	Speed Tactio	al Subtotal	4.208
	East	28%	PinnA_090	50%	94%	6%	0.730	0.045	0.774
10.00	South	25%	PinnA_180	50%	94%	6%	0.658	0.040	0.699
Pinnade A	West	17%	PinnA_270	50%	94%	6%	0.442	0.027	0.469
	North	31%	PinnA_360	50%	94%	6%	0.814	0.050	0.864
	East	28%	PinnB_090	50%	94%	6%	0.730	0.045	0.774
	South	25%	PinnB_180	50%	94%	6%	0.658	0.040	0.699
Pinnacle B	West	17%	PinnB_270	50%	94%	6%	0.442	0.027	0.469
	North	31%	PinnB_360	50%	94%	6%	0.814	0.050	0.864
							Pinnad	le Subtotal	5.611

	NOL	F Site X H	elicopter Annual	Average D	aily Flight	Operation	ns for No Ac	tion	
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
			Std090_Sp1	25%	94%	6%	5.076	0.310	5.385
	Cash	200/	Std090_Sp2	25%	94%	6%	5.076	0.310	5.385
	Cast	2070	Std090_Sp3	25%	94%	6%	5.076	0.310	5.385
			Std090_Sp4	25%	94%	6%	5.076	0.310	5.385
	-		Std180_Sp1	25%	94%	6%	4.579	0.279	4.858
	Caral	25.04	Std180_Sp2	25%	94%	6%	4.579	0.279	4.858
	South	25%	Std180_Sp3	25%	94%	6%	4.579	0.279	4.858
Acres 1			Std180_Sp4	25%	94%	6%	4.579	0.279	4.858
Standard			Std270_Sp1	25%	94%	6%	3.071	0.187	3.259
			Std270_Sp2	25%	94%	6%	3.071	0.187	3.259
	West	17%	Std270_Sp3	25%	94%	6%	3.071	0.187	3.259
			Std270_Sp4	25%	94%	6%	3.071	0.187	3.259
			Std360_Sp1	25%	94%	6%	5.664	0.346	6.010
			Std360_Sp2	25%	94%	6%	5.664	0.346	6.010
	North	31%	Std360_Sp3	25%	94%	6%	5.664	0.346	6.010
			Std360_Sp4	25%	94%	6%	5.664	0.346	6.010
	-						Standa	rd Subtotal	78.048
	East	28%	TRBO_090N	100%	94%	6%	2.813	0.172	2.985
Tail Rotor /	South	25%	TRBO_180N	100%	94%	6%	2.538	0.155	2.693
Boost Off	West	17%	TRBO_270N	100%	94%	6%	1.702	0.104	1.806
	North	31%	TRBO_360N	100%	94%	6%	3.139	0.192	3.331
							External Loa	ad Subtutal	10.814
	Fact	200/	T_09_Sp1W	70%	94%	6%	3.065	0.187	3.252
	Last	20 /0	T_09_SpNM	5%	94%	6%	0.219	0.013	0.232
		25.04	T_18_Sp1W	70%	94%	6%	2.765	0.169	2.934
TLA: Tactics	South	25%	T_18_SpNM	5%	94%	6%	0.198	0.012	0.210
Side	1.0		T_27_Sp2W	70%	94%	6%	1.855	0.113	1.968
	West	1/%	T_27_SpNM	5%	94%	6%	0.132	0.008	0.141
			T_36_Sp2W	70%	94%	6%	3.421	0.209	3.629
	North	31%	T_36_SpNM	5%	94%	6%	0.244	0.015	0.259
	and a		T_NA09_Dw	12.5%	94%	6%	0.547	0.033	0.581
	East	28%	T_NA09_Up	12.5%	94%	6%	0.547	0.033	0.581
		1	T_NA18_Dw	12.5%	94%	6%	0.494	0.030	0.524
TLA: Normal	South	25%	T_NA18_Up	12.5%	94%	6%	0.494	0.030	0.524
Side	1		T_NA27_Dw	12.5%	94%	6%	0.331	0.020	0.351
	West	17%	T_NA27 Up	12.5%	94%	6%	0.331	0.020	0.351
			T NA36 Dw	12.5%	94%	6%	0.611	0.037	0.648
	North	31%	T NA36 Up	12.5%	94%	6%	0.611	0.037	0.648
							π	A Subtotal	16.834
							Patte	rn Subtotal	143.034
								TOTAL	162 700

	NOLF Sit	te X Helic	opter Annual Ave	erage Daily	Flight O	perations fo	or Proposed	Action	
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	-	2000	ArrE_090N	60%	94%	6%	0.468	0.029	0.497
	East	28%	ArrE_090T	40%	94%	6%	0.312	0.019	0.331
		250	ArrE_180N	60%	94%	6%	0.422	0.026	0.448
Arr. from	South	25%	ArrE_180T	40%	94%	6%	0.282	0.017	0.299
East		170	ArrE_270N	60%	94%	6%	0.283	0.017	0.301
	west	1/%	ArrE_270T	40%	94%	6%	0.189	0.012	0.200
			ArrE_360N	60%	94%	6%	0.522	0.032	0.554
	North	31%	ArrE_360T	40%	94%	6%	0.348	0.021	0.369
						Arr	ival from Ea	st Subtotal	2.999
	-	2004	ArrW_090N	60%	94%	6%	1.404	0.086	1.490
	East	28%	ArrW_090T	40%	94%	6%	0.936	0.057	0.993
		110	ArrW_180N	60%	94%	6%	1.267	0.077	1.344
Arr. from	South	25%	ArrW_180T	40%	94%	6%	0.845	0.052	0.896
West	1.000		ArrW_270N	60%	94%	6%	0.850	0.052	0.902
	West	17%	ArrW_270T	40%	94%	6%	0.566	0.035	0.601
		31%	ArrW_360N	60%	94%	6%	1.567	0.096	1.663
	North	31%	ArrW_360T	40%	94%	6%	1.045	0.064	1.108
						Arri	al from We	st Subtotal	8.997
							Arriv	val Subtotal	11.996
3.		1000	DEP_TF	50%	94%	6%	5.653	0.345	5.998
Dep.	ALL	100%	DEP_WOA	50%	94%	6%	5.653	0.345	5.998
							Departu	re Subtotal	11.996
	East	28%	AR90_090	100%	94%	6%	3.432	0.209	3.641
90°	South	25%	AR90_180	100%	94%	6%	3.096	0.189	3.285
rotation	West	17%	AR90_270	100%	94%	6%	2.077	0.127	2.203
The second second	North	31%	AR90_360	100%	94%	6%	3.830	0.234	4.063
						90°	Autorotati	on Subtotal	13.193
1	East	28%	AR180_090	100%	94%	6%	3.432	0.209	3.641
180*	South	25%	AR180_180	100%	94%	6%	3.096	0.189	3.285
rotation	West	17%	AR180_270	100%	94%	6%	2.077	0.127	2.203
	North	31%	AR180_360	100%	94%	6%	3.830	0.234	4.063
						180°	Autorotati	on Subtotal	13.193

	NOLF Sit	te X Helic	opter Annual Ave	erage Daily	Flight O	perations fo	or Proposed	Action	
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	East	28%	CLA_090	100%	94%	6%	1.781	0.109	1.889
Confined	South	25%	CLA_180	100%	94%	6%	1.607	0.098	1.705
Landing Area	West	17%	CLA_270	100%	94%	6%	1.077	0.066	1.143
	North	31%	CLA_360	100%	94%	6%	1.987	0.121	2.108
						Confined	Landing Are	ea Subtotal	6.845
	East	28%	EL_090TD	100%	94%	6%	0.089	0.005	0.095
External	South	25%	EL_180TD	100%	94%	6%	0.080	0.005	0.085
Load on Tactical Duty	West	17%	EL_270TD	100%	94%	6%	0.054	0.003	0.057
	North	31%	EL_360TD	100%	94%	6%	0.099	0.006	0.106
				-		1	External Los	ad Subtutal	0.343
	24		HST090_N	60%	94%	6%	0.801	0.049	0.850
	tast	28%	HST090_T	40%	94%	6%	0.534	0.033	0.567
	South	1.2.2.1	HST180_N	60%	94%	6%	0.723	0.044	0.767
High Speed		h 25%	HST180_T	40%	94%	6%	0.482	0.029	0.511
Tactical	West	Vest 17%	HST270_N	60%	94%	6%	0.485	0.030	0.514
			HST270_T	40%	94%	6%	0.323	0.020	0.343
		1444	HST360_N	60%	94%	6%	0.894	0.055	0.949
	North	31%	HST360_T	40%	94%	6%	0.596	0.036	0.633
						High	Speed Tactio	al Subtotal	5.134
	East	28%	PinnA_090	50%	94%	6%	0.890	0.054	0.945
	South	25%	PinnA_180	50%	94%	6%	0.803	0.049	0.852
Pinnade A	West	17%	PinnA_270	50%	94%	6%	0.539	0.033	0.572
	North	31%	PinnA_360	50%	94%	6%	0.994	0.061	1.054
	East	28%	PinnB_090	50%	94%	6%	0.890	0.054	0.945
and the second	South	25%	PinnB_180	50%	94%	6%	0.803	0.049	0.852
Pinnacle B	West	17%	PinnB_270	50%	94%	6%	0.539	0.033	0.572
	North	31%	PinnB_360	50%	94%	6%	0.994	0.061	1.054
	-		and the local distances of				Pinnad	le Subtotal	6.845

NOLF Site X Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Proposed Action											
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total		
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night			
			Std090_Sp1	25%	94%	6%	6.192	0.378	6.570		
	Cash	200/	Std090_Sp2	25%	94%	6%	6.192	0.378	6.570		
	Cast	2070	Std090_Sp3	25%	94%	6%	6.192	0.378	6.570		
			Std090_Sp4	25%	94%	6%	6.192	0.378	6.570		
	-		Std180_Sp1	25%	94%	6%	5.587	0.341	5.927		
	Caral	25.04	Std180_Sp2	25%	94%	6%	5.587	0.341	5.927		
	South	25%	Std180_Sp3	25%	94%	6%	5.587	0.341	5.927		
distant.			Std180_Sp4	25%	94%	6%	5.587	0.341	5.927		
Standard			Std270_Sp1	25%	94%	6%	3.747	0.229	3.975		
			Std270_Sp2	25%	94%	6%	3.747	0.229	3.975		
	West	17%	Std270_Sp3	25%	94%	6%	3.747	0.229	3.975		
			Std270_Sp4	25%	94%	6%	3.747	0.229	3.975		
			Std360_Sp1	25%	94%	6%	6.910	0.422	7.332		
			Std360_Sp2	25%	94%	6%	6.910	0.422	7.332		
	North	31%	Std360_Sp3	25%	94%	6%	6.910	0.422	7.332		
			Std360_Sp4	25%	94%	6%	6.910	0.422	7.332		
	-						Standa	rd Subtotal	95.220		
	East	28%	TRBO_090N	100%	94%	6%	3.432	0.209	3.641		
Tail Rotor /	South	25%	TRBO_180N	100%	94%	6%	3.096	0.189	3.285		
Boost Off	West	17%	TRBO_270N	100%	94%	6%	2.077	0.127	2.203		
	North	31%	TRBO_360N	100%	94%	6%	3.830	0.234	4.063		
							External Loa	d Subtutal	13.193		
	East	200/	T_09_Sp1W	70%	94%	6%	3.740	0.228	3.968		
	Last	20 /0	T_09_SpNM	5%	94%	6%	0.267	0.016	0.283		
		25.04	T_18_Sp1W	70%	94%	6%	3.374	0.206	3.580		
TLA: Tactics	South	25%	T_18_SpNM	5%	94%	6%	0.241	0.015	0.256		
Side	1.0		T_27_Sp2W	70%	94%	6%	2.263	0.138	2.401		
	West	17%	T_27_SpNM	5%	94%	6%	0.162	0.010	0.171		
			T_36_Sp2W	70%	94%	6%	4.173	0.255	4.428		
	North	31%	T_36_SpNM	5%	94%	6%	0.298	0.018	0.316		
	in e		T_NA09_Dw	12.5%	94%	6%	0.668	0.041	0.709		
	East	28%	T_NA09_Up	12.5%	94%	6%	0.668	0.041	0.709		
		1	T_NA18_Dw	12.5%	94%	6%	0.602	0.037	0.639		
TLA: Normal	South	25%	T_NA18_Up	12.5%	94%	6%	0.602	0.037	0.639		
Side	1		T_NA27_Dw	12.5%	94%	6%	0.404	0.025	0.429		
	West	17%	T NA27 Up	12.5%	94%	6%	0.404	0.025	0.429		
			T NA36 Dw	12.5%	94%	6%	0.745	0.045	0.791		
	North	31%	T NA36 Up	12.5%	94%	6%	0.745	0.045	0.791		
							π	A Subtotal	20.538		
1							Patte	rn Subtotal	174.504		
								TOTAL	198 497		

Appendix C-5 NOLF Harold Distribution of Operations

	NOLF Harold Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Baseline									
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total	
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night		
			ARR_E_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.321	0.003	0.323	
	Fact	170/	ARR_E_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.321	0.003	0.323	
	EdSL	1770	ARR_E_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.321	0.003	0.323	
			ARR_E_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.321	0.003	0.323	
			ARR_N_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.592	0.005	0.596	
	North	210/	ARR_N_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.592	0.005	0.596	
	NOTUT	51/0	ARR_N_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.592	0.005	0.596	
0			ARR_N_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.592	0.005	0.596	
Arr.			ARR_S_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.478	0.004	0.482	
	Cauth	250/	ARR_S_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.478	0.004	0.482	
	South	25%	ARR_S_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.478	0.004	0.482	
			ARR_S_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.478	0.004	0.482	
			ARR_W_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.530	0.004	0.534	
		200/	ARR_W_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.530	0.004	0.534	
	west	28%	ARR_W_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.530	0.004	0.534	
			ARR_W_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.530	0.004	0.534	
							Arrival	Subtotal	7.745	
Dep.	West	28%	HST270	100%	100%	0%	0.643	0.000	0.643	
						l	Departure	Subtotal	0.718	
	East	170/	CAL_E_01	50%	100%	0%	0.519	0.000	0.519	
	East	1770	CAL_E_02	50%	100%	0%	0.519	0.000	0.519	
	North	31%	CAL_N_01	50%	100%	0%	0.957	0.000	0.957	
Confined			CAL_N_02	50%	100%	0%	0.957	0.000	0.957	
Air Landing	Cth	250/	CAL_S_01	50%	100%	0%	0.774	0.000	0.774	
	South	25%	CAL_S_02	50%	100%	0%	0.774	0.000	0.774	
		2024	CAL_W_01	50%	100%	0%	0.858	0.000	0.858	
	West	28%	CAL_W_02	50%	100%	0%	0.858	0.000	0.858	
							CAL	Subtotal	6.216	
			CAR90_E01	33%	100%	0%	0.998	0.000	0.998	
	East	17%	CAR90_E02	33%	100%	0%	0.998	0.000	0.998	
			CAR90_E03	33%	100%	0%	0.998	0.000	0.998	
			CAR90_N01	10%	100%	0%	0.552	0.000	0.552	
	N	24.04	CAR90_N02	10%	100%	0%	0.552	0.000	0.552	
	North	31%	CAR90_N03	40%	100%	0%	2.209	0.000	2.209	
90°			CAR90_N04	40%	100%	0%	2.209	0.000	2.209	
Auto- rotation			CAR90_S01	10%	100%	0%	0.446	0.000	0.446	
rotation	C	250/	CAR90_S02	10%	100%	0%	0.446	0.000	0.446	
	South	25%	CAR90_S03	40%	100%	0%	1.786	0.000	1.786	
			CAR90_S04	40%	100%	0%	1.786	0.000	1.786	
			CAR90_W01	33%	100%	0%	1.650	0.000	1.650	
	West	28%	CAR90_W02	33%	100%	0%	1.650	0.000	1.650	
			CAR90_W03	33%	100%	0%	1.650	0.000	1.650	
						90° Aut	orotation	Subtotal	17.932	

	NOLF	Harold	Helicopter Annual	Average Dai	ily Flight O	perations f	or Baselin	е	
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
			CAR180_E01	33%	100%	0%	0.998	0.000	0.998
	East	17%	CAR180_E02	33%	100%	0%	0.998	0.000	0.998
			CAR180_E03	33%	100%	0%	0.998	0.000	0.998
			CAR180_N01	10%	100%	0%	0.552	0.000	0.552
	North	210/	CAR180_N02	10%	100%	0%	0.552	0.000	0.552
	NOTUT	5170	CAR180_N03	40%	100%	0%	2.209	0.000	2.209
180°			CAR180_N04	40%	100%	0%	2.209	0.000	2.209
rotation			CAR180_S01	10%	100%	0%	0.446	0.000	0.446
	South	25%	CAR180_S02	10%	100%	0%	0.446	0.000	0.446
	South	25%	CAR180_S03	40%	100%	0%	1.786	0.000	1.786
			CAR180_S04	40%	100%	0%	1.786	0.000	1.786
			CAR180_W01	33%	100%	0%	1.650	0.000	1.650
	West	28%	CAR180_W02	33%	100%	0%	1.650	0.000	1.650
			CAR180_W03	33%	100%	0%	1.650	0.000	1.650
						180° Aut	orotation	Subtotal	17.932
	East	17%	CEL_E_01	100%	100%	0%	1.038	0.000	1.038
External	North	31%	CEL_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.915	0.000	1.915
Load	South	25%	CEL_S_01	100%	100%	0%	1.548	0.000	1.548
	West	28%	CEL_W_01	100%	100%	0%	1.716	0.000	1.716
		External Load Sul						Subtotal	6.216
	East	17%	CPN_E_01	100%	100%	0%	1.038	0.000	1.038
Pinnacle	North	31%	CPN_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.915	0.000	1.915
	South	25%	CPN_S_01	100%	100%	0%	1.548	0.000	1.548
	West	28%	CPN_W_01	100%	100%	0%	1.716	0.000	1.716
							Pinnacle	Subtotal	6.216
			CST_E_01	33%	99%	1%	8.152	0.111	8.262
	East	17%	CST_E_02	33%	99%	1%	8.152	0.111	8.262
			CST_E_03	33%	99%	1%	8.152	0.111	8.262
			CST_N_01	10%	99%	1%	4.510	0.061	4.572
	North	31%	CST_N_02	10%	99%	1%	4.510	0.061	4.572
	Nor an	5170	CST_N_03	40%	99%	1%	18.041	0.245	18.286
Standard			CST_N_04	40%	99%	1%	18.041	0.245	18.286
Stundard			CST_S_01	10%	99%	1%	3.646	0.050	3.696
	South	25%	CST_S_02	10%	99%	1%	3.646	0.050	3.696
	50000	2370	CST_S_03	40%	99%	1%	14.585	0.198	14.783
			CST_S_04	40%	99%	1%	14.585	0.198	14.783
			CST_W_01	33%	99%	1%	13.472	0.183	13.655
	West	28%	CST_W_02	33%	99%	1%	13.472	0.183	13.655
			CST_W_03	33%	99%	1%	13.472	0.183	13.655
							Standard	Subtotal	148.427

	NOLF Harold Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Baseline										
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total		
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night			
			CTL_E_01	33%	100%	0%	1.038	0.000	1.038		
	East	17%	CTL_E_02	33%	100%	0%	1.038	0.000	1.038		
			CTL_E_03	33%	100%	0%	1.038	0.000	1.038		
			CTL_N_01	33%	100%	0%	1.915	0.000	1.915		
	North	31%	CTL_N_02	33%	100%	0%	1.915	0.000	1.915		
Testical			CTL_N_03	33%	100%	0%	1.915	0.000	1.915		
Tactical			CTL_S_01	33%	100%	0%	1.548	0.000	1.548		
	South	25%	CTL_S_02	33%	100%	0%	1.548	0.000	1.548		
			CTL_S_03	33%	100%	0%	1.548	0.000	1.548		
			CTL_W_01	33%	100%	0%	1.716	0.000	1.716		
	West	28%	CTL_W_02	33%	100%	0%	1.716	0.000	1.716		
			CTL_W_03	33%	100%	0%	1.716	0.000	1.716		
							Tactica	Subtotal	18.649		
	East	17%	HST090	100%	100%	0%	0.779	0.000	0.779		
High Speed	South	25%	HST180	100%	100%	0%	1.161	0.000	1.161		
Tactical	West	28%	HST270	100%	100%	0%	1.287	0.000	1.287		
	North	31%	HST360	100%	100%	0%	1.436	0.000	1.436		
						High Spe	ed Tactica	Subtotal	4.663		
							Pattern	Subtotal	226.252		
								TOTAL	234.715		

Γ	NOLF Harold Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Proposed Action										
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total		
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night			
			ARR_E_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.276	0.002	0.278		
	Fast	17%	ARR_E_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.276	0.002	0.278		
	Last	1770	ARR_E_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.276	0.002	0.278		
			ARR_E_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.276	0.002	0.278		
			ARR_N_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.509	0.004	0.513		
	North	21%	ARR_N_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.509	0.004	0.513		
	NOTUT	5170	ARR_N_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.509	0.004	0.513		
Arr			ARR_N_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.509	0.004	0.513		
AII.			ARR_S_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.411	0.003	0.415		
	South	25%	ARR_S_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.411	0.003	0.415		
	300011	2370	ARR_S_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.411	0.003	0.415		
			ARR_S_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.411	0.003	0.415		
			ARR_W_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.456	0.004	0.460		
	Wost	<b>२०</b> %	ARR_W_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.456	0.004	0.460		
	West	2070	ARR_W_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.456	0.004	0.460		
			ARR_W_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.456	0.004	0.460		
							Arrival	Subtotal	6.663		
Dep.	West	28%	HST270	100%	100%	0%	0.554	0.000	0.554		
						[	Departure	Subtotal	0.618		
	East	170/	CAL_E_01	50%	100%	0%	0.447	0.000	0.447		
	East	1770	CAL_E_02	50%	100%	0%	0.447	0.000	0.447		
	North	31%	CAL_N_01	50%	100%	0%	0.824	0.000	0.824		
Confined			CAL_N_02	50%	100%	0%	0.824	0.000	0.824		
Landing	Courth	25.0/	CAL_S_01	50%	100%	0%	0.666	0.000	0.666		
	South	25%	CAL_S_02	50%	100%	0%	0.666	0.000	0.666		
	Most	200/	CAL_W_01	50%	100%	0%	0.738	0.000	0.738		
	west	28%	CAL_W_02	50%	100%	0%	0.738	0.000	0.738		
							CAL	Subtotal	5.348		
			CAR90_E01	33%	100%	0%	0.859	0.000	0.859		
	East	17%	CAR90_E02	33%	100%	0%	0.859	0.000	0.859		
			CAR90_E03	33%	100%	0%	0.859	0.000	0.859		
			CAR90_N01	10%	100%	0%	0.475	0.000	0.475		
	North	21%	CAR90_N02	10%	100%	0%	0.475	0.000	0.475		
	NOTUT	51/0	CAR90_N03	40%	100%	0%	1.901	0.000	1.901		
90°			CAR90_N04	40%	100%	0%	1.901	0.000	1.901		
rotation			CAR90_S01	10%	100%	0%	0.384	0.000	0.384		
	South	25%	CAR90_S02	10%	100%	0%	0.384	0.000	0.384		
5	South	23%	CAR90_S03	40%	100%	0%	1.536	0.000	1.536		
			CAR90_S04	40%	100%	0%	1.536	0.000	1.536		
			CAR90_W01	33%	100%	0%	1.419	0.000	1.419		
	West	28%	CAR90_W02	33%	100%	0%	1.419	0.000	1.419		
			CAR90_W03	33%	100%	0%	1.419	0.000	1.419		
						90° Aut	orotation	Subtotal	15.427		

	NOLF Har	old Helio	copter Annual Aver	rage Daily Fl	light Opera	tions for P	roposed A	ction	
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
			CAR180_E01	33%	100%	0%	0.859	0.000	0.859
	East	17%	CAR180_E02	33%	100%	0%	0.859	0.000	0.859
			CAR180_E03	33%	100%	0%	0.859	0.000	0.859
			CAR180_N01	10%	100%	0%	0.475	0.000	0.475
	North	21%	CAR180_N02	10%	100%	0%	0.475	0.000	0.475
	North	21/0	CAR180_N03	40%	100%	0%	1.901	0.000	1.901
180°			CAR180_N04	40%	100%	0%	1.901	0.000	1.901
rotation			CAR180_S01	10%	100%	0%	0.384	0.000	0.384
	South	25%	CAR180_S02	10%	100%	0%	0.384	0.000	0.384
	South	25%	CAR180_S03	40%	100%	0%	1.536	0.000	1.536
			CAR180_S04	40%	100%	0%	1.536	0.000	1.536
			CAR180_W01	33%	100%	0%	1.419	0.000	1.419
	West	28%	CAR180_W02	33%	100%	0%	1.419	0.000	1.419
			CAR180_W03	33%	100%	0%	1.419	0.000	1.419
						180° Aut	orotation	Subtotal	15.427
	East	17%	CEL_E_01	100%	100%	0%	0.893	0.000	0.893
External	North	31%	CEL_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.647	0.000	1.647
Load	South	25%	CEL_S_01	100%	100%	0%	1.332	0.000	1.332
	West	28%	CEL_W_01	100%	100%	0%	1.476	0.000	1.476
						Exte	ernal Load	Subtotal	5.348
	East	17%	CPN_E_01	100%	100%	0%	0.893	0.000	0.893
Pinnacle	North	31%	CPN_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.647	0.000	1.647
	South	25%	CPN_S_01	100%	100%	0%	1.332	0.000	1.332
	West	28%	CPN_W_01	100%	100%	0%	1.476	0.000	1.476
							Pinnacle	Subtotal	5.348
			CST_E_01	33%	99%	1%	7.013	0.095	7.108
	East	17%	CST_E_02	33%	99%	1%	7.013	0.095	7.108
			CST_E_03	33%	99%	1%	7.013	0.095	7.108
			CST_N_01	10%	99%	1%	3.880	0.053	3.933
	North	31%	CST_N_02	10%	99%	1%	3.880	0.053	3.933
	Nor an	5170	CST_N_03	40%	99%	1%	15.521	0.211	15.732
Standard			CST_N_04	40%	99%	1%	15.521	0.211	15.732
Standara			CST_S_01	10%	99%	1%	3.137	0.043	3.180
:	South	25%	CST_S_02	10%	99%	1%	3.137	0.043	3.180
	30000	2370	CST_S_03	40%	99%	1%	12.548	0.170	12.718
			CST_S_04	40%	99%	1%	12.548	0.170	12.718
			CST_W_01	33%	99%	1%	11.590	0.157	11.748
	West	28%	CST_W_02	33%	99%	1%	11.590	0.157	11.748
			CST_W_03	33%	99%	1%	11.590	0.157	11.748
							Standard	Subtotal	127.693

	NOLF Harold Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Proposed Action									
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total	
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night		
			CTL_E_01	33%	100%	0%	0.893	0.000	0.893	
	East	17%	CTL_E_02	33%	100%	0%	0.893	0.000	0.893	
			CTL_E_03	33%	100%	0%	0.893	0.000	0.893	
			CTL_N_01	33%	100%	0%	1.647	0.000	1.647	
	North	31%	CTL_N_02	33%	100%	0%	1.647	0.000	1.647	
Testical			CTL_N_03	33%	100%	0%	1.647	0.000	1.647	
Tactical			CTL_S_01	33%	100%	0%	1.332	0.000	1.332	
	South	25%	CTL_S_02	33%	100%	0%	1.332	0.000	1.332	
			CTL_S_03	33%	100%	0%	1.332	0.000	1.332	
			CTL_W_01	33%	100%	0%	1.476	0.000	1.476	
	West	28%	CTL_W_02	33%	100%	0%	1.476	0.000	1.476	
			CTL_W_03	33%	100%	0%	1.476	0.000	1.476	
							Tactica	l Subtotal	16.044	
	East	17%	HST090	100%	100%	0%	0.670	0.000	0.670	
High Speed	South	25%	HST180	100%	100%	0%	0.999	0.000	0.999	
Tactical	West	28%	HST270	100%	100%	0%	1.107	0.000	1.107	
	North	31%	HST360	100%	100%	0%	1.236	0.000	1.236	
						High Spe	ed Tactica	Subtotal	4.012	
							Pattern	Subtotal	194.647	
								TOTAL	201.928	

	NOLF Harold Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for No Action									
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total	
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night		
			ARR_E_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.226	0.002	0.228	
	Fast	170/	ARR_E_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.226	0.002	0.228	
	EdSL	1770	ARR_E_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.226	0.002	0.228	
			ARR_E_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.226	0.002	0.228	
			ARR_N_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.417	0.003	0.421	
	North	210/	ARR_N_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.417	0.003	0.421	
	North	51%	ARR_N_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.417	0.003	0.421	
٨٣٣			ARR_N_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.417	0.003	0.421	
Arr.			ARR_S_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.337	0.003	0.340	
	South	250/	ARR_S_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.337	0.003	0.340	
	South	23%	ARR_S_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.337	0.003	0.340	
			ARR_S_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.337	0.003	0.340	
			ARR_W_01L	25%	99%	1%	0.374	0.003	0.377	
	West	200/	ARR_W_02L	25%	99%	1%	0.374	0.003	0.377	
	west	28%	ARR_W_01R	25%	99%	1%	0.374	0.003	0.377	
			ARR_W_02R	25%	99%	1%	0.374	0.003	0.377	
							Arrival	Subtotal	5.462	
Dep.	West	28%	HST270	100%	100%	0%	0.454	0.000	0.454	
						[	Departure	Subtotal	0.506	
	East	170/	CAL_E_01	50%	100%	0%	0.366	0.000	0.366	
	East	1770	CAL_E_02	50%	100%	0%	0.366	0.000	0.366	
	North	31%	CAL_N_01	50%	100%	0%	0.675	0.000	0.675	
Confined	North		CAL_N_02	50%	100%	0%	0.675	0.000	0.675	
Landing	Cauth	25.0/	CAL_S_01	50%	100%	0%	0.546	0.000	0.546	
	South	25%	CAL_S_02	50%	100%	0%	0.546	0.000	0.546	
	Mash	200/	CAL_W_01	50%	100%	0%	0.605	0.000	0.605	
	west	28%	CAL_W_02	50%	100%	0%	0.605	0.000	0.605	
							CAL	Subtotal	4.384	
			CAR90_E01	33%	100%	0%	0.704	0.000	0.704	
	East	17%	CAR90_E02	33%	100%	0%	0.704	0.000	0.704	
			CAR90_E03	33%	100%	0%	0.704	0.000	0.704	
			CAR90_N01	10%	100%	0%	0.389	0.000	0.389	
	North	210/	CAR90_N02	10%	100%	0%	0.389	0.000	0.389	
	North	51/0	CAR90_N03	40%	100%	0%	1.558	0.000	1.558	
90°			CAR90_N04	40%	100%	0%	1.558	0.000	1.558	
rotation			CAR90_S01	10%	100%	0%	0.315	0.000	0.315	
	South	250/	CAR90_S02	10%	100%	0%	0.315	0.000	0.315	
	Jouth	23%	CAR90_S03	40%	100%	0%	1.259	0.000	1.259	
			CAR90_S04	40%	100%	0%	1.259	0.000	1.259	
			CAR90_W01	33%	100%	0%	1.163	0.000	1.163	
	West	28%	CAR90_W02	33%	100%	0%	1.163	0.000	1.163	
			CAR90_W03	33%	100%	0%	1.163	0.000	1.163	
						90° Aut	orotation	Subtotal	12.645	

NOLF Harold Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for No Action										
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total	
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night		
			CAR180_E01	33%	100%	0%	0.704	0.000	0.704	
	East	17%	CAR180_E02	33%	100%	0%	0.704	0.000	0.704	
			CAR180_E03	33%	100%	0%	0.704	0.000	0.704	
			CAR180_N01	10%	100%	0%	0.389	0.000	0.389	
	North	210/	CAR180_N02	10%	100%	0%	0.389	0.000	0.389	
	North	31%	CAR180_N03	40%	100%	0%	1.558	0.000	1.558	
180°			CAR180_N04	40%	100%	0%	1.558	0.000	1.558	
rotation			CAR180_S01	10%	100%	0%	0.315	0.000	0.315	
	с. н	250/	CAR180_S02	10%	100%	0%	0.315	0.000	0.315	
	South	25%	CAR180_S03	40%	100%	0%	1.259	0.000	1.259	
			CAR180_S04	40%	100%	0%	1.259	0.000	1.259	
			CAR180_W01	33%	100%	0%	1.163	0.000	1.163	
	West	28%	CAR180_W02	33%	100%	0%	1.163	0.000	1.163	
			CAR180_W03	33%	100%	0%	1.163	0.000	1.163	
						180° Aut	orotation	Subtotal	12.645	
	East	17%	CEL_E_01	100%	100%	0%	0.732	0.000	0.732	
External	North	31%	CEL_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.350	0.000	1.350	
Load	South	25%	CEL_S_01	100%	100%	0%	1.092	0.000	1.092	
	West	28%	CEL_W_01	100%	100%	0%	1.210	0.000	1.210	
						Exte	ernal Load	Subtotal	4.384	
	East	17%	CPN_E_01	100%	100%	0%	0.732	0.000	0.732	
Pinnacle	North	31%	CPN_N_01	100%	100%	0%	1.350	0.000	1.350	
T IIIIdele	South	25%	CPN_S_01	100%	100%	0%	1.092	0.000	1.092	
	West	28%	CPN_W_01	100%	100%	0%	1.210	0.000	1.210	
							Pinnacle	Subtotal	4.384	
			CST_E_01	33%	99%	1%	5.748	0.078	5.826	
	East	17%	CST_E_02	33%	99%	1%	5.748	0.078	5.826	
			CST_E_03	33%	99%	1%	5.748	0.078	5.826	
			CST_N_01	10%	99%	1%	3.180	0.043	3.224	
	North	21%	CST_N_02	10%	99%	1%	3.180	0.043	3.224	
	NOTUT	51/0	CST_N_03	40%	99%	1%	12.722	0.173	12.895	
Standard			CST_N_04	40%	99%	1%	12.722	0.173	12.895	
Stanuaru			CST_S_01	10%	99%	1%	2.571	0.035	2.606	
	Cauth	250/	CST_S_02	10%	99%	1%	2.571	0.035	2.606	
	South	25%	CST_S_03	40%	99%	1%	10.285	0.140	10.425	
			CST_S_04	40%	99%	1%	10.285	0.140	10.425	
			CST_W_01	33%	99%	1%	9.500	0.129	9.629	
	West	28%	CST_W_02	33%	99%	1%	9.500	0.129	9.629	
			CST_W_03	33%	99%	1%	9.500	0.129	9.629	
			-				Standard	Subtotal	104.665	

	NOLF Harold Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for No Action										
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total		
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night			
			CTL_E_01	33%	100%	0%	0.732	0.000	0.732		
	East	17%	CTL_E_02	33%	100%	0%	0.732	0.000	0.732		
			CTL_E_03	33%	100%	0%	0.732	0.000	0.732		
			CTL_N_01	33%	100%	0%	1.350	0.000	1.350		
	North	31%	CTL_N_02	33%	100%	0%	1.350	0.000	1.350		
Tactical			CTL_N_03	33%	100%	0%	1.350	0.000	1.350		
Tactical			CTL_S_01	33%	100%	0%	1.092	0.000	1.092		
	South	25%	CTL_S_02	33%	100%	0%	1.092	0.000	1.092		
			CTL_S_03	33%	100%	0%	1.092	0.000	1.092		
			CTL_W_01	33%	100%	0%	1.210	0.000	1.210		
	West	28%	CTL_W_02	33%	100%	0%	1.210	0.000	1.210		
			CTL_W_03	33%	100%	0%	1.210	0.000	1.210		
							Tactica	Subtotal	13.151		
	East	17%	HST090	100%	100%	0%	0.549	0.000	0.549		
High Speed	South	25%	HST180	100%	100%	0%	0.819	0.000	0.819		
Tactical	West	28%	HST270	100%	100%	0%	0.908	0.000	0.908		
	North	31%	HST360	100%	100%	0%	1.013	0.000	1.013		
						High Spe	ed Tactica	Subtotal	3.288		
							Pattern	Subtotal	159.544		
								TOTAL	165.512		

Appendix C-6 NOLF Santa Rosa Distribution of Operations

NOLF Santa Rosa Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Baseline									
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
	Fact	170/	ARR_E_01L	50%	100%	0%	1.110	0.000	1.110
	EdSt	1770	ARR_E_01R	50%	100%	0%	1.110	0.000	1.110
	North	210/	ARR_N_01L	50%	100%	0%	2.048	0.000	2.048
Day	North	31%	ARR_N_01R	50%	100%	0%	2.048	0.000	2.048
Arr.	Couth	250/	ARR_S_01L	50%	100%	0%	1.655	0.000	1.655
	South	25%	ARR_S_01R	50%	100%	0%	1.655	0.000	1.655
	West	200/	ARR_W_01L	50%	100%	0%	1.835	0.000	1.835
	west	28%	ARR_W_01R	50%	100%	0%	1.835	0.000	1.835
			_			Da	ytime Arriv	al Subtotal	13.297
	Fact	17%	ARR_E_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.042	0.042
	Lasi	1770	ARR_E_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.042	0.042
	North	210/	ARR_N_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.078	0.078
Night	North	31%	ARR_N_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.078	0.078
Arr.	Cauth	25%	ARR_S_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.063	0.063
	South	25%	ARR_S_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.063	0.063
	West	200/	ARR_W_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.070	0.070
	west	28%	ARR_W_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.070	0.070
						Nigł	nttime Arriv	al Subtotal	0.509
							Arriv	al Subtotal	13.806
Den	Couth	250/	HST_S	25%	100%	0%	0.939	0.000	0.939
Dep.	South	25%	HST_W	75%	100%	0%	1.041	0.000	1.041
							Departu	re Subtotal	266.775
	East	17%	CAR90_E01	100%	100%	0%	8.043	0.000	8.043
90°	North	31%	CAR90_N01	100%	100%	0%	14.833	0.000	14.833
rotation	South	25%	CAR90_S01	100%	100%	0%	11.992	0.000	11.992
	West	28%	CAR90_W01	100%	100%	0%	13.292	0.000	13.292
						90°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	48.159
	East	17%	CAR180_E01	100%	100%	0%	8.043	0.000	8.043
180°	North	31%	CAR180_N01	100%	100%	0%	14.833	0.000	14.833
rotation	South	25%	CAR180_S01	100%	100%	0%	11.992	0.000	11.992
	West	28%	CAR180_W01	100%	100%	0%	13.292	0.000	13.292
						180°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	48.159

NOLF Santa Rosa Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Baseline											
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total		
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night			
			CST_E_01	20%	98%	2%	11.545	0.190	11.735		
			CST_E_02	20%	98%	2%	11.545	0.190	11.735		
	East	17%	CST_E_03	20%	98%	2%	11.545	0.190	11.735		
			CST_E_04	20%	98%	2%	11.545	0.190	11.735		
			CST_E_05	20%	98%	2%	11.545	0.190	11.735		
			CST_N_01	20%	98%	2%	21.293	0.351	21.644		
			CST_N_02	20%	98%	2%	21.293	0.351	21.644		
	North	31%	CST_N_03	20%	98%	2%	21.293	0.351	21.644		
			CST_N_04	20%	98%	2%	21.293	0.351	21.644		
Standard			CST_N_05	20%	98%	2%	21.293	0.351	21.644		
Stanuaru			CST_S_01	20%	98%	2%	17.214	0.284	17.498		
			CST_S_02	20%	98%	2%	17.214	0.284	17.498		
	South	25%	CST_S_03	20%	98%	2%	17.214	0.284	17.498		
			CST_S_04	20%	98%	2%	17.214	0.284	17.498		
			CST_S_05	20%	98%	2%	17.214	0.284	17.498		
			CST_W_01	20%	98%	2%	19.080	0.315	19.395		
			CST_W_02	20%	98%	2%	19.080	0.315	19.395		
	West 28%	28%	CST_W_03	20%	98%	2%	19.080	0.315	19.395		
			CST_W_04	20%	98%	2%	19.080	0.315	19.395		
			CST_W_05	20%	98%	2%	19.080	0.315	19.395		
							Standa	rd Subtotal	351.359		
	Fact	ast 17%	CTL_E_01	50%	100%	0%	2.519	0.000	2.519		
	Last	1770	CTL_E_02	50%	100%	0%	2.519	0.000	2.519		
	North	210/	CTL_N_01	50%	100%	0%	4.647	0.000	4.647		
Tectical	NOTUT	51%	CTL_N_02	50%	100%	0%	4.647	0.000	4.647		
Tactical	Cauth	250/	CTL_S_01	50%	100%	0%	3.756	0.000	3.756		
	South	25%	CTL_S_02	50%	100%	0%	3.756	0.000	3.756		
	<b>14</b> /+	200/	CTL_W_01	50%	100%	0%	4.164	0.000	4.164		
	West	28%	CTL_W_02	50%	100%	0%	4.164	0.000	4.164		
							Tactio	al Subtotal	30.173		
Tail	East	17%	CTRB_E_01	100%	100%	0%	8.043	0.000	8.043		
Rotor/	North	31%	CTRB_N_01	100%	100%	0%	14.833	0.000	14.833		
Boost	South	25%	CTRB_S_01	100%	100%	0%	11.992	0.000	11.992		
Off	West	28%	CTRB_W_01	100%	100%	0%	13.292	0.000	13.292		
						Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	off Subtotal	48.159		
	East	17%	HST_E	100%	100%	0%	1.260	0.000	1.260		
High Speed	North	31%	HST_N	100%	100%	0%	2.323	0.000	2.323		
Tactical	South	25%	HST_S	100%	100%	0%	1.878	0.000	1.878		
	West	28%	HST_W	100%	100%	0%	2.082	0.000	2.082		
						High	Speed Tactio	al Subtotal	7.542		
							Patte	rn Subtotal	533.550		
								TOTAL	814.131		

NOLF Santa Rosa Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Proposed Action										
Track Type	Course Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total		
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night		
Day Arr.	East	17%	ARR_E_01L	50%	100%	0%	1.339	0.000	1.339	
			ARR_E_01R	50%	100%	0%	1.339	0.000	1.339	
	North	31%	ARR_N_01L	50%	100%	0%	2.470	0.000	2.470	
			ARR_N_01R	50%	100%	0%	2.470	0.000	2.470	
	South	25%	ARR_S_01L	50%	100%	0%	1.997	0.000	1.997	
			ARR_S_01R	50%	100%	0%	1.997	0.000	1.997	
	West	28%	ARR_W_01L	50%	100%	0%	2.213	0.000	2.213	
			ARR_W_01R	50%	100%	0%	2.213	0.000	2.213	
	Daytime Arrival Subtotal							16.036		
Night Arr.	East	17%	ARR_E_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.051	0.051	
			ARR_E_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.051	0.051	
	North	31%	ARR_N_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.095	0.095	
			ARR_N_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.095	0.095	
	South	25%	ARR_S_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.076	0.076	
			ARR_S_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.076	0.076	
	West	28%	ARR_W_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.085	0.085	
			ARR_W_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.085	0.085	
						Nigh	nttime Arriv	val Subtotal	0.614	
							Arriv	al Subtotal	16.650	
Dep.	South	25%	HST_S	25%	100%	0%	1.132	0.000	1.132	
			HST_W	75%	100%	0%	1.255	0.000	1.255	
Departure Subtotal 321.73										
90° Auto- rotation	East	17%	CAR90_E01	100%	100%	0%	9.699	0.000	9.699	
	North	31%	CAR90_N01	100%	100%	0%	17.889	0.000	17.889	
	South	25%	CAR90_S01	100%	100%	0%	14.462	0.000	14.462	
	West	28%	CAR90_W01	100%	100%	0%	16.030	0.000	16.030	
	90° Autorotation Subtotal								58.080	
180° Auto- rotation	East	17%	CAR180_E01	100%	100%	0%	9.699	0.000	9.699	
	North	31%	CAR180_N01	100%	100%	0%	17.889	0.000	17.889	
	South	25%	CAR180_S01	100%	100%	0%	14.462	0.000	14.462	
	West	28%	CAR180_W01	100%	100%	0%	16.030	0.000	16.030	
180° Autorotation Subtotal										

NOLF Santa Rosa Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for Proposed Action										
Track Type Course F		e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total	
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night		
			CST_E_01	20%	98%	2%	13.923	0.230	14.153	
	East	17%	CST_E_02	20%	98%	2%	13.923	0.230	14.153	
			CST_E_03	20%	98%	2%	13.923	0.230	14.153	
			CST_E_04	20%	98%	2%	13.923	0.230	14.153	
			CST_E_05	20%	98%	2%	13.923	0.230	14.153	
	North	31%	CST_N_01	20%	98%	2%	25.679	0.423	26.103	
			CST_N_02	20%	98%	2%	25.679	0.423	26.103	
			CST_N_03	20%	98%	2%	25.679	0.423	26.103	
			CST_N_04	20%	98%	2%	25.679	0.423	26.103	
Standard			CST_N_05	20%	98%	2%	25.679	0.423	26.103	
Stanuaru		25%	CST_S_01	20%	98%	2%	20.760	0.342	21.102	
			CST_S_02	20%	98%	2%	20.760	0.342	21.102	
	South		CST_S_03	20%	98%	2%	20.760	0.342	21.102	
			CST_S_04	20%	98%	2%	20.760	0.342	21.102	
			CST_S_05	20%	98%	2%	20.760	0.342	21.102	
			CST_W_01	20%	98%	2%	23.011	0.379	23.391	
			CST_W_02	20%	98%	2%	23.011	0.379	23.391	
	West	28%	CST_W_03	20%	98%	2%	23.011	0.379	23.391	
			CST_W_04	20%	98%	2%	23.011	0.379	23.391	
			CST_W_05	20%	98%	2%	23.011	0.379	23.391	
Standard Subtotal									423.743	
	East	17%	CTL_E_01	50%	100%	0%	3.038	0.000	3.038	
Tactical			CTL_E_02	50%	100%	0%	3.038	0.000	3.038	
	North	31%	CTL_N_01	50%	100%	0%	5.604	0.000	5.604	
			CTL_N_02	50%	100%	0%	5.604	0.000	5.604	
	South	25%	CTL_S_01	50%	100%	0%	4.530	0.000	4.530	
			CTL_S_02	50%	100%	0%	4.530	0.000	4.530	
	West	28%	CTL_W_01	50%	100%	0%	5.022	0.000	5.022	
			CTL_W_02	50%	100%	0%	5.022	0.000	5.022	
Tactical Subtotal 36.3										
Tail	East	17%	CTRB_E_01	100%	100%	0%	9.699	0.000	9.699	
Rotor/	North	31%	CTRB_N_01	100%	100%	0%	17.889	0.000	17.889	
Boost	South	25%	CTRB_S_01	100%	100%	0%	14.462	0.000	14.462	
Uff	West	28%	CTRB_W_01	100%	100%	0%	16.030	0.000	16.030	
Tail Rotor/Boost Off Subtotal										
	East	17%	HST_E	100%	100%	0%	1.519	0.000	1.519	
High Speed Tactical	North	31%	HST_N	100%	100%	0%	2.802	0.000	2.802	
	South	25%	HST_S	100%	100%	0%	2.265	0.000	2.265	
	West	28%	HST_W	100%	100%	0%	2.511	0.000	2.511	
						High	Speed Tactio	al Subtotal	9.096	
Pattern Subtotal									643.469	
								TOTAL	981.853	
NOLF Santa Rosa Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for No Action										
---	-----------	-----------	------------	---------	-------	---------	--------------	-------------	---------	
Track Type	Course	Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total	
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night		
	Fact	170/	ARR_E_01L	50%	100%	0%	1.098	0.000	1.098	
	EdSt		ARR_E_01R	50%	100%	0%	1.098	0.000	1.098	
	North	210/	ARR_N_01L	50%	100%	0%	2.024	0.000	2.024	
Day	North	31%	ARR_N_01R	50%	100%	0%	2.024	0.000	2.024	
Arr.	Couth	250/	ARR_S_01L	50%	100%	0%	1.636	0.000	1.636	
	South	25%	ARR_S_01R	50%	100%	0%	1.636	0.000	1.636	
	West	200/	ARR_W_01L	50%	100%	0%	1.814	0.000	1.814	
	west	28%	ARR_W_01R	50%	100%	0%	1.814	0.000	1.814	
						Da	ytime Arriv	al Subtotal	13.144	
	Fact	17%	ARR_E_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.042	0.042	
	EdSt	1770	ARR_E_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.042	0.042	
	North	210/	ARR_N_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.077	0.077	
Night	North	31%	ARR_N_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.077	0.077	
Arr.	Cauth	250/	ARR_S_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.063	0.063	
	South 25%	25%	ARR_S_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.063	0.063	
	West	200/	ARR_W_02L	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.069	0.069	
	west	28%	ARR_W_02R	50%	0%	100%	0.000	0.069	0.069	
						Nigł	nttime Arriv	al Subtotal	0.503	
							Arriv	al Subtotal	13.647	
Den	Couth	250/	HST_S	25%	100%	0%	0.928	0.000	0.928	
Dep.	ep. South	South 25%	HST_W	75%	100%	0%	1.029	0.000	1.029	
							Departu	re Subtotal	263.712	
	East	17%	CAR90_E01	100%	100%	0%	7.950	0.000	7.950	
90°	North	31%	CAR90_N01	100%	100%	0%	14.663	0.000	14.663	
rotation	South	25%	CAR90_S01	100%	100%	0%	11.854	0.000	11.854	
	West	28%	CAR90_W01	100%	100%	0%	13.139	0.000	13.139	
						90°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	47.606	
	East	17%	CAR180_E01	100%	100%	0%	7.950	0.000	7.950	
180°	North	31%	CAR180_N01	100%	100%	0%	14.663	0.000	14.663	
rotation	South	25%	CAR180_S01	100%	100%	0%	11.854	0.000	11.854	
	West	28%	CAR180_W01	100%	100%	0%	13.139	0.000	13.139	
						180°	Autorotatio	on Subtotal	47.606	

NOLF Santa Rosa Helicopter Annual Average Daily Flight Operations for No Action									
Track Type	Course	e Flow		Profile			Acoustic	Acoustic	Total
	Dir	Use	ID	% Use	% Day	% Night	Day	Night	
			CST_E_01	20%	98%	2%	11.412	0.188	11.601
			CST_E_02	20%	98%	2%	11.412	0.188	11.601
	East	17%	CST_E_03	20%	98%	2%	11.412	0.188	11.601
			CST_E_04	20%	98%	2%	11.412	0.188	11.601
			CST_E_05	20%	98%	2%	11.412	0.188	11.601
			CST_N_01	20%	98%	2%	21.048	0.347	21.395
			CST_N_02	20%	98%	2%	21.048	0.347	21.395
	North	31%	CST_N_03	20%	98%	2%	21.048	0.347	21.395
			CST_N_04	20%	98%	2%	21.048	0.347	21.395
Standard			CST_N_05	20%	98%	2%	21.048	0.347	21.395
Stanuaru			CST_S_01	20%	98%	2%	17.016	0.281	17.297
			CST_S_02	20%	98%	2%	17.016	0.281	17.297
	South	25%	CST_S_03	20%	98%	2%	17.016	0.281	17.297
			CST_S_04	20%	98%	2%	17.016	0.281	17.297
			CST_S_05	20%	98%	2%	17.016	0.281	17.297
			CST_W_01	20%	98%	2%	18.861	0.311	19.172
			CST_W_02	20%	98%	2%	18.861	0.311	19.172
	West	28%	CST_W_03	20%	98%	2%	18.861	0.311	19.172
			CST_W_04	20%	98%	2%	18.861	0.311	19.172
			CST_W_05	20%	98%	2%	18.861	0.311	19.172
							Standa	rd Subtotal	347.325
	Fact	17%	CTL_E_01	50%	100%	0%	2.490	0.000	2.490
	North 31%	1770	CTL_E_02	50%	100%	0%	2.490	0.000	2.490
		210/	CTL_N_01	50%	100%	0%	4.593	0.000	4.593
Tectical		51%	CTL_N_02	50%	100%	0%	4.593	0.000	4.593
Tactical	Cauth	250/	CTL_S_01	50%	100%	0%	3.713	0.000	3.713
	South	25%	CTL_S_02	50%	100%	0%	3.713	0.000	3.713
		CTL_W_C	CTL_W_01	50%	100%	0%	4.116	0.000	4.116
	west	28%	CTL_W_02	50%	100%	0%	4.116	0.000	4.116
							Tactio	al Subtotal	29.826
Tail	East	17%	CTRB_E_01	100%	100%	0%	7.950	0.000	7.950
Rotor/	North	31%	CTRB_N_01	100%	100%	0%	14.663	0.000	14.663
Boost	South	25%	CTRB_S_01	100%	100%	0%	11.854	0.000	11.854
Off	West	28%	CTRB_W_01	100%	100%	0%	13.139	0.000	13.139
			-			Tail Ro	tor/Boost C	Off Subtotal	47.606
	East	17%	HST_E	100%	100%	0%	1.245	0.000	1.245
High Speed	North	31%	HST_N	100%	100%	0%	2.296	0.000	2.296
Tactical	South	25%	HST_S	100%	100%	0%	1.857	0.000	1.857
	West	28%	HST_W	100%	100%	0%	2.058	0.000	2.058
						High	Speed Tactio	al Subtotal	7.456
							Patte	rn Subtotal	527.425
								TOTAL	804.784

## Appendix A1 Discussion of Noise and Its Effects on the Environment

This page intentionally left blank.

## Acknowledgements

This review of noise and its effects on the environment was prepared by Wyle Laboratories, Inc., with contributions from Blue Ridge Research and Consulting LLC and Ecology and Environment, Inc.

This page intentionally left blank.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

A1	DISCUS	SION OF NOISE AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT	1-11
	A1.1	Basics of SoundA	1-11
		A1.1.1 Sound Waves and DecibelsA2	1-11
		A1.1.2 Sound Levels and Types of SoundsA2	1-14
		A1.1.3 Low-Frequency Noise	1-15
	A1.2	Noise MetricsA	1-16
		A1.2.1 Single Events	1-17
		A1.2.2 Cumulative EventsA2	1-18
		A1.2.3 Supplemental MetricsA2	1-21
	A1.3	Noise EffectsA	1-21
		A1.3.1 AnnoyanceA2	1-22
		A1.3.2 Speech InterferenceA2	1-28
		A1.3.3 Sleep Disturbance	1-31
		A1.3.4 Noise-Induced Hearing ImpairmentA2	1-34
		A1.3.5 Nonauditory Health EffectsA2	1-41
		A1.3.6 Performance Effects	1-49
		A1.3.7 Noise Effects on ChildrenA2	1-50
		A1.3.8 Property ValuesA2	1-54
		A1.3.9 Noise-Induced Vibration Effects on Structures and HumansA2	1-55
		A1.3.10 Noise Effects on Terrain	1-58
		A1.3.11 Noise Effects on Historical and Archaeological Sites	1-58
		A1.3.12 Effects on Domestic Animals and WildlifeA2	1-59
	A1.4	ReferencesA	1-74

## List of Figures

Figure A-1	Sound Waves from a Vibrating Tuning Fork A1-11
Figure A-2	Frequency Characteristics of A- and C-Weighting A1-13
Figure A-3	Typical A-weighted Sound Levels of Common Sounds A1-15
Figure A-4	Sample Time History of Noise Generated by an Aircraft Flyover Event
Figure A-5	Example of $L_{eq(24)}$ , DNL, and CNEL Computed from Hourly Equivalent Sound
	Levels
Figure A-6	Typical DNL or CNEL Ranges in Various Types of Communities A1-20
Figure A-7	Schultz Curve Relating Noise Annoyance to DNL A1-23
Figure A-8	Response of Communities to Noise: A Comparison of Original Schultz (1978)
	Curve to Finegold et al (1994) Curve A1-24
Figure A-9	Percent Highly Annoyed: A Comparison of ISO 1996-1 to FICON 1992 A1-26
Figure A-10	Speech Intelligibility Curve
Figure A-11	FICAN 1997 Recommended Sleep Disturbance Dose-Response Relationship A1-32
Figure A-12	RANCH Study Reading Scores Varying with $L_{\mbox{\tiny eq}}$ A1-51
Figure A-13	Depiction of Sound Transmission through Built Construction A1-56

## List of Tables

Table A-1	Non-Acoustic Variables Influencing Aircraft Noise Annoyance	A1-24
Table A-2	Percent Highly Annoyed by Different Transportation-Noise Sources	A1-25
Table A-3	Indoor Noise Level Criteria Based on Speech Intelligibility	A1-31
Table A-4	Probability of Awakening from NA90SEL	A1-33
Table A-5	Average (Ave.) NIPTS and $10^{\text{th}}$ Percentile NIPTS as a Function of $L_{\text{eq}(24)}$	A1-36
Table A-6	Vibration Criteria for the Evaluation of Human Exposure to Whole-Body	
	Vibration	A1-58

This page intentionally left blank.

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
AGL	Above Ground Level
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
СНАВА	Committee on Hearing, Bioacoustics, and Biomechanics
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
dB	Decibel
dBA or dB(A)	A-Weighted Decibel
DLR	German Aerospace Center (Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt e.V.)
DNL	Day-Night Average Sound Level
DNWG	Defense Noise Working Group
DoD	Department of Defense
EU	European Union
FAA	(U.S.) Federal Aviation Administration
FICAN	Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise
FICON	Federal Interagency Committee on Noise
HYENA	Hypertension and Exposure to Noise near Airports
Hz	Hertz
IHD	Ischemic heart disease
IRR	Incidence Rate Ratio
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
L	Sound Level
LAX	Los Angeles International Airport
L <sub>ct</sub>	Community Tolerance Level
L <sub>dn</sub>	Day-Night Average Sound Level

Acronym	Definition
Ldnmr	Onset-Rate Adjusted Monthly Day-Night Average Sound Level
L <sub>eq</sub>	Equivalent Sound Level
Leq(24)	Equivalent Sound Level over 24 hours
L <sub>eq(30min)</sub>	Equivalent Sound Level over 30 minutes
L <sub>eq(8)</sub>	Equivalent Sound Level over 8 hours
Leq(h)	Hourly Equivalent Sound Level
L <sub>max</sub>	Maximum Sound Level
L <sub>pk</sub>	Peak Sound Pressure Level
mmHg	millimeters of mercury
NA	Number of Events Above
NAL	Number of Events Above a Threshold Level
NDI	Noise Depreciation Index
NIPTS	Noise-induced Permanent Threshold Shift
NORAH	Noise-Related Annoyance, Cognition, and Health
OSHA	United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PHL	Potential Hearing Loss
PTS	Permanent Threshold Shift
RANCH	Road Traffic and Aircraft Noise Exposure and Children's Cognition and Health
SEL	Sound Exposure Level
SIL	Speech Interference Level
SUA	Special Use Airspace
ТА	Time Above
TTS	Temporary Threshold Shift

Acronym	Definition
U.S.	United States
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

Acronym	Definition
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
WHO	World Health Organization

## A1 Discussion of Noise and its Effects on the Environment

This appendix discusses sound and noise, and the potential effects of noise, particularly aircraft noise, on the human and natural environment. Section A1.1 provides an overview of the basics of sound and noise. Section A1.2 defines and describes the various metrics used to describe noise. Section A1.3 reviews the potential effects of aircraft noise, focusing on effects on humans but also addressing effects on property values, terrain, structures, and animals. Section A1.4 contains the list of references cited.

#### A1.1 Basics of Sound

Section A1.1 describes sound waves and decibels, and Section A1.2 describes sound levels and types of sounds.

#### A1.1.1 Sound Waves and Decibels

Sound consists of minute vibrations that travel through the air and are sensed by the human ear. Figure A-1 depicts how sound waves emanate from a tuning fork. As shown, the waves move outward as a series of crests, in which the air is compressed, and troughs, in which the air is expanded. The height of the crests and the depth of the troughs determines the *amplitude* of the wave. The sound *pressure* determines the sound wave's energy, or intensity. The number of crests or troughs that pass a given point each second is called the *frequency* of the sound wave.



Figure A-1 Sound Waves from a Vibrating Tuning Fork

The measurement and human perception of sound involves three basic physical characteristics: intensity, frequency, and duration.

- *Intensity* is a measure of the acoustic energy of a sound and is related to sound pressure. The greater the sound pressure, the more energy is carried by the sound and the louder the perception of that sound will be.
- *Frequency* determines how the pitch of a sound is perceived. Low-frequency sounds are characterized as rumbles or roars, while high-frequency sounds are often described as sounding like sirens or screeches.

• *Duration* is the length of time a sound can be detected.

The loudest sounds that can be comfortably heard by the human ear have intensities a trillion times higher than those of sounds barely heard. Because of this vast range, it is unwieldy to use a linear scale to represent the intensity of sound. As a result, a logarithmic unit known as the decibel (dB) is used to represent the intensity of a sound. Such a representation is called a sound level and is abbreviated as L. A sound level of 0 dB is approximately the threshold of human hearing and is barely audible under extremely quiet listening conditions. Normal speech has a sound level of approximately 60 dB. Sound levels above 120 dB would be uncomfortable for the average person, and levels of 130 to 140 dB would start to be felt as pain (Berglund and Lindvall, 1995). It is important to realize some people will be more sensitive to sound and some less sensitive; therefore, the level at which sound becomes uncomfortable or painful will vary across the population.

As shown in Figure A-1, the sound from a tuning fork spreads out uniformly as it travels from its source. This spreading causes the sound's intensity to decrease with distance from the source. For a point source of a sound, such as an air conditioning unit, the sound level will decrease by about 6 dB for every doubling of its distance from a receptor. For a busy highway, which creates a linear distribution of noise sources, the sound level will decrease by 3 to 4.5 dB for every doubling of distance.

As sound travels from its source, it is also absorbed by the air. The amount of absorption depends on the frequency composition of the sound and the temperature and humidity of the air. Sound with high-frequency content, such as a human voice, gets absorbed by the air more readily than sound with low-frequency content, such as a military jet. More sound is absorbed in colder and drier air than in hot and wet air. Sound is also affected by wind and temperature gradients, terrain (elevation and ground cover), and structures.

Because of the logarithmic nature of the dB unit, sound levels cannot simply be added or subtracted and are somewhat cumbersome to handle mathematically. However, some simple rules are useful in understanding sound levels.

First, if a sound's intensity is doubled, the sound level increases by 3 dB, regardless of the initial sound level. For example:

60 dB + 60 dB = 63 dB, and 80 dB + 80 dB = 83 dB.

Second, the total sound level produced by two sounds of different levels is usually only slightly greater than the higher of the two. For example:

Because the addition of sounds of differing levels is different than that of simply adding numbers, this process is often referred to as "decibel addition."

The minimum change in the sound level of individual events that an average human ear can detect is about 3 dB. On average, a person perceives a change in sound level of about 10 dB as a doubling (or halving) of that sound's loudness. This relation holds true for both loud and quiet sounds. A decrease in sound level of 10 dB actually represents a 90-percent decrease in sound intensity but only a 50-percent decrease in perceived loudness because the human ear does not respond to sound linearly. Intensity of a sound is the physical measure of the stimulus, and loudness of a sound is the perceptual measure of a listener's response to it.

Sound frequency is measured in terms of cycles per second, or hertz (Hz). The normal ear of a young person can detect sounds that range in frequency from about 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz. Not all sounds in this wide range of frequencies are heard equally. Human hearing is most sensitive to frequencies in the 1,000 to 4,000 Hz range, and as we get older, we lose the ability to hear high-frequency sounds. The notes on a piano range in frequency from just over 27 Hz to 4,186 Hz, with middle C equal to 261.6 Hz. Most sounds (including a single note on a piano) are not simply pure tones like those produced by the tuning fork in Figure A-1 but instead contain a mix, or spectrum, of many frequencies.

Sounds with different frequency spectra are perceived differently even if the sound levels are the same. Weighting curves have been developed to correspond to the sensitivity and perception of different frequencies of sound. A-weighting and C-weighting are the two most common frequency weightings. These two curves, shown in Figure A-2, are adequate to quantify most environmental sounds. Aweighting puts emphasis on the 1,000 to 4,000 Hz frequency range.

Very loud or impulsive sounds, such as explosions or sonic booms, can sometimes be felt and can cause secondary effects, such as shaking of a structure or rattling of windows. These types of sounds can add to annoyance and are best measured by C-weighted sound levels, denoted dBC. C-weighting is nearly flat throughout the audible frequency range and includes low frequencies that may not be heard but cause shaking or rattling. C-weighting approximates the human ear's sensitivity to higher intensity sounds. For example, using the A-weighted curve, a 125 Hz tone at moderate sound levels (around 50 dB) is perceived to be about 17 dB lower than a 1,000 Hz tone. However, using the C-weighted curve, if the sound level is increased to 100 dB, the two tones are perceived to be the same level.





#### A1.1.2 Sound Levels and Types of Sounds

Most environmental sounds are measured and described as A-weighted sound levels, and they may be labeled as dBA or dB(A) rather than dB. When the use of A-weighting is understood, the term "A-weighted" is often omitted, and the unit dB is used. Unless otherwise stated, dB units refer to A-weighted sound levels.

Sound becomes noise when it is unwelcome and interferes with normal activities, such as sleep or conversation. Noise is unwanted sound and can become an issue when its level exceeds the ambient or background sound level. Ambient sound levels in urban areas typically vary from 60 to 70 dB but can be as high as 80 dB in the center of a large city. Quiet suburban neighborhoods experience ambient sound levels around 45 to 50 dB (USEPA [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency], 1978).

Figure A-3 is a chart of dBA sound levels emitted from common sources. For some sources depicted on the figure, such as the air conditioner and vacuum cleaner, the sound levels shown are continuous sounds, and these sound levels are constant for some time. For other sources depicted on the figure, such as the automobile and heavy truck, the sound levels shown are the maximum sound level emitted during an intermittent event such as a vehicle pass-by. Some sound levels shown, for sources such as "urban daytime" and "urban nighttime," are average sound levels over extended periods. A variety of noise metrics have been developed to describe noise over different time periods. These are discussed in detail in Section A1.2.

Aircraft noise consists of two major types of sound events: flight (including takeoffs, landings, and flyovers) and stationary, such as engine maintenance run-ups. The former are intermittent and the latter primarily continuous. Noise from aircraft overflights typically occurs beneath main approach and departure paths at an airfield, in local air traffic patterns around the airfield, and in areas near aircraft parking ramps and staging areas. As aircraft climb, the noise received on the ground drops to lower levels, eventually fading into the background or ambient levels.

Impulsive noises are generally short, loud events, with a single-event duration that is usually less than 1 second. Examples of impulsive noises are small-arms gunfire, hammering, pile driving, metal impacts during rail-yard shunting operations, and riveting. Examples of high-energy impulsive sounds are explosions associated with quarrying or mining operations; sonic booms; demolition explosions; and industrial processes that use high explosives; military ordnance use (e.g., armor, artillery, and mortar fire, and bomb detonation); explosive ignition of rockets and missiles; and any other explosive source where the equivalent mass of dynamite exceeds 25 grams (ANSI [American National Standards Institute], 1996).



Source: Harris 1979.



#### A1.1.3 Low-Frequency Noise

Normally, the components of a structure most sensitive to airborne noise are the windows and, infrequently, the plastered walls and ceilings. An evaluation of the sound pressures impinging on the structure may be used to assess the risk for damage. In general, sound pressure levels below 130 dB (unweighted) are unlikely to pose a risk to structures. While certain frequencies (such as 30 Hz for window breakage) may be of more concern than other frequencies, conservatively, only sounds lasting more than one second and at a sound pressure level above 130 dB (unweighted) are potentially damaging to structural components (CHABA [Committee on Hearing, Bioacoustics, and Biomechanics] 1977).

Noise-induced structural vibration may result from aircraft operating at low altitudes, which would occur during takeoff and landing operations. Such vibrations are likely to cause annoyance to dwelling occupants because of induced secondary vibrations or rattling of objects within the dwelling such as hanging pictures, dishes, plaques, and bric-a-brac. Window panes may also vibrate noticeably when exposed to high levels of airborne noise. In general, such noise-induced vibrations occur at sound pressure levels of 110 dB (unweighted) or greater.

Aside from concerns about potential structural damage from low-frequency noise, the perception of low-frequency sound may differ considerably when compared with mid- or high-frequency sound. Laboratory measurements of annoyance from low-frequency noise each use different spectra and levels, making comparisons difficult, but the majority share the same conclusion that annoyance caused by low-frequency sound increases rapidly with level and that dBA sound level alone can underestimate the effects of low-frequency noises (Leventhall, 2004). The most recent update to the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standard (ISO 1996:1 [2016]) describes the main causes for these differences as:

- a weakening of pitch sensation as the frequency of the sound decreases below 60 Hz;
- a perception of sounds as pulsations and fluctuations;
- a much more rapid increase in loudness and annoyance with increasing sound pressure levels at low frequencies than at middle or high frequencies;
- complaints about feelings of ear pressure;
- an annoyance caused by secondary effects such as rattling of buildings elements, windows, and doors, or the tinkling of bric-a-brac;
- less building sound-transmission loss at low frequencies than at middle or high frequencies.

While the Federal Interagency Committee of Noise (FICON) recommends the use of the dBA Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) metric as the primary basis of both commercial and military aircraft noise impacts (FICON, 1992), in a recent update to a research needs statement, the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) stated the following for low-frequency noise concerns:

FICAN finds that additional research needs to be conducted before a [low-frequency noise] metric and an associated dose-response relationship can be recommended. For airports with low-frequency noise concerns, supplemental noise analysis--possibly including vibration measurements--should be considered (FICAN, 2018).

#### A1.2 Noise Metrics

Noise metrics quantify sounds so they can be compared with each other, and with their effects, in a standard way. The simplest metric is the overall dBA sound level, which is appropriate by itself for quantifying constant noise such as that generated by an air conditioner. However, unlike noise from an air conditioning unit, aircraft flyover noise varies with time. During an aircraft overflight, noise starts at the background level, rises to a maximum level as the aircraft flies close to the receptor, and then returns to the background as the aircraft recedes into the distance. An example graph of the resulting sound levels from a flyover is provided in Figure A-4, which also indicates two metrics (Maximum Sound Level [Lmax] and Sound Exposure Level [SEL]), that are described in Section A1.2.1 below.

A number of metrics can be used to describe a range of situations--from the effect of a particular individual noise event to the cumulative effect of all noise events over a long time. This section describes the metrics relevant to environmental noise analysis of aircraft operations.



## A1.2.1 Single Events

#### Maximum Sound Level

The highest dBA sound level measured during a single event in which the sound changes with time, such as a flyover, is called the maximum dBA sound level, or Maximum Sound Level, and is abbreviated  $L_{max}$ . The  $L_{max}$  is depicted for a sample event in Figure A-4.

 $L_{max}$  is the maximum sound level that occurs over a fraction of a second. For aircraft noise, this "fraction of a second" is one-eighth of a second, denoted as "fast" response on a sound-level measurement meter (ANSI, 1988). Slowly varying or steady sounds are generally measured over 1 second and denoted as "slow" response.  $L_{max}$  is important in determining whether a noise event will interfere with conversation, television or radio listening, or other common activities. Although  $L_{max}$  provides some measure of a given sound event, it does not fully describe the noise because it does not account for how long the sound is heard.

#### Peak Sound Pressure Level

The Peak Sound Pressure Level  $(L_{pk})$  is the highest instantaneous level measured by a sound-level measurement meter.  $L_{pk}$  is typically measured every 20 microseconds, and it is usually based on unweighted or linear response of the meter.  $L_{pk}$  is used to describe individual impulsive events, such as blast noise. Because blast noise varies from explosion to explosion and with meteorological (weather) conditions, the United States (U.S.) Department of Defense (DoD) usually characterizes  $L_{pk}$  by the metric PK 15(met), which is the  $L_{pk}$  that is exceeded 15 percent of the time. The "met" notation refers to the metric accounting for varied meteorological or weather conditions.

#### Sound Exposure Level

SEL combines both the intensity of a sound and its duration. For an aircraft flyover, SEL includes the maximum and all lower noise levels produced as part of the overflight, together with how long each part

lasts. SEL represents the total sound energy in the event. Figure A-4 indicates the SEL for a sample flyover event, representing it as if all the sound energy were contained within 1 second.

Because aircraft noise events last more than a few seconds, the SEL value is larger than  $L_{max}$ . SEL does not directly represent the sound level heard at any given time during the event but rather during the entire event. SEL provides a much better measure of aircraft flyover noise exposure than  $L_{max}$  alone.

#### A1.2.2 Cumulative Events

#### **Equivalent Sound Level**

Equivalent Sound Level ( $L_{eq}$ ) is a "cumulative" metric that combines a series of noise events, such as aircraft operations, over a period of time.  $L_{eq}$  is the sound level that represents the dB average SEL of all sounds in a specific time period. Just as SEL has proven to be a good measure of a single event,  $L_{eq}$  has proven to be a good measure of a series of events during a given time period.

The time period of an  $L_{eq}$  measurement is usually related to some activity and is given along with the value. The time period is often shown in parenthesis (e.g.,  $L_{eq(24)}$ , or the equivalent sound level for 24 hours). The  $L_{eq}$  from 7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. may give exposure of noise for a school day and would be represented as  $L_{eq(8)}$ , or the equivalent sound level for 8 hours.

Figure A-5 provides an example of  $L_{eq(24)}$  using notional hourly equivalent sound levels ( $L_{eq(h)}$ ) for each hour of the day as an example. The  $L_{eq(24)}$  for this example is 61 dB.





#### Day-Night Average Sound Level and Community Noise Equivalent Level

DNL, or  $L_{dn}$ , is a cumulative metric that accounts for all noise events, such as aircraft operations, in a 24hour period. However, unlike  $L_{eq(24)}$ , DNL contains a nighttime noise adjustment. To account for humans' increased sensitivity to noise at night, DNL applies a 10 dB adjustment to noise events that occur during the nighttime period, defined as 10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. The notations DNL and  $L_{dn}$  are both used for Day-Night Average Sound Level and are equivalent.

Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is a variation of DNL specified by law in California (California Code of Regulations Title 21, *Public Works*) (Wyle Laboratories, 1970). CNEL has the 10 dB nighttime adjustment for noise events that occur between 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. but also includes a 4.8 dB adjustment for events occurring during the evening period of 7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M. This evening adjustment included in CNEL accounts for the added intrusiveness of sounds occurring during that period.

For airports and military airfields, DNL and CNEL represent the average sound level for an average annual day.

Figure A-5 provides an example of DNL and CNEL using notional  $L_{eq(h)}$  for each hour of the day. Note the  $L_{eq(h)}$  for the hours between 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. have a 10 dB adjustment assigned. For CNEL, the hours between 7:00 P.M. and 10:00 P.M. have a 4.8 dB adjustment assigned. The DNL for this example is 65 dB and the CNEL is 66 dB.

The dB summation nature of these metrics causes the noise levels of the loudest events to control the 24-hour average. As a simple example, consider a case in which only one aircraft overflight occurs during the daytime over a 24-hour period, creating a sound level of 100 dB for 30 seconds. During the remaining 23 hours, 59 minutes, and 30 seconds of that day, the ambient sound level is 50 dB. The DNL for this 24-hour period is 65.9 dB. Assume, as a second example, that 10 such 30-second overflights occur during daytime hours during the next 24-hour period and with the same ambient sound level of 50 dB during the remaining 23 hours and 55 minutes of the day. The DNL for this 24-hour period is 75.5 dB. Clearly, the averaging of noise over a 24-hour period does not ignore the louder single events and tends to emphasize both the sound levels and number of those events.

A feature of the DNL metric is that a given DNL value could result from a very few noisy events or a large number of quieter events. For example, a single overflight at 90 dB creates the same DNL as 10 overflights at 80 dB.

DNL or CNEL do not represent a sound level heard at any given time, but they represent long-term sound exposure. Scientific studies have found good correlation between the percentages of groups of people highly annoyed by noise and their level of average noise exposure measured in DNL (Schultz, 1978; USEPA, 1978).

DNL or CNEL can be used to measure sound levels in a variety of types of communities. Figure A-6 shows the ranges of DNL or CNEL that occur in various types of communities. For example, under a flight path at a major airport, the DNL may exceed 80 dB, while rural areas not near a major airport may experience DNL less than 45 dB. Sound levels in a downtown area of a major metropolis may be equivalent to the sound levels under a flight path of a major airport.



## Onset-Rate Adjusted Monthly Day-Night Average Sound Level (L<sub>dnmr</sub>) and Onset-Rate Adjusted Monthly Community Noise Equivalent Level

Military aircraft utilizing Special Use Airspace (SUA), such as Military Training Routes, Military Operations Areas, and Restricted Areas/Ranges, generate a noise environment that is somewhat different from that generated around airfields. Rather than regularly occurring operations such as those conducted at airfields, activity in SUAs is highly sporadic. SUA activity is often seasonal, ranging from 10 operations per hour to less than one per week. Individual military overflight events also differ from typical community noise events in that noise from a low-altitude, high-airspeed flyover can have a rather sudden onset, with rates of up to 150 dB per second.

The cumulative daily noise metric devised to account for the "surprise" effect of the sudden onset of aircraft noise events on humans and the sporadic nature of SUA activity is  $L_{dnmr}$ . Onset rates between 15 and 150 dB per second require an adjustment of 0 to 11 dB to the event's SEL, while onset rates below 15 dB per second require no adjustment to the event's SEL (Stusnick et al., 1992). The term "monthly" in  $L_{dnmr}$  refers to the noise assessment being conducted for the month with the most operations or sorties-the so-called "busiest month."

In California, a variant of  $L_{dnmr}$  includes an adjustment for evening operations (7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.) and is referred to as the Onset-Rate Adjusted Monthly CNEL.

#### A1.2.3 Supplemental Metrics

#### Number of Events Above a Threshold Level

The Number of Events Above (NA) metric gives the total number of events that exceed a noise threshold level (L) during a specified period of time. Combined with the selected threshold, the metric is denoted NAL. The threshold can be either SEL or  $L_{max}$ , and it is important that this selection is shown in the nomenclature. When labeling a contour line or point of interest, NAL is followed by the number of events in parentheses. For example, where 10 events exceed an SEL of 90 dB over a given period of time, the nomenclature would be NA90SEL(10). Similarly, for  $L_{max}$  it would be NA90L<sub>max</sub>(10). The period of time can be an average 24-hour day, daytime, nighttime, school day, or any other time period appropriate to the nature and application of the analysis.

NA is a supplemental metric. It is not supported by the amount of science behind DNL or CNEL, but it is valuable in helping to describe the number of noise events the community may hear. A threshold level and metric are selected that best meet the need for each situation. An L<sub>max</sub> threshold is normally selected to analyze speech interference, while an SEL threshold is normally selected for analysis of sleep disturbance.

The NA metric is the only supplemental metric that combines single-event noise levels with the number of aircraft operations. In essence, it answers the question of how many aircraft (or range of aircraft) flyover events will occur on average at a given location or area at or above a selected threshold noise level.

#### Time Above a Specified Level

The Time Above (TA) metric is the total time, in minutes, that the dBA noise level is at or above a threshold. Combined with the threshold L, it is denoted TAL. TA can be calculated over a full 24-hour average annual day, the 15-hour daytime and 9-hour nighttime periods, a school day, or any other time period of interest, provided there are operational data for that time.

TA is a supplemental metric, used to help understand noise exposure. It is useful for describing the noise environment in schools, particularly when assessing classroom or other noise-sensitive areas for various scenarios.

TA helps describe the noise exposure of an individual event or many events occurring over a given time period. When computed for a full day, the TA can be compared alongside the DNL in order to determine the sound levels and total duration of events that contribute to the DNL. TA analysis is usually conducted along with NA analysis so the results show not only how many events occur but also the total duration of those events above the threshold.

#### A1.3 Noise Effects

Noise is of concern because of potential adverse effects. The following subsections describe how noise can affect communities and the environment, and how those effects are quantified. The specific topics discussed are:

- annoyance
- speech interference
- sleep disturbance

- noise-induced hearing impairment
- non-auditory health effects
- performance effects
- noise effects on children
- property values
- noise-induced vibration effects on structures and humans
- noise effects on terrain
- noise effects on historical and archaeological sites
- noise effects on domestic animals and wildlife

#### A1.3.1 Annoyance

With the introduction of jet aircraft in the 1950s, it became clear that aircraft noise annoyed people and was a significant problem around airports. Early studies, such as those of Rosenblith et al. (1953) and Stevens et al. (1953), showed that effects depended on the quality of the sound, its level, and the number of flights. Over the next 20 years, considerable research was performed refining this understanding and setting guidelines for noise exposure. In the early 1970s, the USEPA published its "Levels Document" (USEPA, 1974), which reviewed the noise factors that affected communities. DNL (or L<sub>dn</sub>) was identified as an appropriate noise metric, and threshold criteria were recommended.

Threshold criteria for annoyance were identified from social surveys, in which people exposed to noise were asked how noise affected them. Surveys provide direct real-world data on how noise affects actual residents.

Surveys in the early years had a range of designs and formats, and they needed some interpretation to find common ground. In 1978, Schultz showed that the common ground was the number of people "highly annoyed," defined as the upper 28-percent range of whatever response scale a survey used (Schultz, 1978). With that definition, Schultz was able to show a remarkable consistency among the majority of the surveys for which data were available. Figure A-7 shows the result of his study relating DNL to individual annoyance as measured by percent highly annoyed.



Schultz's original synthesis included 161 data points. Figure A-8 compares revised fits of the Schultz data set with an expanded set of 400 data points collected through 1989 (Finegold et al., 1994). The new form of the curve is the preferred form in the U.S., endorsed by FICAN (1997). Other forms have been proposed, such as that of Fidell and Silvati (2004), but these have not gained widespread acceptance.

When the goodness of fit of the Schultz curve is examined, the correlation between groups of people is high, in the range of 85 to 90 percent. However, the correlation between individuals is much lower, at 50 percent or less. This finding is not surprising, given the personal differences between individuals, with some people more sensitive to noise than others. The surveys underlying the Schultz curve include results that show that annoyance from noise is also affected by non-acoustical factors. The influence of non-acoustical factors is a complex interaction influencing an individual's annoyance response to noise (Brisbane Airport Corporation, 2007). Newman and Beattie (1985) divided the non-acoustic factors into the emotional and physical variables shown in Table A-1.



(1994) Curve

#### Table A-1 Non-Acoustic Variables Influencing Aircraft Noise Annoyance

Emotional Variables	Physical Variables
Feeling about the necessity or preventability of the	Type of neighborhood
TIOISE	
Judgement of the importance and value of the activity that is producing the noise	Time of day
Activity at the time an individual hears the noise	Season
Attitude about the environment	Predictability of the noise
General sensitivity to noise	Control over the noise source
Belief about the effect of noise on one's health	Length of time an individual is exposed to a noise
Feeling of fear associated with the noise	

Schreckenberg and Schuemer (2010) and Laszlo et al. (2012) examined the importance of some of these factors on short-term annoyance. Attitudinal factors were identified as having an effect on annoyance. In formal regression analysis, however,  $L_{eq}$  was found to be more important than attitude. Similarly, a series of studies conducted by Marki (2013) at three European airports showed that less than 20 percent of the variance in annoyance can be explained by noise alone (Marki, 2013). Miedema and Voss (1998) found that fear and noise sensitivity have a significant influence on an individual annoyance response. Moreover, in another study, they demonstrated that noise sensitivity is not a function of noise exposure and that noise-sensitive individuals have a steeper annoyance response to increasing noise levels compared to people who are not noise sensitive (Miedema and Vos, 2003).

A study by Plotkin et al. (2011) examined updating DNL to account for these non-acoustic variables. Plotkin et al. (2011) concluded that the data requirements for a general analysis were much greater than are available from most existing studies. It was noted that the most significant issue with DNL is that the metric is not readily understood by the public and that supplemental metrics such as TA and NA were valuable in addressing attitude when communicating noise analysis to communities (DoD, 2009a).

A factor that is partially non-acoustical is the source of the noise. Miedema and Vos (1998) presented synthesis curves for the relationship between DNL and percentage "annoyed" and percentage "highly annoyed" for three transportation-noise sources. Different curves were found for aircraft, road traffic, and railway noise. Table A-2 summarizes their results. Comparing the updated Schultz curve to these results suggests that the percentage of people highly annoyed by aircraft noise may be higher than previously thought. Authors Miedema and Oudshoorn (2001) supplemented that investigation with further derivation of percentage of population highly annoyed as a function of either DNL or DENL<sup>1</sup>, along with the corresponding 95-percent confidence intervals, and obtained similar results.

	Percent Highly Annoyed (%HA)					
	Miedem	Miedema and Vos				
DNL (dB)	Air	Road	Rail	Schultz Combined		
55	12	7	4	3		
60	19	12	7	6		
65	28	18	11	12		
70	37	29	16	22		
75	48	40	22	36		

# Table A-2Percent Highly Annoyed byDifferent Transportation-Noise Sources

Source: Miedema and Vos, 1998.

As noted by the World Health Organization (WHO), however, even though aircraft noise seems to produce a stronger annoyance response than road traffic noise, caution should be exercised when interpreting synthesized data from different studies (WHO, 1999).

Consistent with the WHO's recommendations, FICON considered the Schultz curve to be the best source of dose information to predict community response to noise but recommended further research to investigate the differences in perception of noise from different sources (FICON, 1992).

The ISO update (ISO 1996-1 [2016]) introduced the concept of Community Tolerance Level ( $L_{ct}$ ) as the DNL at which 50 percent of the people in a particular community are predicted to be highly annoyed by noise exposure.  $L_{ct}$  accounts for differences between sources and/or communities when predicting the percentage highly annoyed by noise exposure. ISO also recommended a change to the adjustment range used when comparing aircraft noise to road traffic noise. The previous edition suggested a +3 dB to +6 dB adjustment range for aircraft noise relative to road traffic noise, while the latest edition recommends an adjustment range of +5 dB to +8 dB. This adjustment range allows DNL to be correlated to consistent annoyance rates when originating from different noise sources (i.e. road traffic, aircraft, or railroad). This change to the adjustment range would increase the calculated percent highly annoyed at 65 dB DNL by approximately 2 percent to 5 percent greater than the previous ISO definition. Figure A-9 depicts the estimated percentage of people highly annoyed for a given DNL using both the ISO 1996-1 estimation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> DENL is the Day-Evening-Night Average Sound Level, which is similar to CNEL except it has a 5.0 dB adjustment to the evening period. DENL is not used in the U.S.

and the older FICON 1992 method. The results suggest that the percentage of people highly annoyed may be greater for aircraft noise than previously thought.



Figure A-9 Percent Highly Annoyed: A Comparison of ISO 1996-1 to FICON 1992

In the 2008 Hypertension and Exposure to Noise near Airports (HYENA) study, annoyance levels due to aircraft noise and road traffic noise were assessed in subjects who lived in the vicinity of six major European airports using the 11-point International Commission on Biological Effects of Noise scale. Exposure-response curves for road noise were congruent with the European Union (EU) standard curves used for predicting the number of highly noise-annoyed subjects, but ratings of annoyance due to aircraft noise were higher than predicted. The study supports findings that people's attitude toward aircraft noise has changed over the years and that the EU standard curve for aircraft noise should be modified (Babisch et al., 2009).

The U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is currently conducting a major airport community noise survey at approximately 20 U.S. airports in order to update the relationship between aircraft noise and annoyance (Miller et al., 2014). Results from this study are expected to be released in late 2018.

In a study related to assessing aircraft noise exposure for people in the surrounding community, the Brisbane Airport in Queensland, Australia, assembled a Health Impact Assessment (Volume D7), which discussed, among other noise effects, annoyance and human response to changes in noise exposure versus steady-state response (Section 7.9 of the report) (Brisbane Airport Corporation, 2007). The authors suggest there is a difference between the gradual increase in noise exposure and the additive property of increasing noise levels from a particular event. The latter is called a "step change." The Brisbane Health Impact Assessment references Brown and Kamp (2005), who have reviewed the literature available on human response to such changes. They observe:

"Most information on the relationship between transport noise exposure and subjective reaction (annoyance/dissatisfaction) comes from steady state surveys at sites where there have not been step changes in noise exposure. Environmental appraisals often need to assess the

effects of such step changes in exposure and there is growing evidence that when noise exposure is changed, annoyance-ratings may change more than would be predicted from steady state relationships.

"Conventional wisdom is that human response to a step change in exposure to transport noise can be predicted from exposure-response curves that have been derived from studies where human response has been assessed over a range of steady-state noise conditions. However, in situations where a step change in transport noise exposure has occurred, various surveys suggest that human response may be different, usually greater, as a result of the increase/decrease in noise, to what would be predicted from exposure-response curves derived under steady-state conditions. Further, there are suggestions that such (over)reaction may be more than a short-term effect. (Brown and Kamp, 2005)."

Guski (2004) describes this change effect in a hypothetical model and also notes that where the noise situation is permanently changed, the annoyance of residents usually changes in a way that cannot be predicted by steady-state dose/response relationships. Most studies show an "over reaction" of the residents: with increasing noise levels, people are much more annoyed than would be predicted by steady-state curves, and, with a decrease of noise levels, people are much less annoyed. Guski also notes that the annoyance may change prematurely before the change of levels, with residents expecting an increase in noise levels reacting more annoyed, and residents expecting a decrease in noise levels less annoyed than would be predicted in the steady-state condition.

Brown and Kamp (2005) conclude:

"Our review of the literature on response to changes in noise leads us to the conclusion that we cannot discount the possibility that overreaction to a step change in transport noise may occur, and that this effect may not attenuate over time. However, evidence is still inconclusive and based on limited studies that tend not to be comparable in terms of method, size, design and context. Further, our view is that most explanations given in the literature for an overreaction are only partly supported, in some cases not at all, and generally there is conflicting evidence for them. There is still also no accepted view on the mechanism by which annoyance changes in response to a change in exposure. In particular, most explanations are usually post-hoc and the noise change studies have not been designed to test them. (Brown and Kamp, 2005)."

The Brisbane Airport Corporation Health Impact Assessment suggests that the potential for "overreaction" to stepped changes in noise exists and needs to be recognized; people subject to an increase in noise may experience more annoyance than predicted, while people subject to a decrease in noise may experience less annoyance than predicted. Further, any such over-reaction should not necessarily be assumed to be a temporary phenomenon; evidence from existing studies suggests that it could persist for years after the exposure changes (Brisbane Airport Corporation, 2007).

An individual with an increased sensitivity to sounds may have hyperacusis, which results in a lower tolerance of everyday sound (Aazh et al., 2018). A person with hyperacusis reacts differently to sounds due to reactions of increased distress and discomfort from everyday sounds. This condition arises from a problem with the auditory processes within an afflicted individual's brain. The causes and diagnosis are not well understood (Aazh et al., 2018). Physical causes of hyperacusis may range from head injury, ear damage, or viral diseases, to temporomandibular joint disorders (TMJ). Neurologic causes may range from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), chronic fatigue syndrome, depression, to migraine headaches (American Academy of Otolaryngology--Head and Neck Surgery, 2018). An individual with

hyperacusis will also likely have tinnitus, which may lead to further discomfort. Hyperacusis can lead to misophonia, which may cause an individual to react with abnormally strong emotions and behaviors to specific sounds, but hyperacusis does not cause this reaction. Studies of misphonia are very limited at this time.

Another condition that falls under the condition of hyperacusis is noise sensitivity (Aazh et al., 2018). A noise-sensitive individual is characteristically more prone to being annoyed by environmental noise compared to a non-noise-sensitive person regardless of the overall noise exposure (Kishikawa et al., 2006). This result indicates that the annoyance response for noise-sensitive people is not a direct function of noise exposure levels.

#### A1.3.2 Speech Interference

Speech interference from noise is a primary cause of annoyance for communities. Disruption of routine activities such as radio or television listening, telephone use, or conversation leads to frustration and annoyance. The quality of speech communication is also important in classrooms and offices. In the workplace, speech interference from noise can cause fatigue and vocal strain in those who attempt to talk over the noise. In schools it can impair learning.

Speech comprehension is measured in two ways:

- 1. *Word Intelligibility,* or the percentage of words spoken and understood. This might be especially important for students in the lower grades who are learning the English language and particularly important for students who are studying English as a Second Language.
- 2. Sentence Intelligibility, or the percentage of sentences spoken and understood. This might be especially important for high-school students and adults who are familiar with the language and who do not necessarily have to understand each word spoken in order to understand sentences.

#### U.S. Federal Criteria for Interior Noise

In 1974, the USEPA identified a goal of an indoor  $L_{eq(24)}$  of 45 dB to minimize speech interference based on sentence intelligibility and the presence of steady noise (USEPA, 1974). Figure A-10 shows the effect of steady indoor background sound levels on sentence intelligibility. For an average adult with normal hearing and fluency in the language, steady background indoor sound levels of less than 45 dB  $L_{eq}$  are expected to allow 100-percent sentence intelligibility.



Figure A-10 Speech Intelligibility Curve

The curve in Figure A-10 shows 99-percent intelligibility at  $L_{eq}$  below 54 dB and less than 10 percent above 73 dB. Recalling that  $L_{eq}$  is dominated by louder noise events, the USEPA  $L_{eq(24)}$  goal of 45 dB generally ensures that sentence intelligibility will be high most of the time.

#### **Classroom Criteria**

For teachers to be understood, their regular voice must be clear and uninterrupted. Background noise must be below the teacher's voice level. Intermittent noise events that momentarily drown out the teacher's voice need to be kept to a minimum. It is therefore important to evaluate the steady background noise level, the level of voice communication, and the single-event noise level from aircraft overflights that might interfere with speech.

Lazarus (1990) found that for listeners with normal hearing and fluency in the language, complete sentence intelligibility can be achieved when the signal-to-noise ratio (i.e., a comparison of the level of the sound to the level of background noise) is in the range of 15 to 18 dB. The initial American National Standards Institute (ANSI) classroom noise standard (ANSI, 2010) and American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, 2005) guidelines concur, recommending at least a 15 dB signal-to-noise ratio in classrooms. If the teacher's voice level is at least 50 dB, the background noise level must not exceed an average of 35 dB. The National Research Council of Canada (Bradley, 1993) and the WHO (1999) agree with this criterion for background noise.

For eligibility for noise insulation funding, the FAA guidelines state that the design objective for a classroom environment is 45 dB  $L_{eq}$  during normal school hours (FAA, 1985).

Most aircraft noise is not continuous. Instead, it consists of individual events like the one depicted by the graph in Figure A-4. Since speech interference in the presence of aircraft noise is caused by individual aircraft flyover events, a time-averaged metric alone, such as  $L_{eq}$ , is not necessarily appropriate. In addition to the background level criteria described above, single-event criteria that account for those noisy events are also needed.

A 1984 study for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey recommended using Speech Interference Level (SIL) for classroom noise criteria (Sharp and Plotkin, 1984). SIL is based on the maximum sound levels in the frequency range that most affects speech communication (500 to 2,000 Hz). The study identified an SIL of 45 dB as the goal, a level that would provide 90-percent word intelligibility for the short time periods during aircraft overflights. While SIL is technically the best metric for measuring speech interference, it can be approximated by an L<sub>max</sub> value. An SIL of 45 dB is equivalent to an L<sub>max</sub> of 50 dBA for aircraft noise (Wesler, 1986).

Lind et al. (1998) also concluded that an  $L_{max}$  criterion of 50 dB would result in 90-percent word intelligibility. Bradley (1985) recommends SEL as a better indicator. His work indicates that 95-percent word intelligibility would be achieved when indoor SEL did not exceed 60 dB. For a typical single aircraft overflight, this corresponds to an  $L_{max}$  of 50 dB. While the WHO (1999) only specifies a background  $L_{max}$ criterion, the organization also notes the SIL frequencies and that interference can begin at around 50 dB.

The Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) conducted a study to assess aircraft noise conditions affecting student learning by analyzing the interior and exterior sound levels while observing students and teachers at 11 schools surrounding Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The five schools located under the LAX flight paths experienced frequent overflight events, while the six schools further south of the airport experienced minimal LAX aircraft noise exposure events. The study found a positive correlation between teacher voice-masking or voice-raising and fluctuations in interior noise events. A majority of teachers reported that they felt aircraft noise interfered with teacher-student communication and caused students to lose concentration. However, the student observations were unable to identify any aircraft-noise-related events that caused a distraction in a child. Other students caused the majority of distractions while playing with various items and daydreaming, and were found to be the significant sources of distractions. The authors, as well as the teachers' opinions gathered in the teacher surveys, concluded that even moderate levels of aircraft noise exposure can impact children's learning due to the correlation between voice-masking events and measured interior sound events (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017).

The United Kingdom Department for Education and Skills established in its classroom acoustics guide a 30-minute time-averaged metric of  $L_{eq(30min)}$  for background levels and the metric of  $L_{A1,30min}$  for intermittent noises, at thresholds of 30 to 35 dB and 55 dB, respectively.  $L_{A1,30min}$  represents the dBA sound level that is exceeded 1 percent of the time (in this case, during a 30-minute teaching session) and is generally equivalent to the  $L_{max}$  metric (United Kingdom Department for Education and Skills, 2003).

Table A-3 summarizes the criteria discussed. Other than the FAA (1985) 45 dB  $L_{max}$  criterion, the criteria are consistent with a limit on indoor background noise of 35 to 40 dB  $L_{eq}$  and a single-event limit of 50 dB  $L_{max}$ . It should be noted that the limits listed in Table A-3 were set based on students with normal hearing capability and no special needs. At-risk students may be adversely affected at lower sound levels.

Source	Metric/Level (dB)	Effects and Notes
U.S. FAA (1985)	Leq(during school hours) = 45 dB	Federal assistance criteria for school sound
		be used.
Lind et al. (1998),	L <sub>max</sub> = 50 dB / SIL 45	Single-event level permissible in the classroom.
Sharp and Plotkin (1984),		
Wesler (1986)		
WHO (1999)	L <sub>eq</sub> = 35 dB	Assumes average speech level of 50 dB and
	L <sub>max</sub> = 50 dB	recommends signal-to-noise ratio of 15 dB.
U.S. ANSI (2010)	L <sub>eq</sub> = 35 dB, based on Room	Acceptable background level for continuous and
	Volume (e.g., cubic feet)	intermittent noise.
United Kingdom	L <sub>eq(30min)</sub> = 30-35 dB	Minimum acceptable in classroom and most other
Department for Education	L <sub>max</sub> = 55 dB	learning environs.
and Skills (2003)		

 Table A-3
 Indoor Noise Level Criteria Based on Speech Intelligibility

#### A1.3.3 Sleep Disturbance

Sleep disturbance is a major concern for communities exposed to aircraft noise at night. A large amount of research developed in the laboratory during the past 30 years has produced variable results, suggesting a complex interaction of factors including the noise characteristics and individual sensitivity, rather than a clear dose-effect relationship (Muzet, 2007; Kwak et al., 2016). Sleep disorders may cause negative health effects such as cardiovascular problems, neuroendocrine abnormalities, and changes in cognition, mood, and memory. The causal relationships between noise exposure, effects on sleep, and contribution to health disturbances, both behavioral and physical, are not yet firmly established (Zaharna, 2010; Perron et al., 2012). A number of studies have attempted to quantify the effects of noise on sleep. This section provides an overview of the major noise-induced sleep disturbance studies. Emphasis is on studies that have influenced U.S. federal noise policy. The studies have been separated into two groups:

- 1. Initial studies, conducted in the 1960s and 1970s, in which the research was focused on sleep observations performed under laboratory conditions.
- 2. Later studies, conducted from the 1990s up to the present, in which the research was focused on field observations.

#### Initial Studies

The relationship between noise and sleep disturbance is complex and not fully understood. The disturbance depends not only on the depth of sleep and the noise level but also on the non-acoustic factors cited for annoyance. The easiest effect to measure is the number of arousals or awakenings caused by noise events. Much of the literature has therefore focused on predicting the percentage of the population that will be awakened at various noise levels.

FICON's 1992 review of airport noise issues (FICON, 1992) included an overview of relevant research conducted through the 1970s. Literature reviews and analyses were conducted from 1978 through 1989 using existing data (Griefahn, 1978; Griefahn and Muzet, 1978; Lukas, 1978; Pearsons et. al., 1989). Because of large variability in the data, FICON did not endorse the reliability of those results.

FICON did, however, recommend an interim dose-response curve, awaiting future research. That curve predicted the percentage of the population expected to be awakened as a function of the exposure to SEL. This curve was based on research conducted for the U.S. Air Force (Finegold et al., 1994). The data included most of the research performed up to that point and predicted a 10-percent probability of awakening when exposed to an interior SEL of 58 dB. The data used to derive this curve were primarily from controlled laboratory studies.

#### Recent Sleep Disturbance Research: Field and Laboratory Studies

As noted above, early sleep laboratory studies did not account for some important factors, including habituation to the laboratory, previous exposure to noise, and awakenings from noise other than aircraft. In the early 1990s, field studies in people's homes were conducted to validate the earlier laboratory work conducted in the 1960s and 1970s. The field studies of the 1990s (e.g., Horne et al., 1994) found that 80 to 90 percent of sleep disturbances were not related to outdoor noise events but rather to indoor noises and non-noise factors. The results showed that, in real life conditions, noise had less of an effect on sleep than had been previously reported from laboratory studies. Laboratory sleep studies tend to show more sleep disturbance than field studies show because people who sleep in their own homes are accustomed to their environment and, therefore, do not wake up as easily (FICAN, 1997).

Based on this new information, FICAN in 1997 recommended a dose-response curve to use instead of the earlier 1992 FICON curve (FICAN, 1997). Figure A-11 shows FICAN's curve, the red line, which is based on the results of three field studies, which are also shown in the figure (Ollerhead et al., 1992; Fidell et al., 1994; Fidell et al., 1995a; Fidell et al., 1995b) along with the data from six previous field studies.



#### Number of Events and Awakenings

It is reasonable to expect that sleep disturbance is affected by the number of events. The German Aerospace Center (DLR) conducted an extensive study focused on the effects of nighttime aircraft noise on sleep and related factors (Basner et al., 2004). The DLR study was one of the largest studies to examine the link between aircraft noise and sleep disturbance, and it involved both laboratory and inhome field research phases. The DLR investigators developed a dose-response curve that predicts the number of aircraft events at various values of L<sub>max</sub> expected to produce one additional awakening over the course of a night. The dose-effect curve was based on the relationships found in the field studies.

Later studies by DLR conducted in the laboratory comparing the probability of awakenings from noise generated by different modes of transportation showed that aircraft noise led to significantly lower awakening probabilities than either road traffic or rail noise (Basner et al., 2011). Furthermore, it was noted that the probability of awakening, per noise event, decreased as the number of noise events increased. The authors concluded that by far the majority of awakenings from noise events merely replaced awakenings that would have occurred spontaneously anyway.

A different approach was taken by an ANSI standards committee (ANSI, 2008), which used the average of the data on field studies shown in Figure A-11 rather than the upper envelope (i.e., the red line), to predict average probability of awakening from one event. Probability theory is then used to project the awakening from multiple noise events.

Currently, there are no established criteria for evaluating sleep disturbance from aircraft noise, although recent studies have suggested a benchmark of an outdoor SEL of 90 dB as an appropriate tentative criterion when comparing the effects of different operational alternatives. The corresponding indoor SEL would be approximately 25 dB lower (at 65 dB) with doors and windows closed, and approximately 15 dB lower (at 75 dB) with doors and windows open. According to the ANSI (2008) standard, the probability of awakening from a single aircraft event at this level is between 1 and 2 percent for people habituated to the noise and sleeping in bedrooms with their windows closed, and 2 to 3 percent for those sleeping in bedrooms with their windows open. The probability of the exposed population awakening at least once from multiple aircraft events at noise levels of 90 dB SEL is shown in Table A-4.

Number of Aircraft	Minimum Probability of Awakening at Least Once	
Events at 90 dB SEL for	Windows	Windows
Average 9-Hour Night	Closed	Open
1	1%	2%
3	4%	6%
5	7%	10%
9 (1 per hour)	12%	18%
18 (2 per hour)	22%	33%
27 (3 per hour)	32%	45%

## Table A-4 Probability of Awakening from NA90SEL

Source: DoD, 2009b

In December 2008, FICAN recommended the use of this standard. FICAN also recognized that more research is underway by various organizations and that work may result in changes to FICAN's position.

FICAN reaffirmed its recommendation for the use of the ANSI (2008) standard (FICAN, 2008). However, it is noted that this standard has been withdrawn, but it will be used until further recommendations are made by FICAN.

A recent study further examined the relationship between self-reported sleep insufficiency and airport noise using the U.S. Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System data and DNL contours generated by the FAA's Integrated Noise Model software for 95 airports (Holt et al., 2015). The survey data comprise the results of a random-digit-dialed telephone survey of non-institutionalized U.S. civilians 18 years or older covering all 50 states. Responses that included sleep insufficiency questions were included in this study totaling more than 700,000 respondents for 2008 and 2009 year datasets. The authors found that, once controlled for individual sociodemographic characteristics and ZIP Code-level socioeconomic status, there were no significant associations between airport noise exposure levels and self-reported sleep insufficiency. These results are consistent with a study that found aircraft-noise-induced awakening are more reasonably predicted from relative rather than absolute SELs (Fidell et al., 2013). However, Kim et al. (2014) found a response relationship between aircraft noise and sleep quality in a community-based cross-sectional study when controlling for a mental health condition (Kim et al., 2014).

The WHO recommends the use of the dBA long-term average sound level  $L_{night}$ , measured outside the home, for sleep disturbance and related effects, with an interim target of 55 dB  $L_{night, outside}$  and a night noise guideline of 40 dB (WHO, 2009).

The choice of a noise metric for policy-making purposes depends on both the particular type of noise source and the particular effect being studied. Even for sleep disturbance caused by aircraft noise, there is no single noise exposure metric or measurement approach that is generally agreed upon (Finegold, 2010).

#### Summary

Sleep disturbance research still lacks the details to accurately estimate the population awakened for a given noise exposure. The procedure described in the ANSI (2008) standard and endorsed by FICAN is based on probability calculations that have not yet been scientifically validated. While this procedure certainly provides a much better method for evaluating sleep awakenings from multiple aircraft noise events, the estimated probability of awakenings can only be considered approximate.

#### A1.3.4 Noise-Induced Hearing Impairment

Residents in communities surrounding airfields express concerns regarding the effects of aircraft noise on hearing. This section provides a brief overview of hearing loss caused by noise exposure. The goal is to provide a sense of perspective as to how aircraft noise (as experienced on the ground) compares to other activities that are often linked with hearing loss.

The *Noise-Induced Hearing Impairment* bulletin is one of a series of technical bulletins issued by the DoD Defense Noise Working Group (DNWG) under the initiative to educate and train DoD military, civilian, and contractor personnel, and the public on noise issues. "The ability to convey the effects of military aircraft noise exposure should facilitate both the public discussions and the environmental assessment process," according to DNWG (2013). In its background discussion on the topic of noise-induced hearing impairment, DNWG (2013) states:

"Considerable data have been collected and analyzed by the scientific/medical community on the effects of noise on workers in industrial settings, and it has been well established that
continuous exposure to high noise levels from any source will damage human hearing and result in noise induced hearing loss (USEPA, 1974). The scientific community has concluded that there is little likelihood of hearing damage resulting from exposure to aircraft noise at commercial airports. Until recently, the same was thought true for military airbases, but the introduction of new generation fighter aircraft with high thrust to weight ratio and correspondingly high noise levels has required a re-analysis of the risk of hearing damage for those communities close to military airbases. Residents in surrounding communities are expressing concerns regarding the effects of these new aircraft on hearing."

DNWG goes on to define the major components of hearing loss, temporary versus permanent loss, and threshold shift in hearing, and how they can be differentiated:

"Hearing loss is generally interpreted as a decrease in the ear's sensitivity or acuity to perceive sound, i.e. a shift in the hearing threshold to a higher level. This change can either be a Temporary Threshold Shift or a Permanent Threshold Shift.

"A Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) can result from exposure to loud noise over a given amount of time, yet the hearing loss is not necessarily permanent. An example of TTS might be a person attending a loud music concert. After the concert is over, the person may experience a threshold shift that may last several hours, depending upon the level and duration of exposure. While experiencing TTS, the person becomes less sensitive to low-level sounds, particularly at certain frequencies in the speech range (typically near 2,000 and 4,000 Hertz). Normal hearing ability eventually returns, as long as the person has enough time to recover in a relatively quiet environment.

"A Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) usually results from repeated exposure to high noise levels, where the ears are not given adequate time to recover from the strain and fatigue of exposure. A common example of PTS is the result of working in a very noisy environment such as a factory. It is important to note that TTS can eventually become PTS over time. Thus, even if the ear is given time to recover from TTS, repeated occurrence of TTS may eventually lead to permanent hearing loss. The point at which a Temporary Threshold Shift results in a Permanent Threshold Shift is difficult to identify and varies with a person's sensitivity. In general, hearing loss (be it TTS or PTS) is determined by the duration and level of the sound exposure (DNWG, 2013)."

On the topic of noise-induced hearing loss and its specific components, DNWG (2013) provides the following overview:

"The 1982 EPA Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis presents the risk of hearing loss from exposure to noise in the workplace in terms of the Noise-Induced Permanent Threshold Shift (NIPTS), a quantity that defines the permanent change in hearing level, or threshold, caused by exposure to noise (USEPA, 1982). It represents the difference in PTS between workers exposed to noise and those who are not exposed. Numerically, the NIPTS is the change in threshold averaged over the frequencies 0.5, 1, 2, and 4 kHz that can be expected from daily exposure to noise over a normal working lifetime of 40 years, with the exposure beginning at an age of 20 years. A grand average of the NIPTS over time (40 years) and hearing sensitivity (10 to 90 percentiles of the exposed population) is termed the Average NIPTS, or Ave. NIPTS for short. The Ave. NIPTS that can be expected for noise exposure as measured by the 24-hour average noise level, Leq24, is given in Table A-5 (USEPA, 1982).

	Ave. NIPTS	10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
L <sub>eq(24)</sub>	(dB)*	NIPTS (dB)*
75-76	1.0	4.0
76-77	1.0	4.5
77-78	1.6	5.0
78-79	2.0	5.5
79-80	2.5	6.0
80-81	3.0	7.0
81-82	3.5	8.0
82-83	4.0	9.0
83-84	4.5	10.0
84-85	5.5	11.0
85-86	6.0	12.0
86-87	7.0	13.5
87-88	7.5	15.0
88-89	8.5	16.5
89-90	9.5	18.0
Source: DoD	, 2012	

# Table A-5Average (Ave.) NIPTSand 10th Percentile NIPTS as aFunction of Leq(24)

\* rounded to the nearest 0.5 dB

"Thus, for a noise exposure of 80 Leq24, the expected lifetime average value of NIPTS is 3 dB. The Ave. NIPTS is estimated as an average over all people exposed to the noise. The actual value of NIPTS for any given person will depend on their physical sensitivity to noise – some will experience more hearing loss than others. The EPA Guidelines provide information on this variation in sensitivity in the form of the NIPTS exceeded by 10 percent of the population, which is included in Table A-5 in the '10th Percentile NIPTS' column (USEPA, 1982). As in the example above, for individuals exposed to 80 Leq24, the most sensitive of the population would be expected to show a degradation to their hearing of 7 dB over time. To put these numbers in perspective, changes in hearing level of less than 5 dB are generally not considered noticeable or significant. Furthermore, there is no known evidence that a NIPTS of 5 dB is perceptible or has any practical significance for the individual. Lastly, the variability in audiometric testing is generally assumed to be ±5 dB (USEPA, 1974). (DNWG, 2013)."

According to DNWG, applying these measurement tools for NIPTS to a specific population is the next step in the process of fully understanding noise impacts on a community (DNWG, 2013):

"In order to quantify the overall impact of noise on a community it is necessary to include the numbers of people who are exposed. This is accomplished by calculating the population average value of Ave. NIPTS, known as the Potential Hearing Loss (PHL), using the following equation:

$$PHL = \frac{\sum_{i} NIPTS_i \times P_i}{\sum_{i} P_i}$$
(1)

where NIPTSi is the Ave. NIPTS for people within the *ith* noise level band (see Table A-5), and Pi is the total population living within the *ith* noise level band. The quantity PHL represents the average change in hearing threshold, or the average hearing loss, for the local community exposed to the noise.

The actual noise exposure is determined by the portion of the time the population is outdoors and the outdoor noise levels to which they are exposed. The EPA Guidelines allows for calculating the exposure taking into account the length of time the population is indoors and exposed to lower levels. If the outdoor exposure exceeds 3 hours per day, the contribution of the indoor levels can usually be neglected. (DNWG, 2013)."

The criteria for measuring permanent hearing loss in the workplace are similar but more complex, according to DNWG (2013):

"The database from which the risk of hearing loss in Table A-5 was developed is based almost entirely on extensive audiometric measurements of workers in industrial settings. A considerable amount of hearing loss data have been collected and analyzed, including measurements of hearing loss in people with known histories of noise exposure. The available evidence consists of statistical distributions of hearing levels for populations at various exposure levels. Much of the analysis consists of grouping these measurements into populations of the same age with the same history of noise exposure and determining the percentile distribution of hearing loss for populations with the same noise exposure. Thus, the evidence for noise-induced permanent threshold shift can be clearly seen by comparing the distribution of a noise-exposed population with that of a relatively non-noise-exposed population (USEPA, 1974).

"Most of these data are drawn from cross-sectional rather than longitudinal studies. That is, individuals or populations have been tested at only one point in time. Because complete noise exposure histories do not exist, many conclusions are limited by the need to make certain assumptions about the onset and progression of noise-induced hearing loss. (DNWG, 2013)."

The USEPA, National Academy of Sciences, WHO, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, and DoD have each established their own criteria for measuring hearing loss within the workplace, according to DNWG (2013):

"Using this database, the EPA established 75 dB for an 8-hour exposure and 70 dB for a 24-hour exposure as the average noise level standard requisite to protect the most sensitive (approximately 1 percent) of the population from greater than a 5 dB permanent threshold shift in hearing. The EPA document explains that the requirement for an adequate margin of safety necessitates a highly conservative approach which dictates the prevention of any effect on hearing, defined here as an essentially insignificant and not measurable NIPTS of less than 5 dB. (USEPA, 1974).

"The National Academy of Sciences Committee on Hearing, Bioacoustics, and Biomechanics (CHABA) identified 75 dB as the minimum level at which hearing loss may occur from continuous, long-term (40 years) exposure (CHABA, 1965).

"The World Health Organization has concluded that environmental and leisure-time noise below a Leq24 value of 70 dB 'will not cause hearing loss in the large majority of the population, even after a lifetime of exposure (WHO, 2000).' "The OSHA regulation of 1971 standardizes the limits on workplace noise exposure for protection from hearing loss as an average level of 90 dB over an 8-hour work period, or 85 dB over a 16-hour period (U.S. Department of Labor, 1971). The standard is based on a 5 dB decrease in allowable noise level per doubling of exposure time. Exposure at levels greater than this require a hearing conservation program to be implemented. The maximum level for workplace exposure to continuous noise is 115 dB, and exposure to this level is limited to 15 minutes. A maximum level of 140 dB is specified for impulsive noise.

"The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health recommends a maximum exposure of 85 dB for a period of 8 hours, with a recommended exchange rate of 3 dB per doubling of exposure time (NIOSH, 1998). The maximum allowable exposure level is 140 dB for both continuous and impulsive noise.

"The Department of Defense requirements for hearing conservation specify that a hearing conservation program should be implemented if the 8-hour average noise level (Leq8) is greater than 85 decibels (DoD, 2004). The recommended exchange rate is a decrease of 3 dB per doubling of exposure time, although an alternative rate of 4 dB is allowed. (DNWG, 2013)."

The DoD has issued guidelines for hearing risk assessment in local communities, according to DNWG (2013):

"The current DoD policy for assessing hearing loss risk as part of the EIS process is stated in the June 16, 2009 memorandum "Methodology for Assessing Hearing Loss Risk and Impacts in DoD Environmental Impact Analysis" issued by the Under Secretary of Defense (DoD, 2009c). The memorandum defines the conditions under which assessments are required, references the methodology from the 1982 EPA report, and describes how the assessments are to be calculated.

'Current and future high performance aircraft create a noise environment in which the current impact analysis based primarily on annoyance may be insufficient to capture the full range of impacts on humans. As part of the noise analysis in all future environmental impact statements, DoD components will use the 80 Day-Night A-Weighted (DNL) noise contour to identify populations at the most risk of potential hearing loss. DoD components will use as part of the analysis, as appropriate, a calculation of the Potential Hearing Loss (PHL) of the at risk population. The PHL (sometimes referred to as Population Hearing Loss) methodology is defined in EPA Report No. 550/9-82-105, *Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis* (USEPA, 1982).' (DoD, 2009c).

"The 2009 DoD policy directive requires that hearing loss risk be estimated for the population most at risk, defined as the population exposed to a Day-Night Average Noise Level (DNL) greater than or equal to 80 dB, including residents of on-base housing. Limiting the analysis to the 80 DNL contour area does not necessarily imply that populations outside this contour, i.e. at lower exposure levels, are not at some degree of risk of hearing loss, but it is generally considered that this risk is small. The exposure of workers inside the base boundary area should be considered occupational and evaluated using the appropriate DoD component regulations for occupational noise exposure.

"Environmental noise assessments normally estimate the number of people exposed to noise expressed in terms of the DNL noise metric, which contains a 10 dB weighting factor for aircraft

operations occurring between the hours of 2200 and 0700 to account for people's increased sensitivity to noise during the normal sleeping period. However, the mechanism by which high noise levels may cause hearing impairment is physical in nature (by damaging the hair cells in the cochlear) and has no such temporal effects – noise is noise as far as the potential for hearing loss is concerned, regardless of the time of day the exposure occurs. Thus, even though the population most at risk is identified in terms of the 80 DNL contour, it is not appropriate to estimate risk using the DNL metric. The actual assessment of hearing loss risk should be conducted using 24-hour average noise levels (Leq24). (DNWG, 2013)."

Regarding community hearing loss and aircraft noise, DNWG (2013) provides this overview:

"The preponderance of available information on hearing loss risk upon which Table A-5 is based is from the workplace with continuous exposure throughout the day for many years. Community exposure to aircraft noise is not continuous but consists of individual events where the sound level exceeds the background level for a limited time period as the aircraft flies past the observer. The maximum noise levels experienced from military aircraft may be very high, and the exposure could result in a temporary threshold shift (TTS). But unless the flights are continuous, the ear may have adequate time to recover from the strain and fatigue of individual exposures, and normal hearing ability may eventually return.

"There is very limited data on the effect of aircraft noise on hearing. From a civilian airport perspective, the scientific community has concluded that there is little likelihood that the resulting noise exposure from aircraft noise could result in either a temporary or permanent hearing loss (Newman and Beattie, 1985). The EPA criterion (Leq24 = 70 dB) can be exceeded in some areas located near airports, but that is only the case outdoors. Inside a building, where people are more likely to spend most of their time, the average noise level will be much less than 70 dB (Eldred and von Gierke, 1993). Eldred and von Gierke (1993) also report that 'several studies in the U.S., Japan, and the U.K. have confirmed the predictions that the possibility for permanent hearing loss in communities, even under the most intense commercial take-off and landing patterns, is remote.' (DNWG, 2013)."

DNWG (2013) then provides a closer look at military aircraft noise specifically:

"Military aircraft are in general much noisier than their civilian counterparts, but the available data, while sometimes contradictory, appears to indicate a similar lack of significant effects of noise on hearing. A laboratory study (Nixon et al., 1993) measured changes in human hearing from noise representative of low-flying aircraft on Military Training Routes (MTRs). The potential effects of aircraft flying along MTRs are of particular concern as the maximum overflight noise levels can exceed 115 dB, with a rapid increase in noise level exceeding 30 dB/sec. In this study, participants were first subjected to four overflight noise exposures at A-weighted levels of 115 dB to 130 dB. One-half of the subjects showed no change in hearing levels, one-fourth had a temporary 5 dB increase in sensitivity, and one-fourth had a temporary 5 dB decrease in sensitivity. In the next phase, participants were subjected to up to eight successive overflights, separated by 90 second intervals, at a maximum level of 130 dB until a temporary shift in hearing was observed. The temporary hearing threshold shift showed a decrease in sensitivity of up to 10 dB.

"In another study of 115 test subjects between 18 and 50 years old, TTSs were measured after laboratory exposure to military low-altitude flight (MLAF) noise (Ising et al., 1999). The results

indicate that repeated exposure to MLAF noise with maximum noise levels greater than 114 dB, may have the potential to cause permanent noise induced hearing loss, especially if the noise level increases rapidly (Ising et al., 1999).

"A report prepared by researchers at the University of Southampton (Lawton and Robinson, 1991) summarized the state of knowledge as of 1991. Their review of the literature indicated that the main body of information with which comparisons can be made of the hearing damage risk from military overflight noise is to be found in standards and regulatory documents published by various organizations. It was concluded that the risk of hearing loss due to a single event of 125 dB maximum level and equivalent duration of the order 0.5 seconds is small, even after repeated daily occurrences over several years. Supplementary experimental evidence, involving TTS, showed that a small amount of TTS might be engendered by military overflight noise at the levels in question, but that this would have no significant long-term effect even on the more susceptible ears. The literature search did uncover a small number of population surveys of hearing loss related to noise, but the quantitative results were rare and only one investigation produced audiometric results linked to noise measurements.

"The report concluded that there is little evidence of hearing loss risk from military overflights, either for adults or children. 'Whether in the case of TTS or PTS, laboratory or field studies, adults or children, there appear to be no reports of significant hearing damage attributable to the noise of aircraft overflights (Lawton and Robinson, 1991).'

"In Japan, audiological tests were conducted on a sample of residents who had lived near Kadena Air Base for periods ranging from 19 to 43 years (Yamamoto, 1999). The sample had been exposed (not necessarily continuously) to noise levels ranging from DNL 75 to 88 dB. Examinations showed that there was a one in ten chance of a NIPTS of 20 dB at 4 kHz. However, the NIPTS at 2 kHz and lower was much less, so that the value of Ave. NIPTS was on the order of 10 dB or so. These results are consistent with the '10th Percentile NIPTS' figures in Table A-5.

"Ludlow and Sixsmith (Ludlow and Sixsmith, 1999) conducted a cross-sectional pilot study to examine the hypothesis that military jet noise exposure early in life is associated with raised hearing thresholds. The authors concluded that there were no significant differences in audiometric test results between military personnel who as children had lived in or near stations where fast jet operations were based, and a similar group who had no such exposure as children. (DNWG, 2013)."

According to DNWG's (2013) conclusions, noise levels at commercial and military airfields have important distinguishing characteristics:

"Aviation noise levels near commercial airports are not comparable to the occupational or recreational noise exposures associated with hearing loss, and studies of aircraft noise levels have not definitively correlated permanent hearing impairment with aircraft activity. It is unlikely that airport neighbors will remain outside their homes 24 hours per day, so there is little likelihood of hearing loss below an average sound level of 75 dB.

"Near military airbases, average noise levels above 75 dB may occur, and while new DoD policy dictates that NIPTS should be evaluated, research results to date have not found a definitive relationship between significant permanent hearing impairment (greater than 10 dB) and prolonged exposure to aviation noise. (DNWG, 2013)."

## A1.3.5 Nonauditory Health Effects

The general understanding of the possible effects of aircraft noise has been hindered by the publication of overly sensational and misleading articles in the popular press and by similarly sensational statements from reputed scientists, who are calling attention to their work. These statements have proven less than useful in the research and understanding of potential health effects from aircraft noise exposures. Moreover, the sensational statements have disturbing consequences because they provide misleading information, create unfounded worry and negative bias, distort certain facts, and add to a growing mistrust of science. These sensational statements have been firmly criticized by other researchers as lacking in rigor because they do not consider other known factors that cause health problems and because they analyze only a selection of the available data (ANR, 2010). The following discussion attempts to summarize the research into the possible nonauditory effects of aircraft noise based on a review of peer-reviewed research. The research reviewed ranges from general stress-related effects on health to specific individual studies on effects such as heart disease and stroke. In addition to these individual studies, there are summaries of meta-analyses of pooled results from individual studies addressing the same issue. The meta-analyses evaluate the studies for consistent results among the smaller individual studies, and they derive effect estimates from the different studies for a quantitative risk assessment (Babisch, 2013). Meta-analysis is an analytical technique designed to summarize the results of multiple smaller studies in order to increase the sample size and to identify patterns among the several smaller studies. The validity of meta-analysis is highly dependent on the quality of the included smaller studies because it cannot correct the poor design and/or bias of the original studies. Because of these limitations, a meta-analysis of several smaller studies cannot predict the results of a single large study and may result in misleading information for the general public.

# A1.3.5.1 Overview

The potential for aircraft noise to impair one's health deserves special attention and accordingly has been the subject of numerous epidemiological studies and meta-analyses of the gathered data. The basic premise is that noise can cause annoyance, annoyance can cause stress, and prolonged stress is known to be a contributor to a number of health disorders, such as hypertension, myocardial infarction (heart attack), cardiovascular disease, and stroke (Munzel et al., 2014). According to Kryter and Poza (1980), "It is more likely that noise-related general ill-health effects are due to the psychological annoyance from the noise interfering with normal everyday behavior than it is from the noise eliciting, because of its intensity, reflexive response in the autonomic or other physiological systems of the body."

The connection between annoyance and stress and health issues requires careful experimental design because of the large number of confounding issues, such as heredity, medical history, smoking, diet, lack of exercise, and air pollution. Some highly publicized reports on health effects have, in fact, been rooted in poor science. Meecham and Shaw (1979) apparently found a relation between noise levels and mortality rates in neighborhoods located under the approach path to LAX. When the same data were analyzed by others (Frerichs et al., 1980), no relationship was found. Jones and Tauscher (1978) found a high rate of birth defects for the same neighborhoods. But when the Centers for Disease Control performed a more thorough study near Atlanta's Hartsfield International Airport, no relationships were found for DNL greater than 65 dB (Edmonds et al., 1979).

An early study by Cantrell (1974) confirmed that noise can provoke stress, but it noted that results on its effect on cardiovascular health were contradictory. Some studies in the 1990s found a connection between aircraft noise and increased blood pressure (Michalak et al., 1990; Ising et al., 1990; Rosenlund et al., 2001), while others did not (Pulles et al., 1990). This inconsistency in results led the WHO in 2000 to conclude that there was only a weak association between long-term noise exposure and hypertension and cardiovascular effects, and that a dose-response relationship could not be

To put the Odds Ratio (OR) number in context, an OR of 1.5 would be considered a weak relationship between noise and health; 3.5 would be a moderate relationship; 9.0 would be a strong relationship; and 32 a very strong relationship (Cohen, 1988).

established (WHO, 2000). Later, van Kempen concluded that "Whereas noise exposure can contribute to the prevalence of cardiovascular disease, the evidence for a relation between noise exposure and ischemic heart disease is still inconclusive" (van Kempen et al., 2002).

More recently, major studies have been conducted in an attempt to identify an association between noise and health effects, develop a dose-response relationship, and identify a threshold below which the effects are minimal. The most important of these are briefly described below. In these studies, researchers usually present their results in terms of the Odds Ratio, which is the ratio of the odds that health will be impaired by an increase in noise level of 10 dB to the odds that health would be impaired without any noise exposure. An OR of 1.25 means that there is a 25-percent increase in likelihood that noise will impair health. To put the OR number in context, an OR of 1.5 would be considered a weak relationship between noise and health; 3.5 would be a moderate relationship; 9.0 would be a strong relationship; and 32 a very strong relationship (Cohen, 1988). For examples, the OR for the relationship between smoking and coronary heart disease is 4.4 (Rosengren et al., 1992). The summary of these studies shows that the relationship between noise and impaired health is a very weak one because none of the statistically significant ORs were greater than 1.5. Most of the ORs were less than 1.2.

#### A1.3.5.2 Blood Pressure and Hypertension

• The carefully designed HYENA study was conducted around six European airports from 2002 through 2006 (Jarup et al., 2005, 2007, 2008; Babisch et al., 2008). The study covered 4,861 subjects, aged between 45 and 70. Blood pressure was measured, and questionnaires were administered for health, socioeconomic, and lifestyle factors, including diet and physical exercise. Noise from aircraft and highways was predicted from models.

HYENA study results showed an OR less than 1 for the association between daytime aircraft noise and hypertension, which was not statistically significant<sup>2</sup> and indicated no positive association. The OR for the relationship between nighttime aircraft noise and hypertension was 1.14--a result that was marginally significant statistically. For daytime road traffic noise, the OR

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In many of the studies reported above, the researchers use the word "significant" to describe a relationship between noise and health, conjuring up the idea that the relationship is strong and that the effect is large. But this is an inappropriate and misleading use of the word in statistical analysis. What the researchers really mean is that the relationship is "statistically significant" in that they are sure that it is real. It does not mean that the effect is large or important, or that it has any decision-making utility. A relationship can be statistically significant, i.e. real, while being weak, or small and insignificant.

was 1.1 and not significant. The measured effects were small and not necessarily distinct from other events. A close review of the data for nighttime aircraft noise raised some questions about the data and the methods employed (ACRP, 2008). Using data from the HYENA study, Haralabidis et al. (2008) reported an increase in systolic blood pressure of 6.2 millimeters of mercury (mmHg) for aircraft noise events (about 6 percent) and an increase of 7.4 mmHg (about 7 percent) for other indoor noises, such as snoring; a snoring partner and road traffic had similar impacts on blood pressure.

- Ancona et al. (2010) reported a study on a randomly selected sample of subjects aged 45 to 70 years who had lived in the study area for at least 5 years. Personal data were collected via interview, and blood pressure measurements were taken for a study population of 578 subjects. No statistically significant association was found between aircraft noise levels and hypertension for noise levels above 75 dB L<sub>eq(24)</sub> compared to levels below 65 dB. However, there was an increase in nocturnal systolic pressure of 5.4 mmHg (about 5 percent) for subjects in the highest exposure category (greater than or equal to 75 dB).
- Eriksson et al. (2007) found that for subjects exposed to energy-averaged levels above 50 dBA, the adjusted relative risk for hypertension was 1.19 (95-percent Cl = 1.03 to 1.37). Maximum aircraft noise levels presented similar results, with a relative risk of 1.20 (1.03 to 1.40) for those exposed above 70 dBA. Stronger associations were suggested among older subjects, those with a normal glucose tolerance, nonsmokers, and subjects not annoyed by noise from other sources. The study comprised a cohort of 2,754 men in four municipalities around Stockholm Arlanda airport who were followed from 1992 to 1994 and 2002 to 2004.
- Matsui et al. (2008) reported higher OR for noise levels greater than L<sub>den</sub> 70 dB, but not altogether statistically significant, for hypertension from the effects of military aircraft noise at Kadena Air Base in Okinawa, Japan. The study was conducted in 1995 and 1996 but used older noise data that were not necessarily appropriate for the same time period.
- A study of Noise-Related Annoyance, Cognition and Health (NORAH), designed to identify transportation noise effects in communities around German airports, has reported results of self-monitoring of blood pressure of approximately 2,000 residents near Frankfurt Airport exposed to aircraft L<sub>eq(24)</sub> in the range of 40 to 65 dB during the period 2012 to 2014 after the opening of a new runway (Shreckenberg and Guski, 2015). The results showed small positive effects of noise on blood pressure without statistical significance. No statistically significant effect was determined between aircraft noise and hypertension as defined by the WHO.
- A meta-analysis of Huang el al. (2015) examined four research studies comprising a total of 16,784 residents. The overall OR for hypertension in residents with aircraft noise exposure was 1.36 for men and statistically significant, and 1.31 and not statistically significant for women. No account was taken for any confounding factors. The meta-analysis suggests that aircraft noise could contribute to the prevalence of hypertension, but the evidence for a relationship between aircraft noise exposure and hypertension is still inconclusive because of limitations in study populations, exposure characterization, and adjustment for important confounders.
  - The four studies in Huang's meta-analysis include one by Black et al. (2007) that purports to show relatively high OR values for self-reported hypertension, but these results only applied to a select subset of those surveyed that reported high noise stress. When this data set is excluded, Huang's meta-analysis yields results similar to those obtained in the HYENA and NORAH studies. Furthermore, the longitudinal

study included in the analysis that followed 4,721 people for 8 years (Eriksson et al., 2010) reported an OR of 1.02, which was not statistically significant.

- Rhee et al. (2008) found that subjects exposed to helicopter noise had a significantly higher
  prevalence of hypertension than the unexposed control group. Although a source-specific
  difference in the risk of cardiovascular disease by environmental noise exposure is suggested, no
  other study has evaluated whether or not exposure to noise from helicopters differs from
  exposure to noise from fighter jets in their influence on the prevalence of hypertension.
- Hwang et al. (2012) conducted a 20-year prospective cohort study of 1,301 aviation workers in Taiwan to follow AGT genotypes (TT, TM, and MM) across four exposure categories according to the levels of noise representing high (>80 dBA), medium (80-65 dBA), and low exposure (64-50 dBA) and the reference level (49-40 dBA). AGT (TT vs MM adjusted incidence rate ratio [IRR] 1.77, 95-percent Cl 1.24 to 2.51) and noise exposure (high and medium combined) during 3 to 15 years (adjusted IRR 2.35, 95-percent Cl 1.42 to 3.88) were independent determinants of hypertension. Furthermore, the risk of hypertension increased with noise exposure (adjusted IRR 3.73, 95-percent Cl 1.84 to 7.56) among TT homozygotes but not among those with at least one M allele (Rothman synergy index = 1.05).
- Haralabidis et al. (2011) studied the association between exposure to transportation noise and blood pressure reduction during nighttime sleep utilizing 24-hour ambulatory blood pressure measurements at 15-minute intervals carried out on 149 persons living near four major European airports. Although road traffic noise exposure was found to decrease blood pressure dipping in diastolic blood pressure, no associated decrease in dipping was found for aircraft noise exposure.

#### A1.3.5.3 Heart Disease and Stroke

- Huss et al. (2010) examined the risk of mortality from myocardial infarction (heart attack) resulting from exposure to aircraft noise using the Swiss National database of mortality records for the period 2000 to 2005. The analysis was conducted on a total of 4.6 million people, with 15,500 deaths from acute myocardial infarction. The results showed that the risk of death from all circulatory diseases combined was not associated with aircraft noise, and there was not any association between noise and the risk of death from stroke. The overall risk of death from myocardial infarction alone was 1.07 and not statistically significant, but it was higher (OR = 1.3 and not statistically significant) in people exposed to aircraft noise of 60 dB DNL or greater for 15 years or more. The risk of death from myocardial infarction was also higher (OR = 1.10), and statistically significant, for those living near a major road. Cardiovascular risk factors, such as smoking, were not directly taken into account in this study.
- Floud (2013) used the HYENA data to examine the relationship between noise levels and self-reported heart disease and stroke. There was no association for daytime noise and no statistically significant association for nighttime noise. However, for those exposed to nighttime aircraft noise for more than 20 years, the OR was 1.25 per 10 dB increase in noise (L<sub>night</sub>) and marginally significant.
- Correia et al. (2013) evaluated the risk of hospitalization for cardiovascular diseases in older people (65 years of age and older) residing in areas exposed to a DNL of at least 45 dB around U.S. airports. Health insurance data from 2009 Medicare records were examined for approximately 6 million people living in neighborhoods around 89 airports in the U.S. The

potential confounding effect of socioeconomic status was extracted from several zip-code-level variables from the 2000 U.S. Census. No controls were included for smoking or diet, both of which are strong risk factors for cardiovascular disease. Noise levels were calculated at census block centroids. Taking into account the potential effects of air pollution, they report an OR of 1.035, which was marginally significant statistically. While the overall results show a link between increased noise and increased health risk, some of the individual airport data show a decreased health risk with increased aircraft noise exposure.

- Hansell et al. (2013) investigated the association of aircraft noise with risk of hospital admission for, and mortality from, stroke, coronary heart disease, and cardiovascular disease in neighborhoods around London's Heathrow airport exposed to an equivalent sound level over 16 hours of at least 50 dB. The data were adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, deprivation, and a smoking proxy (lung cancer mortality) at the census area level but not at the individual level. It was important to consider the effect of ethnicity (in particular, South Asian ethnicity, which is itself strongly associated with risk of coronary heart disease). The reported ORs for stroke, heart disease, and cardiovascular disease were 1.24, 1.21, and 1.14, respectively. Similar results were reported for mortality. The results suggest a higher risk of mortality from coronary heart disease than cardiovascular disease, which seems counter-intuitive given that cardiovascular disease encompasses all the diseases of the heart and circulation, including coronary heart disease and stroke along with heart failure and congenital heart disease (ERCD, 2014).
- Evrard et al. (2015) studied mortality rates for 1.9 million residents living in 161 communes near three major French airports (Paris-Charles de Gaulle, Lyon Saint-Exupéry, and Toulouse-Blagnac) for the period 2007 to 2010. Noise levels in the communes ranged from 42 to 64 dB L<sub>den</sub>. Lung cancer mortality at the commune level was used as a proxy measure for smoking because data on individual smoking or smoking prevalence were not available. Noise exposure was expressed in terms of a population-weighted level for each commune. After adjustment for concentration of nitrogen dioxide, Risk Ratios (similar to Odds Ratios) per 10 dB increase in noise were found to be 1.18 for mortality from cardiovascular disease, 1.23 for mortality from coronary heart disease, and 1.31 for mortality from myocardial infarction. There was no association between mortality from stroke and aircraft noise. As the author notes, results at the commune level may not be applicable to the individual level.
- Seidler et al. (2016) found a statistically significant linear exposure-risk relationship with heart failure or hypertensive heart disease for aircraft traffic noise (1.6-percent risk increase per 10 dB increase in the 24-hour continuous noise level; 95-percent Cl 0.3 to 3.0 percent), road traffic noise (2.4 percent per 10 dB; 95-percent Cl 1.6 to 3.2 percent), and railway noise (3.1 percent per 10 dB; 95-percent Cl 2.2 to 4.1 percent). For individuals with 24-hour continuous aircraft noise levels less than 40 dB and nightly maximum aircraft noise levels exceeding 50 dB six or more times, a significantly increased risk was observed. In general, risks of hypertensive heart disease were considerably higher than the risks of heart failure.
- The NORAH study also included an examination of the effect of aircraft noise on cardiovascular disease (heart attack and stroke) based on examination of health insurance data between 2006 and 2010 for approximately 1 million people over the age of 40 exposed to aircraft L<sub>eq(24)</sub> in the range of 40 to 65 dB (Shreckenberg and Guski, 2015). A questionnaire was used to obtain information on confounding factors. The results showed a non-statistically significant increase in risk for heart attack and stroke, and there was no apparent linear relationship between noise

level and either effect. There was, however, a marginally significant but small increase in risk for heart failure (OR of 1.016). The risk of cardiovascular disease was found to be greater for road and rail noise than for aircraft noise.

- Meta-analyses from Babisch and Kamp (2009), Babisch et al. (2013), and Babisch (2013) focused on epidemiological studies or surveys directly related to associations between aircraft noise and cardiovascular disease outcomes. Considering studies at 10 airports covering over 45,000 people, the pooled effect estimate of the relative risk for hypertension was 1.13 per 10 dBA and only marginally significant (WHO, 2011). One of the studies included in the analysis was for military aircraft noise at Okinawa (see Matsui et al., 2008) for which the OR was 1.27 but not statistically significant. The authors conclude that "No single, generalized and empirically supported exposure-response relationship can be established yet for the association between aircraft noise and cardiovascular risk due to methodological differences between studies." The pooled results show different slopes from different studies with different noise level ranges and methods being used.
- A meta-analysis of 11 studies on road and aircraft noise exposure in relation to incident cases of ischemic heart disease (IHD) was transformed into risk estimates per 10 dB increase in exposure by Vienneau et al. (2013). Pooled relative risk for IHD was 1.08 (1.03 to 1.14) per 10 dB increase in noise exposure, with the linear exposure-response starting at 50 dB.
- Passchier-Vermeer and Passchier (2000) reviewed studies on noise exposure and health effects and found sufficient evidence to support observation thresholds for hearing impairment, hypertension, IHD, annoyance, performance, and sleep disturbance due to noise exposure. The intent of the article was not to quantify impacts necessarily but instead to show that noise exposure can have a major effect in industrial societies in general, and it should be up to policy-makers and regulators to address this potential public health problem. In addition, the article recommended prioritizing additional study in two topic areas: 1) cardiovascular effects, and 2) the underlying mechanisms and the study of the effects of noise on children.
- Seidler et al. (2016) studied myocardial infarction risk due to aircraft, rail, and road noise by investigating patients of the Rhine-Main region of Germany who were diagnosed with myocardial infarction in the years 2006 through 2010. The linear model revealed a statistically significant risk increase due to road noise (2.8 percent per 10 dB rise, 95-percent CI [1.2; 4.5]) and railroad noise (2.3 percent per 10 dB rise [0.5; 4.2]) but not airplane noise. Airplane noise levels of 60 dB and above were associated with a higher risk of myocardial infarction (OR 1.42 [0.62; 3.25]). This higher risk is statistically significant if the analysis is restricted to patients who had died of myocardial infarction by 2014/2015 (OR 2.70 [1.08; 6.74]. In this subgroup, the risk estimators for all three types of traffic noise were of comparable magnitude (3.2 percent to 3.9 percent per 10 dB rise in noise level).
- Floud et al. (2011) examined the health effects of aircraft and road traffic noise exposure and the association with medication use. The cross-sectional study measured the use of prescribed antihypertensives, antacids, anxiolytics, hypnotics, antidepressants, and antiasthmatics in 4,861 persons living near seven airports in six European countries. Differences were found between countries in the effect of aircraft noise on antihypertensive use; for nighttime aircraft noise, a 10 dB increase in exposure was associated with ORs of 1.34 (95-percent Cl, 1.14 to 1.57) for the UK and 1.19 (1.02 to 1.38) for the Netherlands, but no significant associations were found for other countries. For daytime aircraft noise, excess risks were found for the UK (OR 1.35; Cl: 1.13 to

1.60), but a risk deficit was found for Italy (OR 0.82; CI: 0.71 to 0.96). There was an excess risk of taking anxiolytic medication in relation to aircraft noise (OR 1.28; CI: 1.04 to 1.57 for daytime and OR 1.27; CI: 1.01 to 1.59 for nighttime) that held across countries. The authors also found an association between exposure to 24-hour road traffic noise and the use of antacids by men (OR 1.39; CI 1.11 to 1.74).

# A1.3.5.4 Mental Health Issues

- The NORAH study found a risk for unipolar depression to increase with exposure to aircraft noise (OR of 1.09), but the relationship was not linear, with the risk decreasing at the higher noise levels, so this result was not considered reliable (Schreckenberg and Guski, 2015).
- A survey study around Frankfurt Airport explored the relationship between aircraft, road traffic, and railway noise with Quality-of-Life (QoL) concerns for both health and environmental views (Schreckenberg et al., 2010). Aircraft noise affected environmental QoL and, to a lesser extent, health QoL. However, one of the study's observations concerned vulnerable groups, such as people with pre-existing illness and/or high noise sensitivities. This group may have limited resources to deal with noise, which can result in increased health problems.
- A study of the effect of aircraft noise around a large international airport, Schiphol Airport, near Amsterdam, found an association between the use of non-prescribed sleep medication or sedatives with aircraft noise during the late evening (10:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M.). However, the correlation between L<sub>den</sub> and L<sub>eq</sub> (10:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M.) to sleep aids (ORs 1.25 and 1.26, respectively) was not statistically significant (Franssen et al., 2004).
- Beutel et al. (2016) assessed the association of day and night noise annoyance from road traffic, aircraft, railways, industrial, and neighborhood indoor and outdoor noise to anxiety and depression in 15,000 people ages 35 to 74 living in the Rhein-Main Region of Germany. The source and magnitude of noise annoyance was measured by a self-administered questionnaire. Depression and anxiety were also assessed based on established questionnaires. In this study, aircraft noise was the most commonly reported source of annoyance, followed by road noise annoyance. Depression and anxiety increased with the degree of overall noise annoyance. Compared to no annoyance, prevalence ratios for depression and anxiety, respectively, increased from moderate (PR depression 1.20; 95-percent Cl 1.00 to 1.45; PR anxiety 1.42; 95percent Cl 1.15 to 1.74) to extreme annoyance (PR depression 1.97; 95-percent Cl 1.62 to 2.39; PR anxiety 2.14; 95-percent Cl 1.71 to 2.67). Compared to other sources, aircraft noise annoyance was prominent, affecting almost 60 percent of the population. More simply stated, strong noise annoyance was associated with a two-fold higher prevalence of depression and anxiety in the general population. The authors admit that the identified association of annoyance, particularly with aircraft noise, to depression and anxiety is suggestive of a cause but that more study is needed to identify causal relationships. The authors recognized that preexisting anxiety and depression could contribute to increased susceptibility to noise annoyance. Also, the focus of this paper was on subjective annoyance, which is not related to objective measures of noise exposition.
- Van den Berg et al. (2015) conducted a study that explored the suggested limitation in the Beutel (2016) study: the relationship between pre-existing concern and annoyance. More specifically, they sought insight in the relation between worry about a noise source and annoyance from that source. The motivation for the study was the longstanding important

public concern for noise at a political level in Amsterdam, despite implementation of several measures to reduce noise exposure, and the desire to find other variables such as reducing fear and worry that might also help the situation. Using questionnaires from 1,968 respondents and modeling flight-related noise levels in a greater cosmopolitan area around Amsterdam, the researchers found that respondents with a high risk of anxiety/depression are significantly more likely to be highly worried about living close to the airport or an air route compared to those with a low risk (all p < 0.05). Also, respondents who report to have bad/moderate health are significantly more likely to be highly worried about living close to the airport or an air route compared to those with good/excellent health. More generally, the results show there is a strong correlation between annoyance from aircraft or airport noise and worry about the risk for health and/or safety associated with living close to an air route or airport. Also, for aircraft noise, worry increases with both the subjective exposure (annoyance) and the objective exposure (sound level). The authors conclude "that more noise or odor is related to more worry, and this has more effect on persons that have a higher personal risk for being worried and annoyed." When considered within the context of other studies, such as Beutel (2016), it would seem that those who are predisposed to worry are more susceptible to both annoyance and the negative health effects associated with anxiety and depression.

An individual with an increased sensitivity to sounds may have hyperacusis, which results in a lower tolerance of everyday sound (Aazh et al., 2018). A person with hyperacusis reacts differently to sounds due to reactions of increased distress and discomfort from everyday sounds. This condition arises from a problem with the auditory processes within an afflicted individual's brain. The causes and diagnosis are not well understood (Aazh et al., 2018). Physical causes of hyperacusis may range from head injury, ear damage, or viral diseases, to TMJ. Neurologic causes may range from PTSD, chronic fatigue syndrome, depression, to migraine headaches (American Academy of Otolaryngology--Head and Neck Surgery, 2018). An individual with hyperacusis will also likely have tinnitus, which may lead to further discomfort. Hyperacusis can lead to misophonia, which may cause an individual to react with abnormally strong emotions and behaviors to specific sounds, but hyperacusis does not cause this reaction. Studies of misphonia are very limited at this time. Another condition that falls under the condition of hyperacusis is noise sensitivity (Aazh et al., 2018). A noise-sensitive individual is characteristically more prone to being annoyed by environmental noise compared to a nonnoise-sensitive person regardless of the overall noise exposure (Kishikawa et al., 2006). This result indicates that the annoyance response for noise-sensitive people is not a direct function of noise exposure levels.

#### A1.3.5.5 Hospital and Care Facilities

The ACRP (ACRP, 2008) reviewed the literature available at that time to draw the following conclusions regarding noise impacts on patients in hospitals and care facilities:

"A careful search of recent research regarding aviation noise and hospitals and care facilities identified no studies that addressed this specific issue. It is common for airport noise/land-use compatibility guidelines to list hospitals and care facilities as noise-sensitive uses, although there are no studies that have identified health effects associated with aviation noise. There are numerous studies that identify problems with internal hospital noises such as warning alarms,

pagers, gurney collisions with doors, talking, etc.; however, none that addressed aviation or roadway noise."

The WHO (2000), in its Guidelines for Community Noise (Section 4.3.3), applies available information on noise to derive the following general guidance. However, the guidance is not informed by research on hospital and care facility effects from aircraft noise.

"For most spaces in hospitals, the critical effects of noise are on sleep disturbance, annoyance and communication interference, including interference with warning signals. The  $L_{Amax}$  of sound events during the night should not exceed 40 dB indoors. For wardrooms in hospitals, the guideline values indoors are 30 dB  $L_{Aeq}$ , together with 40 dB  $L_{Amax}$  during the night. During the day and evening the guideline value indoors is 30 dB  $L_{Aeq}$ . The maximum level should be measured with the instrument set at '*fast*'.

Since patients have less ability to cope with stress, the equivalent sound pressure level should not exceed 35 dB L<sub>Aeq</sub> in most rooms in which patients are being treated or observed. Particular attention should be given to the sound pressure levels in intensive care units and operating theatres. Sound inside incubators may result in health problems, including sleep disturbance, and may lead to hearing impairment in neonates. Guideline values for sound pressure levels in incubators must await future research."

# A1.3.5.6 Summary of Nonauditory Effects

Research studies seem to indicate that aircraft noise may contribute to the risk of health disorders, along with other factors such as heredity, medical history, smoking, alcohol use, diet, lack of exercise, and air pollution, but that the measured effect is small compared to these other factors and often not statistically significant--i.e., not necessarily real. Despite some sensational articles purporting otherwise and the intuitive feeling that noise in some way must impair health, there are no studies that definitively show a causal and significant relationship between aircraft noise and health. Such studies are notoriously difficult to conduct and interpret because of the large number of confounding factors that have to be considered for their effects to be excluded from the analysis. The WHO notes that there is still considerable variation among studies (WHO, 2011). And, almost without exception, research studies conclude that additional research is needed to determine whether such a causal relationship exists. The European Network on Noise and Health (ENNAH, 2013), in its summary report of 2013, concludes that ".....while the literature on non-auditory health effects of environmental noise is extensive, the scientific evidence of the relationship between noise and non-auditory effects is still contradictory."

As a result, it is not possible to state that there is sound scientific evidence that aircraft noise is a significant contributor to health disorders.

# A1.3.6 Performance Effects

The effect of noise on the performance of activities or tasks has been the subject of many studies. Some of these studies have found links between continuous high noise levels and performance loss. Noise-induced performance losses are most frequently reported in studies where noise levels are above 85 dB. Moderate noise levels appear to act as a stressor for more sensitive individuals performing a difficult psychomotor task. Little change has typically been found in low-noise cases; however, cognitive learning differences were measured in subjects exposed to noise of passing aircraft with maximum amplitudes of 48 dBA, presented once per minute, while performing text learning compared to a control group

exposed to 35 dBA (Trimmel et al., 2012). The findings suggest that background noise below 50 dBA results in impaired and changed structures of learning, as indicated by reproduction scores, because test persons are less able to switch between strategies

While the results of research on the general effect of periodic aircraft noise on performance have yet to yield definitive criteria, several general trends have been noted, including:

- A periodic intermittent noise is more likely to disrupt performance than a steady-state continuous noise of the same level. Flyover noise, due to its intermittent nature, might be more likely to disrupt performance than a steady-state noise of equal level.
- Noise is more inclined to affect the quality than the quantity of work.
- Noise is more likely to impair the performance of tasks that place extreme physical and/or mental demands on workers.

## A1.3.7 Noise Effects on Children

Recent studies on school children indicate a potential link between aircraft noise and both reading comprehension and learning motivation. The effects may be small but of particular concern for children who are already scholastically challenged.

# A1.3.7.1 Effects on Learning and Cognitive Abilities

Early studies in several countries (Cohen et al., 1973, 1980, 1981; Bronzaft and McCarthy, 1975; Green et al., 1982; Evans et al., 1998; Haines et al., 2002; Lercher et al., 2003) showed lower reading scores for children living or attending school in noisy areas than for children away from those areas. In some studies, noise-exposed children were less likely to solve difficult puzzles or more likely to give up while attempting to do so.

A longitudinal study reported by Evans et al. (1998) conducted prior to relocation of the old Munich Airport in 1992, reported that high noise exposure was associated with deficits in long-term memory and reading comprehension in children with a mean age of 10.8 years. Two years after the closure of the airport, these deficits disappeared, indicating that noise effects on cognition may be reversible if exposure to the noise ceases. Most convincing was the finding that deficits in memory and reading comprehension developed over the two-year follow-up for children who became newly noise exposed near the new airport.

More recently, the Road Traffic and Aircraft Noise Exposure and Children's Cognition and Health (RANCH) study (Stansfeld et al., 2005; Clark et al., 2005) compared the effect of aircraft and road traffic noise on over 2,000 children in three countries. This was the first study to derive exposure-effect associations for a range of cognitive and health effects and the first to compare effects across countries.

The study found a linear relation between chronic aircraft noise exposure and impaired reading comprehension and recognition memory. No associations were found between chronic road traffic noise exposure and cognition. Conceptual recall and information recall surprisingly showed better performance in high road-traffic-noise areas. Neither aircraft noise nor road traffic noise affected attention or working memory (Stansfeld et al., 2005; Clark et al., 2005).

Figure A-12 shows RANCH's result relating noise to reading comprehension. It shows that reading falls below average (a z-score of 0) at  $L_{eq}$  greater than 55 dB. Because the relationship is linear, reducing exposure at any level should lead to improvements in reading comprehension.



Figure A-12 RANCH Study Reading Scores Varying with Leq

The RANCH study observed that children may be exposed to aircraft noise for many of their childhood years and the consequences of long-term noise exposure were unknown. A follow-up study of the children in the RANCH project is being analyzed to examine the long-term effects on children's reading comprehension (Clark et al., 2009). Preliminary analysis indicated a trend for reading comprehension to be poorer at 15 to 16 years of age for children who attended noise-exposed primary schools. An additional study utilizing the same data set (Clark et al., 2012) investigated the effects of traffic-related air pollution and found little evidence that air pollution moderated the association of noise exposure on children's cognition.

There was also a trend for reading comprehension to be poorer in aircraft-noise-exposed secondary schools. Significant differences in reading scores were found between primary school children in the two different classrooms at the same school (Bronzaft and McCarthy, 1975). One classroom was exposed to high levels of railway noise, while the other classroom was quiet. The mean reading age of the noise-exposed children was 3 to 4 months behind that of the control children. Studies suggest that the evidence of the effects of noise on children's cognition has grown stronger over recent years (Stansfeld and Clark, 2015), but further analysis adjusting for confounding factors is ongoing and is needed to confirm these initial conclusions.

Studies identified a range of linguistic and cognitive factors to be responsible for children's unique difficulties with speech perception in noise. Children have lower stored phonological knowledge to reconstruct degraded speech, reducing the probability of successfully matching incomplete speech input when compared with adults. Additionally, young children are less able than older children and adults to make use of contextual cues to reconstruct noise-masked words presented in sentential context (Klatte et al., 2013).

FICAN funded a pilot study to assess the relationship between aircraft noise reduction and standardized test scores (Eagan et al., 2004; FICAN, 2007). The study evaluated whether abrupt aircraft noise reduction within classrooms, from either airport closure or sound insulation, was associated with

improvements in test scores. Data were collected in 35 public schools near three airports in Illinois and Texas. The study used several noise metrics. These were, however, all computed indoor levels, which makes it hard to compare with the outdoor levels used in most other studies.

The FICAN study found a significant association between noise reduction and a decrease in failure rates for high school students, but not middle or elementary school students. There were some weaker associations between noise reduction and an increase in failure rates for middle and elementary schools. Overall, the study found that the associations observed were similar for children with or without learning difficulties and between verbal and math/science tests. As a pilot study, the FICAN study was not expected to obtain final answers, but it provided useful indications (FICAN, 2007).

A recent study of the effect of aircraft noise on student learning (Sharp et al., 2013) examined student test scores at a total of 6,198 U.S. elementary schools, 917 of which were exposed to aircraft noise at 46 airports and with noise exposures exceeding 55 dB DNL. The study found small but statistically significant associations between airport noise and student mathematics and reading test scores, after taking demographic and school factors into account. Associations were also observed for ambient noise and total noise on student mathematics and reading test scores, suggesting that noise levels per se, as well as from aircraft, might play a role in student achievement. Recent evidence suggests that potential negative effects on classroom performance can be due to chronic ambient noise exposure. A study of French 8- and 9-year-old children found a significant association between ambient noise levels in urban environments due primarily to road noise (Pujol et al., 2014). The study estimated noise levels at children's bedrooms (L<sub>den</sub>) and found a modest effect of lower scores on French tests, and these lower scores were associated with higher L<sub>den</sub> at children's homes. Once adjusted for classroom L<sub>Aeq,day</sub>, the association between L<sub>den</sub> and math test scores became borderline significant.

As part of the NORAH study conducted at Frankfurt Airport, reading tests were conducted on 1,209 school children at 29 primary schools. It was found that there was a small decrease in reading performance that corresponded to a 1-month reading delay. However, a recent study observing children at 11 schools surrounding LAX found that the majority of distractions to elementary age students were other students, followed by themselves, which includes playing with various items and daydreaming. Less than 1 percent of distractions were caused by traffic noise (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017).

While there are many factors that can contribute to learning deficits in school-aged children, there is increasing awareness that chronic exposure to high aircraft noise levels may impair learning. This awareness has led the WHO and a North Atlantic Treaty Organization working group to conclude that daycare centers and schools should not be located near major sources of noise, such as highways, airports, and industrial sites (North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 2000; WHO, 1999). The awareness has also led to the classroom noise standard discussed earlier (ANSI, 2010).

# A1.3.7.2 Health Effects on Children

A number of studies, including some of the cognitive studies discussed above, have examined the potential for effects on children's health. Health effects include annoyance, psychological health impacts, coronary risk, stress hormones, sleep disturbance, and hearing loss.

**Annoyance.** Chronic noise exposure causes annoyance in children (Bronzaft and McCarthy, 1975; Evans et al., 1995). Annoyance among children tends to be higher than among adults, and there is little

habituation (Haines et al., 2001a). The RANCH study found annoyance may play a role in how noise affects reading comprehension (Clark et al., 2005).

**Psychological Health**. The available literature on psychological health impacts of noise exposure reveals inconsistent findings that are perhaps suggestive of highly situational-specific factors. Lercher et al. (2002) found an association between noise and teacher ratings of psychological health, but only for children with biological risk defined by low birth weight and/or premature birth. Haines et al. (2001b) found that children exposed to aircraft noise had higher levels of psychological distress and hyperactivity. Stansfeld et al. (2009) replicated the hyperactivity result, but not the result for distress. Crombie et al. (2011) found similar hyperactivity results but no significant associations between aircraft noise at school and later mental health issues in children at risk at birth--i.e., those with low birth weight.

Dreger et al. (2015) investigated the influence of different environmental noise sources at children's homes on the incidence of mental health problems in school-aged children. Using a survey of reported level of day and night annoyance by parents as the metric of noise level, the study identified an association between exposure to noise at home and mental health problems such as emotional symptoms, conduct problems, and hyperactivity. Road noise was the most common exposure and was significantly associated with the total difficulties score, emotional symptoms, and conduct problems. Noise by neighbors was associated with conduct problems and hyperactivity. However, aircraft noise (by day) and construction work (by day) were not associated with any of the SDQ categories at a significant level. More generally, and perhaps more importantly, the study found that children who were in the group of constant high exposure, and therefore were continuously exposed for a long time, had higher risk for mental health problems. The authors recognized the lack of quantitative noise measurements as an important study limitation but provide evidence from prior studies indicating reported annoyance as a good proxy.

Hjortebjerg et al. (2016) used noise models to determine average time-weighted road and railroad noise exposure for 46,940 children from birth to age 7 years. Airfield noise was similarly determined but only evaluated as a confounding variable, as was air pollution. A 10 dB increase in average time-weighted road traffic noise exposure from birth to 7 years of age was associated with a 7-percent increase in abnormal versus normal total difficulties scores; 5-percent increases in borderline and abnormal hyperactivity/inattention subscale scores, respectively; and 5-percent and 6-percent increases in abnormal conduct problem and peer relationship problem subscale scores, respectively. Exposure to road traffic noise during pregnancy was not associated with child behavioral problems at 7 years of age. While this study is quantitative, its application to airfield noise is limited due to the different nature of road versus airfield noise.

As with studies of adults, the available evidence suggests that chronic noise exposure is probably not associated with serious psychological illness, but there may be effects on well-being and quality of life. Further research is needed.

**Coronary Risk**. The HYENA study discussed earlier indicated a possible relation between noise and hypertension in older adults. Cohen et al. (1980, 1981) found some increase in blood pressure among school children, but this increase was within the normal range and not indicating hypertension. Hygge et al. (2002) found mixed effects. The RANCH study found some effect for children at home and at night but not at school (van Kempen, 2006). In the Munich study (Evans et al., 1998), chronic noise exposure was found to be associated with both baseline systolic blood pressure and lower reactivity of systolic

blood pressure to a cognitive task presented under acute noise. After the new airport opened, a significant increase in systolic blood pressure was observed, providing evidence for a causal link between chronic noise exposure and raised blood pressure. No association was found between noise and diastolic blood pressure or reactivity (Stansfeld and Crombie, 2011; Stansfeld, 2015).

However, the relationship between aircraft noise and blood pressure was not fully consistent between surveys in different countries. These findings, taken together with those from previous studies, suggest that no unequivocal conclusions can be drawn about the association between aircraft noise exposure and blood pressure. Overall, the evidence for noise effects on children's blood pressure is mixed and less certain than for noise effects on older adults.

**Stress Hormones**. Some studies investigated hormonal levels between groups of children exposed to aircraft noise and those in a control group. Two studies analyzed cortisol and urinary catecholamine levels in school children as measurements of stress response to aircraft noise (Haines et al., 2001a, 2001b, 2001c). In both instances, there were no differences between the aircraft-noise-exposed children and the control groups.

**Sleep Disturbance**. A sub-study of RANCH in a Swedish sample used sleep logs and the monitoring of rest/activity cycles to compare the effect of road traffic noise on child and parent sleep (Ohrstrom et al., 2006). An exposure-response relationship was found for sleep quality and daytime sleepiness for children. While this suggests effects of noise on children's sleep disturbance, it is difficult to generalize from one study. Davies (2012) discusses how a study in France among 10-year-old schoolchildren showed that school noise exposure was associated with higher cortisol levels, indicative of a stress reaction; these finding are supported by a Swedish study that found increased prevalence of reduced diurnal cortisol variability in relation with classroom  $L_{eq}$  during school day noise levels of between 59 and 87 dBA.

# A1.3.8 Property Values

Noise, along with many other conditions, (i.e. location, number of rooms, crime rate, school district) can affect the value of homes. Economic studies of property values based on selling prices and noise have been conducted to find a direct relation. Studies of the effects of aviation noise on property values are highly complex due to differing community environments, market conditions, and methodological approaches, so study results generally range from some negative impacts to significant negative impacts. However, studies that considered positive aspects of airport accessibility have found net positive impacts on property values, while others found poorly informed buyers often bid higher prices in noise-impacted areas, only to potentially be disappointed after purchase (ACRP, 2008). The valuenoise relation is usually presented as the Noise Depreciation Index (NDI), or Noise Sensitivity Depreciation Index, for the percent loss of value per dB (measured by the DNL metric). An early study by Nelson (1978) at three airports found an NDI of 1.8 to 2.3 percent per dB. Nelson also noted a decline in NDI over time, which he theorized could be due to either a change in population or the increase in commercial value of the property near airports. Crowley (1973) reached a similar conclusion. A larger study by Nelson (1980) studying property values near 18 airports found an NDI from 0.5 to 0.6 percent per dB.

In a review of property value studies, Newman and Beattie (1985) found a range of NDI from 0.2 to 2 percent per dB. They noted that many factors other than noise affected values. These socioeconomic

factors include size of house, number of rooms per house, repair of the house, distance from amenities and business districts, and demographics.

Frankel (1991) conducted surveys of 200 realtors and 70 appraisers in 35 suburban communities near Chicago O'Hare International Airport and found that a significant segment of buyers lacked adequate information about the noise environment and often overbid, only to be disappointed after purchase. Frankel classified noise-affected property owners into two groups: one that moved to the location while the environment was quiet but later became noise-impacted and another that purchased from a previous owner while the property was already noise impacted. Frankel concluded that the former group members bore the true financial burden of airport noise.

Fidell et al. (1996) studied the influence of aircraft noise on actual sale prices of residential properties in the vicinity of a military base in Virginia and one in Arizona. They found no meaningful effect on home values. Their results may have been affected by non-noise factors, especially the wide differences in homes between the two study areas.

Tomkins (1998) conducted a study of the residential areas near Manchester Airport, England, and showed that when using the Noise and Number Index (no longer used but similar to DNL), there was no significant negative relationship between noise and property values. When  $L_{eq}$  measure was analyzed, fewer properties are included, but the most noise-blighted are identified. Ultimately, the proximity to the airport had a significant impact and was found to be a more important factor of property values than noise. This could be that potential buyers were more likely to be aware of potentially negative noise impacts when properties were closest to airports and much less aware at further distances.

Lipscomb (2003) analyzed the City of College Park, Georgia, and found that noise did not significantly affect the values of residential properties. Lipscomb concluded that local residents were more accepting of noise because many were employed in airport-related occupations, so the proximity provided offsetting benefits, such as short work commutes.

Recent studies of noise effects on property values have recognized the need to account for non-noise factors. Nelson (2004) analyzed data from 33 airports and discussed the need to account for those factors and the need for careful statistics. His analysis showed NDI from 0.3 to 1.5 percent per dB, with an average of about 0.65 percent per dB. Nelson (2007) and Andersson et al. (2013) discuss statistical modeling in more detail.

Enough data are available to conclude that aircraft noise has a real effect on property values. This effect falls in the range of 0.2 to 2.0 percent per dB, with the average on the order of 0.5 percent per dB. The actual value varies from location to location, and it is very often small compared to non-noise factors such as location, market conditions, neighborhood characteristics, and property age, size, and amenities.

#### A1.3.9 Noise-Induced Vibration Effects on Structures and Humans

The sound from an aircraft overflight travels from the exterior to the interior of a house in one of two ways: through the solid structural elements or directly through the air. Figure A-13 illustrates the sound transmission through a wall constructed with a brick exterior, stud framing, interior finished wall, and absorbent material in the cavity. The sound transmission starts with noise impinging on the wall exterior. Some of this sound energy will be reflected away, and some will make the wall vibrate. The vibrating wall radiates sound into the airspace, which in turn sets the interior finished surface vibrating, with some energy lost in the airspace. This surface then radiates sound into the dwelling interior. As the

figure shows, vibrational energy also bypasses the air cavity by traveling through the studs and edge connections.



Figure A-13 Depiction of Sound Transmission through Built Construction

High noise levels can cause buildings to vibrate. If noise levels are high enough, building components can be damaged. The most sensitive components of a building are the windows, followed by plaster walls and ceilings. Possibility of damage depends on the sound pressures levels and the resonances of the building. While certain frequencies (such as 30 Hz for window breakage) may be of more concern than other frequencies, in general, only sounds lasting more than one second at greater than an unweighted sound level of 130 dB in the 1 Hz to 1,000 Hz frequency range are potentially damaging to structural components (CHABA, 1977; von Gierke and Ward, 1991). Sound levels from normal aircraft operations are typically much less than 130 dB. Even sounds from low-altitude flyovers of heavy aircraft do not reach the potential for damage (Sutherland, 1990).

Noise-induced structural vibration may cause annoyance to dwelling occupants because of induced secondary vibrations, or "rattle," of objects--hanging pictures, dishes, plaques, and bric-a-brac--within the dwelling. Loose window panes may also vibrate noticeably when exposed to high levels of airborne noise, causing homeowners to fear breakage. In general, rattling occurs at unweighted sound levels that last for several seconds at greater than 110 dB.

A field study conducted by Schomer and Neathammer (1985, 1987) examined the role of structural vibration and rattle in human response to helicopter noise. It showed that human response is strongly and negatively influenced when the noise induces noticeable vibration and rattles in the house structure. The A-frequency weighting was adequate to assess community response to helicopter noise when no vibration or rattle was induced. When rattle or vibrations were induced by the helicopter

noise, however, A-weighting alone did not assess the community response adequately, such that significant corrections from 12 dB (for little vibration or rattles) to 20 dB (high level of vibration or rattles) needed to be applied for subjects indoors. It was also found that the presence or absence of high-level noise-induced vibration and rattles was strongly dependent on the helicopter's slant distance. It was recommended that no housing or noise-sensitive land uses be located in zones where high levels of vibration or rattle are induced by helicopter noise.

Community reactions to conventional helicopter noise from low numbers of operations for two helicopter types were studied by Fields and Powell (1987). Using resident interviews in combination with controlled helicopter operations, the authors obtained relations between the annoyance score and noise exposure for short-term (9-hour daytime) periods. It was determined that annoyance increased steadily with noise exposure measured in L<sub>eq</sub> from 45 to 60 dBA for that period. Annoyance response in terms of percentage annoyed was also presented on this scale for various annoyance rating values. The shape of these curves is similar to the well-known dose-response relationship (Schultz curve) for general transportation noise but relates to only the 9-hour daytime period and with no direct comparison with long-term noise exposure.

In a later review of human response to aircraft noise and induced building vibration, Powell and Shepherd (1989) also indicate that in aircraft noise surveys, the annoyance scores are on average greater when vibration is detected than with no vibration detected. Based on the results of the study by Fields and Powell (1987), they conclude, however, that no effect of increased annoyance was found for cases where the helicopter noise level and slant distance were such that appreciable rattle was expected to occur, in contrast to the results of Schomer and Neathammer (1987). Powell and Shepherd (1989) also quote a laboratory study (Cawthorn et al., 1978) in which the sound of rattling glassware added to the aircraft flyover noises but did not increase the level of annoyance.

Community annoyance in the vicinity of airports due to noise-induced vibration and rattle resulting from aircraft ground operations was studied by Fidell et al. (1999) and summarized in the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Low Frequency Noise (LFN) Expert Panel Report (Sutherland et al., 2000). These field surveys of operations in the vicinity of a major international airport indicated that low-frequency aircraft noise can lead to secondary vibration and rattle in residential structures, which may significantly increase annoyance. These studies, however, have been criticized (FICAN, 2002) due to the absence of direct measurements of vibration in support of the findings on the presence of perceptible vibration and rattle. These issues were further addressed by Hodgdon et al. (2007). It was confirmed that the highest levels of noise near the runway during start-of-takeoff-roll and acceleration and during thrust reversal are at frequencies below 200 Hz. It was also found that aircraft noise exposures that contained audible rattling were not the most annoying, likely because the rattle content was audible but not loud compared to the overall noise content. This result is consistent with an earlier study of human response to aircraft noise and induced building vibration (Powell and Shepherd, 1989).

In the assessment of vibration on humans, the following factors determine whether a person will perceive and possibly react to building vibrations:

- 1. Type of excitation: steady state, intermittent, or impulsive vibration.
- 2. Frequency of the excitation. ISO standard 2631-2 (ISO, 1989) recommends a frequency range of 1 to 80 Hz for the assessment of vibration on humans.
- 3. Orientation of the body with respect to the vibration.

- 4. The use of the occupied space (i.e., residential, workshop, hospital).
- 5. Time of day.

Table A-6 lists the whole-body vibration criteria from ISO 2631-2 for one-third octave frequency bands from 1 to 80 Hz.

	Rivis Acceleration (m/s/s)			
Frequency (Hz)	Combined Criterio Curve	а вазе Residential Night	Residential Day	
1.00	0.0036	0.0050	0.0072	
1.25	0.0036	0.0050	0.0072	
1.60	0.0036	0.0050	0.0072	
2.00	0.0036	0.0050	0.0072	
2.50	0.0037	0.0052	0.0074	
3.15	0.0039	0.0054	0.0077	
4.00	0.0041	0.0057	0.0081	
5.00	0.0043	0.0060	0.0086	
6.30	0.0046	0.0064	0.0092	
8.00	0.0050	0.0070	0.0100	
10.00	0.0063	0.0088	0.0126	
12.50	0.0078	0.0109	0.0156	
16.00	0.0100	0.0140	0.0200	
20.00	0.0125	0.0175	0.0250	
25.00	0.0156	0.0218	0.0312	
31.50	0.0197	0.0276	0.0394	
40.00	0.0250	0.0350	0.0500	
50.00	0.0313	0.0438	0.0626	
63.00	0.0394	0.0552	0.0788	
80.00	0.0500	0.0700	0.1000	

# Table A-6Vibration Criteria for the Evaluation of Human Exposure to Whole-Body<br/>Vibration

Source: ISO, 1989

# A1.3.10 Noise Effects on Terrain

It has been suggested that noise levels associated with low-flying aircraft may affect the terrain under the flight path by disturbing fragile soil or snow, especially in mountainous areas, thereby causing landslides or avalanches. There are no known instances of such events. It is improbable that such effects would result from routine subsonic aircraft operations.

# A1.3.11 Noise Effects on Historical and Archaeological Sites

Historic buildings and sites can have elements that are more structurally fragile than conventional buildings. Aircraft noise may affect such sites more severely than newer, modern structures. In older structures, seemingly insignificant surface cracks caused by vibrations from aircraft noise may lead to greater damage from natural forces (Hanson et al., 1991). There are few scientific studies of such effects to provide guidance for their assessment.

One study involved measurements of noise and vibration in a restored plantation house, originally built in 1795. It is located 1,500 feet from the centerline at the departure end of Runway 19L at Washington

Dulles International Airport. The aircraft generating the sound measured was the Concorde. There was special concern for the building's windows because roughly half of the house's 324 panes were original. No instances of structural damage were found. Interestingly, despite the high levels of noise during Concorde takeoffs, the induced structural vibration levels were actually less than those induced by touring groups and vacuum cleaning (Wesler, 1977).

As for conventional structures, noise exposure levels for normally compatible land uses should also be protective of historic and archaeological sites. Unique sites should, of course, be analyzed for specific exposure.

# A1.3.12 Effects on Domestic Animals and Wildlife

Hearing is critical to an animal's ability to react, compete, reproduce, hunt, forage, and survive in its environment. While the existing literature does include studies on possible effects of jet aircraft noise and sonic booms on wildlife, there appears to have been little concerted effort in developing quantitative comparisons of aircraft noise effects on normal auditory characteristics. Behavioral effects have been relatively well described, but the larger ecological context issues, and the potential for drawing conclusions regarding effects on populations, has not been well developed.

The relationships between potential auditory/physiological effects and species interactions with their environments are not well understood. Manci et al. (1988) assert that the consequences that physiological effects may have on behavioral patterns are vital to understanding the long-term effects of noise on wildlife. Questions regarding the effects (if any) on predator-prey interactions, reproductive success, and intra-inter specific behavior patterns remain.

The following discussion provides an overview of the existing literature on noise effects (particularly jet aircraft noise) on animal species. The literature reviewed here involves those studies that have focused on the observations of the behavioral effects that jet aircraft and sonic booms have on animals.

A great deal of research was conducted in the 1960s and 1970s on the effects of aircraft noise on the public and the potential for adverse ecological impacts. These studies were largely completed in response to the increase in air travel and as a result of the introduction of supersonic jet aircraft. According to Manci et al. (1988), the foundation of information created from that focus does not necessarily correlate or provide information specific to the impacts to wildlife in areas overflown by aircraft at supersonic speed or at low altitudes.

The abilities to hear sounds and noise and to communicate assist wildlife in maintaining group cohesiveness and survivorship. Social species communicate by transmitting calls of warning, introduction, and other types that are subsequently related to an individual's or group's responsiveness.

Animal species differ greatly in their responses to noise. Noise effects on domestic animals and wildlife are classified as primary, secondary, and tertiary. Primary effects are direct, physiological changes to the auditory system, and these most likely include the masking of auditory signals. Masking is defined as the inability of an individual to hear important environmental signals that may arise from mates, predators, or prey. There is some potential that noise could disrupt a species' ability to communicate or could interfere with behavioral patterns (Manci et al., 1988). Although the effects are likely temporary, aircraft noise may cause masking of auditory signals within exposed faunal communities. Animals rely on hearing to avoid predators, obtain food, and communicate with, and attract, other members of their species. Aircraft noise may mask or interfere with these functions. Other primary effects, such as ear

drum rupture or temporary and permanent hearing threshold shifts, are not as likely, given the subsonic noise levels produced by aircraft overflights.

Secondary effects may include non-auditory effects such as stress and hypertension; behavioral modifications; interference with mating or reproduction; and impaired ability to obtain adequate food, cover, or water. Tertiary effects are the direct result of primary and secondary effects, and these include population decline and habitat loss. Most of the effects of noise are mild enough that they may never be detectable as variables of change in population size or population growth against the background of normal variation (Bowles, 1995). Other environmental variables (e.g., predators, weather, changing prey base, ground-based disturbance) also influence secondary and tertiary effects, and confound the ability to identify the ultimate factor in limiting productivity of a certain nest, area, or region (Smith et al., 1988). Overall, the literature suggests that species differ in their response to various types, durations, and sources of noise (Manci et al., 1988).

Many scientific studies have investigated the effects of aircraft noise on wildlife, and some have focused on wildlife "flight" due to noise. Animal responses to aircraft are influenced by many variables, including size, speed, proximity (both height above the ground and lateral distance), engine noise, color, flight profile, and radiated noise. The type of aircraft (e.g., fixed wing versus rotor-wing [helicopter]) and type of flight mission may also produce different levels of disturbance, with varying animal responses (Smith et al., 1988). Consequently, it is difficult to generalize animal responses to noise disturbances across species, especially with respect to habituation and ability to adapt to change.

One result of the Manci et al. (1988) literature review was the conclusion that, while behavioral observation studies were relatively limited, a general behavioral reaction in animals from exposure to aircraft noise is the startle response. The intensity and duration of the startle response appears to be dependent on which species is exposed, whether a group or an individual is exposed, and whether there have been some previous exposures. Responses range from flight, trampling, stampeding, jumping, or running, to movement of the head in the apparent direction of the noise source. Manci et al. (1988) reported that the literature indicated that avian species may be more sensitive to aircraft noise than mammals.

# A1.3.12.1 Domestic Animals

Although some studies report that the effects of aircraft noise on domestic animals is inconclusive, a majority of the literature reviewed indicates that domestic animals exhibit some behavioral responses to military overflights but generally seem to habituate to the disturbances over a period of time. Mammals in particular appear to react to noise at sound levels higher than 90 dB, with responses including the startle response, freezing (i.e., becoming temporarily stationary), and fleeing from the sound source. Many studies on domestic animals suggest that some species appear to acclimate to some forms of sound disturbance (Manci et al., 1988). Some studies have reported such primary and secondary effects as reduced milk production and rate of milk release, increased glucose concentrations, decreased levels of hemoglobin, increased heart rate, and a reduction in thyroid activity. These latter effects appear to represent a small percentage of the findings occurring in the existing literature.

Some reviewers have indicated that earlier studies, and claims by farmers linking adverse effects of aircraft noise on livestock, did not necessarily provide clear-cut evidence of cause and effect (Cottereau, 1978). In contrast, many studies conclude that there is no evidence that aircraft overflights affect feed intake, growth, or production rates in domestic animals.

#### Cattle

In response to concerns about overflight effects on pregnant cattle, milk production, and cattle safety, the U.S. Air Force prepared a handbook for environmental protection that summarized the literature on the impacts of low-altitude flights on livestock (and poultry) and includes specific case studies conducted in numerous airspaces across the country. Adverse effects have been found in a few studies but have not been reproduced in other similar studies. One such study, conducted in 1983, suggested that two of 10 cows in late pregnancy aborted after showing rising estrogen and falling progesterone levels. These increased hormonal levels were reported as being linked to 59 aircraft overflights. The remaining eight cows showed no changes in their blood concentrations and calved normally. A similar study reported abortions occurred in three out of five pregnant cattle after exposing them to flyovers by six different aircraft. Another study suggested that feedlot cattle could stampede and injure themselves when exposed to low-level overflights (U.S. Air Force, 1994a).

A majority of the studies reviewed suggest that there is little or no effect of aircraft noise on cattle. Studies presenting adverse effects to domestic animals have been limited. A number of studies (Parker and Bayley, 1960; Casady and Lehmann, 1967; Kovalcik and Sottnik, 1971) investigated the effects of jet aircraft noise and sonic booms on the milk production of dairy cows. Through the compilation and examination of milk production data from areas exposed to jet aircraft noise and sonic boom events, it was determined that milk yields were not affected. This was particularly evident in those cows that had been previously exposed to jet aircraft noise.

A study examined the causes of 1,763 abortions in Wisconsin dairy cattle over a 1-year time period, and none were associated with aircraft disturbances (U.S. Air Force, 1993). In 1987, researchers contacted seven livestock operators for production data, and no effects of low-altitude and supersonic flights were noted. Of the 43 cattle previously exposed to low-altitude flights, three showed a startle response to an F/A-18 aircraft flying overhead at 500 feet above ground level (AGL) and 400 knots by running less than 10 meters. They resumed normal activity within 1 minute (U.S. Air Force, 1994a). Beyer (1983) found that helicopters caused more reaction than other low-aircraft overflights and that helicopters at 30 to 60 feet overhead did not affect milk production and pregnancies of 44 cows in a 1964 study (U.S. Air Force, 1994a).

Additionally, Beyer (1983) reported that five pregnant dairy cows in a pasture did not exhibit fright-flight tendencies or disturb their pregnancies after being overflown by 79 low-altitude helicopter flights and four low-altitude, subsonic jet aircraft flights. A 1956 study found that the reactions of dairy and beef cattle to noise from low-altitude, subsonic aircraft were similar to those caused by paper blowing about, unfamiliar persons, or other moving objects (U.S. Air Force, 1994a).

In a report to Congress, the U. S. Forest Service concluded that "evidence both from field studies of wild ungulates and laboratory studies of domestic stock indicate that the risks of damage are small (from aircraft approaches of 50-100 m), as animals take care not to damage themselves (U.S. Forest Service, 1992). If animals are overflown by aircraft at altitudes of 50-100 m, there is no evidence that mothers and young are separated, that animals collide with obstructions (unless confined) or that they traverse dangerous ground at too high a rate." These varied study results suggest that, although the confining of cattle could magnify animal response to aircraft overflight, there is no proven cause-and-effect link between startling cattle from aircraft overflights and abortion rates or lower milk production.

#### Horses

Horses have also been observed to react to overflights of jet aircraft. Several of the studies reviewed reported a varied response of horses to low-altitude aircraft overflights. Observations made in 1966 and 1968 noted that horses galloped in response to jet flyovers (U.S. Air Force, 1993). Bowles (1995) cites Kruger and Erath as observing horses exhibiting intensive flight reactions, random movements, and biting/kicking behavior. However, no injuries or abortions occurred, and there was evidence that the mares adapted somewhat to the flyovers over the course of a month (U.S. Air Force, 1994a). Although horses were observed noticing the overflights, it did not appear to affect either survivability or reproductive success. There was also some indication that habituation to these types of disturbances was occurring.

LeBlanc et al. (1991) studied the effects of F-14 jet aircraft noise on pregnant mares. They specifically focused on any changes in pregnancy success, behavior, cardiac function, hormone production, and rate of habituation. Their findings reported observations of "flight-fright" reactions, which caused increases in heart rates and serum cortisol concentrations. The mares, however, did habituate to the noise. Levels of anxiety and mass body movements were the highest after initial exposure, with intensities of responses decreasing thereafter. There were no differences in pregnancy success when compared to a control group.

#### Swine

Generally, the literature findings for swine appear to be similar to those reported for cows and horses. While there are some effects from aircraft noise reported in the literature, these effects are minor. Studies of continuous noise exposure (i.e., 6 hours and 72 hours of constant exposure) reported influences on short-term hormonal production and release. Additional constant exposure studies indicated the observation of stress reactions, hypertension, and electrolyte imbalances (Dufour, 1980). A study by Bond et al. (1963) demonstrated no adverse effects on the feeding efficiency, weight gain, ear physiology, or thyroid and adrenal gland condition of pigs subjected to observed aircraft noise. Observations of heart rate increase were recorded, noting that cessation of the noise resulted in the return to normal heart rates. Conception rates and offspring survivorship did not appear to be influenced by exposure to aircraft noise.

Similarly, simulated aircraft noise at levels of 100 to 135 dB had only minor effects on the rate of feed utilization, weight gain, food intake, or reproduction rates of boars and sows exposed, and there were no injuries or inner ear changes observed (Gladwin et al., 1988; Manci et al., 1988).

#### **Domestic Fowl**

According to a 1994 position paper by the U.S. Air Force on effects of low-altitude overflights (below 1,000 feet) on domestic fowl, overflight activity has negligible effects (U.S. Air Force, 1994b). The paper did recognize that given certain circumstances, adverse effects can be serious. Some of the effects can be panic reactions, reduced productivity, and effects on marketability (e.g., bruising of the meat caused during "pile-up" situations).

The typical reaction of domestic fowl after exposure to sudden, intense noise is a short-term startle response. The reaction ceases as soon as the stimulus is ended, and within a few minutes all activity returns to normal. More severe responses are possible depending on the number of birds, the frequency of exposure, and environmental conditions. Large flocks of birds, and birds not previously exposed, are more likely to pile up in response to a noise stimulus (U.S. Air Force, 1994b). According to

studies and interviews with growers, it is typically the previously unexposed birds that incite panic crowding, and the tendency to do so is markedly reduced within five exposures to the stimulus (U.S. Air Force, 1994b). This suggests that the birds habituate relatively quickly. Egg productivity was not adversely affected by infrequent noise bursts, even at exposure levels as high as 120 to 130 dB.

Between 1956 and 1988, there were 100 recorded claims against the Navy for alleged damage to domestic fowl. The number of claims averaged three per year, with peak numbers of claims following publications of studies on the topic in the early 1960s. Many of the claims were disproved or did not have sufficient supporting evidence. The claims were filed for the following alleged damages: 55 percent for panic reactions, 31 percent for decreased production, 6 percent for reduced hatchability, 6 percent for weight loss, and less than 1 percent for reduced fertility (U.S. Air Force, 1994b).

The review of the existing literature suggests that there has not been a concerted or widespread effort to study the effects of aircraft noise on commercial turkeys. One study involving turkeys examined the differences between simulated versus actual overflight aircraft noise, turkey responses to the noise, weight gain, and evidence of habituation (Bowles et al., 1990). Findings from the study suggested that turkeys habituated to jet aircraft noise quickly, that there were no growth-rate differences between the experimental and control groups, and that there were some behavioral differences that increased the difficulty in handling individuals within the experimental group.

Low-altitude overflights were shown to cause turkey flocks that were kept inside turkey houses to occasionally pile up and experience high mortality rates due to the aircraft noise and a variety of disturbances unrelated to aircraft (U.S. Air Force, 1994b).

# A1.3.12.2 Wildlife

Studies on the effects of overflights and sonic booms on wildlife have been focused mostly on avian species and on ungulates such as caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) and bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*). Few studies have been conducted on marine mammals, small terrestrial mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and carnivorous mammals. Generally, species that live entirely below the surface of the water have also been ignored due to the fact they do not experience the same level of sound as terrestrial species (National Park Service, 1994). Wild ungulates appear to be much more sensitive to noise disturbance than domestic livestock. This may be due to previous exposure to disturbances. One common factor appears to be that low-altitude flyovers seem to be more disruptive in terrain where there is little cover (Manci et al., 1988).

# Mammals

# <u>Terrestrial Mammals</u>

Studies of terrestrial mammals have shown that noise levels of 120 dB can damage mammals' ears, and levels at 95 dB can cause temporary loss of hearing acuity. Noise from aircraft has affected other large carnivores by causing changes in home ranges, foraging patterns, and breeding behavior. One study recommended that aircraft not be allowed to fly at altitudes below 2,000 feet AGL over important grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos horribilis*) and polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) habitat. Wolves (*Canis lupus*) have been frightened by low-altitude flights that were 25 to 1,000 feet AGL. However, wolves have been found to adapt to aircraft overflights and noise as long as they were not being hunted from aircraft (Dufour, 1980).

Wild ungulates (American bison [Bison bison], caribou, bighorn sheep) appear to be much more sensitive to noise disturbance than domestic livestock (Weisenberger et al., 1996). Behavioral reactions may be related to the past history of disturbances by humans and aircraft. Common reactions of reindeer kept in an enclosure exposed to aircraft noise disturbance were a slight startle response, rising of the head, pricking ears, and scenting of the air. Panic reactions and extensive changes in behavior of individual animals were not observed. Caribou in Alaska exposed to fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters exhibited running and panic reactions when overflights were at an altitude of 200 feet or less. The reactions decreased with increased altitude of overflights, and, with more than 500 feet in altitude, the panic reactions stopped. Also, smaller groups reacted less strongly than larger groups. One negative effect of the running and avoidance behavior is increased expenditure of energy. For a 90-kilogram animal, the calculated expenditure due to aircraft harassment is 64 kilocalories per minute when running and 20 kilocalories per minute when walking. When conditions are favorable, this expenditure can be counteracted with increased feeding; however, during harsh winter conditions, this may not be possible. Incidental observations of wolves and bears exposed to fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters in the northern regions suggested that wolves are less disturbed than wild ungulates, while grizzly bears showed the greatest response of any animal species observed (Weisenberger et al., 1996).

It has been proven that low-altitude overflights do induce stress in animals. Increased heart rates, an indicator of excitement or stress, have been found in pronghorn antelope (*Antilocapra Americana*), elk (*Cervus Canadensis*), and bighorn sheep. As such reactions occur naturally as a response to predation, infrequent overflights may not, in and of themselves, be detrimental. However, flights at high frequencies over a long period of time may cause harmful effects. The consequences of this disturbance, while cumulative, are not additive. It may be that aircraft disturbance may not cause obvious and serious health effects, but coupled with a harsh winter, it may have an adverse impact. Research has shown that stress induced by other types of disturbances produces long-term decreases in metabolism and hormone balances in wild ungulates.

Behavioral responses can range from mild to severe. Mild responses include head raising, body shifting, or turning to orient toward the aircraft. Moderate disturbance may be nervous behaviors, such as trotting a short distance. Escape is the typical severe response.

#### Marine Mammals

The physiological composition of the ear in aquatic and marine mammals exhibits adaptation to the aqueous environment. These differences (relative to terrestrial species) manifest themselves in the auricle and middle ear (Manci et al., 1988). Some mammals use echolocation to perceive objects in their surroundings and to determine the directions and locations of sound sources (Simmons, 1983 in Manci et al. 1988).

In 1980, the Acoustical Society of America held a workshop to assess the potential hazard of manmade noise associated with proposed Alaska arctic (North Slope-Outer Continental Shelf) petroleum operations on marine wildlife and to prepare a research plan to secure the knowledge necessary for proper assessment of noise impacts (Acoustical Society of America, 1980). Since 1980, it appears that research on responses of aquatic mammals to aircraft noise and sonic booms has been limited. Research conducted on northern fur seals (*Callorhinus ursinus*), sea lions, and ringed seals (*Pusa hispida*) indicated that there are some differences in how various animal groups receive frequencies of sound. It was observed that these species exhibited varying intensities of a startle response to airborne noise, and this response was habituated over time. The rates of habituation appeared to vary with species, populations,

and demographics (age, sex). Time of day of exposure was also a factor (Myrberg, 1978 in Manci et al., 1988).

Studies were conducted near the Channel Islands near the area where the space shuttle launches occur. It was found that there were some response differences between species relative to the loudness of sonic booms. Those booms that were between 80 and 89 dB caused a greater intensity of startle reactions than lower-intensity booms at 72 to 79 dB. However, the duration of the startle responses to louder sonic booms was shorter (Jehl and Cooper, 1980).

Jehl and Cooper (1980) indicated that low-flying helicopters, loud boat noises, and humans were the most disturbing to pinnipeds. According to the research, while the space shuttle launch and associated operational activity noises have not had a measurable effect on the pinniped population, it also suggests that there was a greater "disturbance level" exhibited during launch activities. There was a recommendation to continue observations for behavioral effects and to perform long-term population monitoring (Jehl and Cooper, 1980).

The continued presence of single or multiple noise sources could cause marine mammals to leave a preferred habitat. However, it does not appear likely that overflights could cause migration from suitable habitats because aircraft noise over water is mobile and would not persist over any particular area. Aircraft noise, including supersonic noise, currently occurs in the overwater airspace of Eglin, Tyndall, and Langley Air Force bases from sorties predominantly involving jet aircraft. Survey results reported in Davis et al. (2000) indicate that cetaceans (i.e., dolphins) occur under all of the Eglin and Tyndall marine airspace. The continuing presence of dolphins (family Delphinidae) indicates that aircraft noise does not discourage use of the area and apparently does not harm the locally occurring population.

In a summary by the National Park Service (1994) on the effects of noise on marine mammals, it was determined that gray whales (*Eschrichtius robustus*) and harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) showed no outward behavioral response to aircraft noise or overflights. Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) showed no obvious reaction in a study involving helicopter overflights at 1,200 to 1,800 feet above the water. Neither did they show any reaction to survey aircraft unless the shadow of the aircraft passed over them, at which point there was some observed tendency to dive (Richardson et al., 1995). Other anthropogenic noises in the marine environment from ships and pleasure craft may have more of an effect on marine mammals than aircraft noise (U.S. Air Force, 2000). The noise effects on cetaceans appear to be somewhat attenuated by the air/water interface. The cetacean fauna along the coast of California have been subjected to sonic booms from military aircraft for many years without apparent adverse effects (Tetra Tech, Inc., 1997).

Manatees (*Trichechus spp.*) appear relatively unresponsive to human-generated noise to the point that they are often suspected of being deaf to oncoming boats (although their hearing is actually similar to that of pinnipeds [Bullock et al., 1980]). Little is known about the importance of acoustic communication to manatees, although they are known to produce at least 10 different types of sounds and are thought to have sensitive hearing (Richardson et al., 1995). Manatees continue to occupy canals near Miami International Airport, which suggests they have become habituated to human disturbance and noise (Metro-Dade County, 1995). Since manatees spend most of their time below the surface and do not startle readily, no effect of aircraft overflights on manatees would be expected (Bowles et al., 1993).

#### Birds

Auditory research conducted on birds indicates that they fall between reptiles and mammals relative to hearing sensitivity. According to Dooling (1978), within the range of 1,000 to 5,000 Hz, birds show a level of hearing sensitivity similar to that of the more sensitive mammals. In contrast to mammals, bird sensitivity falls off at a greater rate with increasing and decreasing frequencies. Passive observations and studies examining aircraft bird strikes indicate that birds nest and forage near airports. Aircraft noise in the vicinity of commercial airports apparently does not inhibit bird presence and use.

High-noise events (like a low-altitude aircraft overflight) may cause birds to engage in escape or avoidance behaviors, such as flushing from perches or nests (Ellis et al., 1991). These activities impose an energy cost on the birds that, over the long term, may affect survival or growth. In addition, the birds may spend less time engaged in necessary activities like feeding, preening, or caring for their young because they spend time in noise-avoidance activity. However, the long-term significance of noise-related impacts is less clear. Several studies on nesting raptors have indicated that birds become habituated to aircraft overflights and that long-term reproductive success is not affected (Ellis et al., 1991; Grubb and King, 1991). Threshold noise levels for significant responses range from 62 dB for the Pacific black brant (*Branta bernicla nigricans*) to 85 dB for the crested tern (*Thalasseus bergii*) (Brown, 1990; Ward and Stehn, 1990).

Songbirds were observed to become silent prior to the onset of a sonic boom event (F-111 jets), followed by "raucous discordant cries." There was a return to normal singing within 10 seconds after the boom (Higgins, 1974 in Manci et al., 1988). Ravens (*Corvus corax*) responded by emitting protestation calls, flapping their wings, and soaring.

Manci et al. (1988) reported a reduction in reproductive success in some small territorial passerines (i.e., perching birds or songbirds) after exposure to low-altitude overflights. However, it has been observed that passerines are not driven any great distance from a favored food source by a nonspecific disturbance, such as aircraft overflights (U.S. Forest Service, 1992). Further study may be warranted.

A cooperative study between the DoD and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) assessed the response of the red-cockaded woodpecker (*Leuconotopicus borealis*) to a range of military training noise events, including artillery, small arms, helicopter, and maneuver noise (Pater et al., 1999). The project findings show that the red-cockaded woodpecker successfully acclimates to military noise events. Depending on the noise level that ranged from innocuous to very loud, the birds responded by flushing from their nest cavities. When the noise source was closer and the noise level was higher, the number of flushes increased proportionately. In all cases, however, the birds returned to their nests within a relatively short period of time (usually within 12 minutes). Additionally, the noise exposure did not result in any mortality or statistically detectable changes in reproductive success (Pater et al., 1999). Red-cockaded woodpeckers did not flush when artillery simulators were more than 122 meters away and SELs were 70 dB.

Lynch and Speake (1978) studied the effects of both real and simulated sonic booms on the nesting and brooding eastern wild turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo silvestris*) in Alabama. Hens at four nest sites were subjected to between eight and 11 combined real and simulated sonic booms. All tests elicited similar responses, including quick lifting of the head and apparent alertness for 10 to 20 seconds. No apparent nest failure occurred as a result of the sonic booms. Twenty-one brood groups were also subjected to simulated sonic booms. Reactions varied slightly between groups, but the largest percentage of groups reacted by standing motionless after the initial blast. Upon the sound of the boom, the hens and poults

fled until reaching the edge of the woods (approximately 4 to 8 meters). Afterward, the poults resumed feeding activities while the hens remained alert for a short period of time (approximately 15 to 20 seconds). In no instances were poults abandoned, and they did not scatter and become lost. Every observation group returned to normal activities within a maximum of 30 seconds after a blast.

#### Bald Eagle

A study by Grubb and King (1991) on the reactions of the bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) to human disturbances showed that terrestrial disturbances elicited the greatest response, followed by aquatic (i.e., boats) and aerial disturbances. The disturbance regime of the area where the study occurred was predominantly characterized by aircraft noise. The study found that pedestrians consistently caused responses that were greater in both frequency and duration. Helicopters elicited the highest level of aircraft-related responses. Aircraft disturbances, although the most common form of disturbance, resulted in the lowest levels of response. This low response level may have been due to habituation; however, flights less than 170 meters away caused reactions similar to other disturbance types. Ellis et al. (1991) showed that eagles typically respond to the proximity of a disturbance, such as a pedestrian or aircraft within 100 meters, rather than the noise level. Fleischner and Weisberg (1986) stated that reactions of bald eagles to commercial jet flights, although minor (e.g., looking), were twice as likely to occur when the jets passed at a distance of 0.5 mile or less. They also noted that helicopters were four times more likely to cause a reaction than a commercial jet and 20 times more likely to cause a reaction than a propeller plane.

The USFWS advised Cannon Air Force Base that flights at or below 2,000 feet AGL from October 1 through March 1 could result in adverse impacts to wintering bald eagles (USFWS, 1998). However, Fraser et al. (1985) suggested that raptors habituate to overflights rapidly, sometimes tolerating aircraft approaches of 65 feet or less.

# <u>Golden Eagle</u>

In its guidelines for aerial surveys, USFWS (Pagel et al., 2010) summarized past studies by stating that most golden eagles (*Aquila chrysaetos*) respond to survey aircraft (fixed- and rotary-wing) by remaining on their nests and continuing to incubate or roost. Surveys take place generally as close as 10 to 20 meters from cliffs (including hovering less than 30 seconds if necessary to count eggs) and no farther than 200 meters from cliffs, depending on safety considerations (Pagel et al., 2010).

Grubb et al. (2007) experimented with multiple exposure to two helicopter types and concluded that flights with a variety of approach distances (800, 400, 200, and 100 meters) had no effect on golden eagle nesting success or productivity rates within the same year or on rates of renewed nesting activity the following year when compared to the corresponding data for the larger population of non-manipulated nest sites (Grubb et al., 2007). They found no significant, detrimental, or disruptive responses in 303 helicopter passes near eagles. In 227 AH-64 Apache helicopter experimental passes (considered twice as loud as a civilian helicopter also tested) at test distances of 0 to 800 meters from nesting golden eagles, 96 percent resulted in no more response than watching the helicopter pass. No greater reactions occurred until after hatching, when individual golden eagles exhibited five flatten and three fly behaviors at three nest sites. The flight responses occurred at approach distances of 200 meters or less. No evidence was found of an effect on subsequent nesting activity or success, despite many of the helicopter flights occurring during early courtship and nest repair. None of these responding pairs failed to successfully fledge young, except for one nest that fell later in the season. Excited, startled, or avoidance reactions were never observed. Non-attending eagles or those perched

away from the nests were more likely to fly than attending eagles but also with less potential consequence to nesting success (Grubb et al., 2007). Golden eagles appeared to become less responsive with successive exposures. Much of helicopter sound energy may be at a lower frequency than golden eagles can hear, thus reducing expected impacts. Grubb et al. (2007) found no relationship between helicopter sound levels and corresponding eagle ambient behaviors or limited responses, which occurred throughout recorded test levels (76.7 to 108.8 dB, unweighted). The authors thought that the lower than expected behavioral responses may be partially due to the fact that the golden eagles in the area appear acclimated to the current high levels of outdoor recreational, including aviation, activities. Based on the results of this study, the authors recommended reduction of existing buffers around nest sites to 100 meters (325 feet) for helicopter activity.

Richardson and Miller (1997) reviewed buffers as protection for raptors against disturbance from ground-based human activities. No consideration of aircraft activity was included. They stressed a clear line of sight as an important factor in a raptor's response to a particular disturbance, with visual screening allowing a closer approach of humans without disturbing a raptor. A Geographical Information Systems (GIS)-assisted viewshed approach combined with a designated buffer zone distance was found to be an effective tool for reducing potential disturbance to golden eagles from ground-based activities (Richardson and Miller, 1997). They summarized recommendations that included a median 0.5-mile (800-meter) buffer (range = 200 to 1,600 m, n = 3) to reduce human disturbances (from ground-based activities such as rock climbing, shooting, vehicular activity) around active golden eagle nests from February 1 to August 1 based on an extensive review of other studies (Richardson and Miller, 1997). Physical characteristics (i.e., screening by topography or vegetation) are important variables to consider when establishing buffer zones based on raptors' visual- and auditory-detection distances (Richardson and Miller, 1997).

#### <u>Osprey</u>

A study by Trimper et al. (1998), in Goose Bay, Labrador, Canada, focused on the reactions of nesting osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) to military overflights by CF-18 Hornets. Reactions varied from increased alertness and focused observation of planes to adjustments in incubation posture. No overt reactions (e.g., startle response, rapid nest departure) were observed as a result of an overflight. Young nestlings crouched as a result of any disturbance until 1 to 2 weeks prior to fledging. Helicopters, human presence, float planes, and other ospreys elicited the strongest reactions from nesting ospreys. These responses included flushing, agitation, and aggressive displays. Adult osprey showed high nest occupancy rates during incubation regardless of external influences. The osprey observed occasionally stared in the direction of the flight before the flight was audible to the observers. The birds may have been habituated to the noise of the flights; however, overflights were strictly controlled during the experimental period. Strong reactions to float planes and helicopters may have been due to the slower flight and therefore longer duration of visual rather than noise-related stimuli.

# <u>Red-tailed Hawk</u>

Anderson et al. (1989) conducted a study that investigated the effects of low-level helicopter overflights on 35 red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) nests. Some of the nests had not been flown over prior to the study. The hawks that were naïve (i.e., not previously exposed) to helicopter flights exhibited stronger avoidance behavior (nine of 17 birds flushed from their nests) than those that had experienced prior overflights. The overflights did not appear to affect nesting success in either study group. These findings were consistent with the belief that red-tailed hawks habituate to low-level air traffic, even during the nesting period.

#### Upland Game Birds

#### Greater Sage-grouse

The greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) was recently designated as a candidate species for protection under the Endangered Species Act after many years of scrutiny and research (USFWS, 2010). This species is a widespread and characteristic species of the sagebrush ecosystems in the Intermountain West. Greater sage-grouse, like most bird species, rely on auditory signals as part of mating. Sage-grouse are known to select their leks based on acoustic properties and depend on auditory communication for mating behavior (Braun, 2006). Although little specific research has been completed to determine what, if any, effects aircraft overflight and sonic booms would have on the breeding behavior of this species, factors that may be important include season and time of day, altitude, frequency and duration of overflights, and frequency and loudness of sonic booms.

Booth et al. (2009) found, while attempting to count sage-grouse at leks (breeding grounds) using light sport aircraft at 150 meters (492 feet) to 200 meters (650 feet) AGL, that sage-grouse flushed from leks on 12 of 14 approaches when the airplane was within 656 to 984 feet (200 to 300 meters) of the lek. In the other two instances, male grouse stopped exhibiting breeding behavior and crouched but stayed on the lek. The time to resumption of normal behavior after disturbance was not provided in this study. Strutting ceased around the time when observers on the ground heard the aircraft. The light sport aircraft could be safely operated at very low speed (68 kilometers per hour or 37 nautical miles per hour) and was powered by either a two-stroke or a four-stroke engine. It is unclear how the response to the slow-flying light sport aircraft used in the study would compare to overflight by military jets, operating at speeds 10 to 12 times as great as the aircraft used in the study. It is possible that response of the birds was related to the slow speed of the light sport aircraft causing it to resemble an aerial predator.

Other studies have found disturbance from energy operations, and other nearby development have adversely affected breeding behavior of greater sage-grouse (Holloran, 2005; Doherty, 2008; Walker et al., 2007; Harju et al., 2010). These studies do not specifically address overflights, do not isolate noise disturbance from other types of disturbance (e.g., visual, human presence), and do not generally provide noise levels or qualification of the noise source (e.g., continuous or intermittent, frequency, duration).

Because so few studies have been done on greater sage-grouse response to overflights or sonic booms, research on related species may be applicable. Observations on other upland game bird species include those on the behavior of four wild turkey (*Meleagris gallapavo*) hens on their nests during real and simulated sonic booms (Manci et al., 1988). Simulated sonic booms were produced by firing 5-centimeter mortar shells from a location 300 to 500 feet from the nest of each hen. Recordings of pressure for both types of booms measured 0.4 to 1.0 pounds per square foot at the observer's location.

Turkey hens exhibited only a few seconds of head alert behavior at the sound of the sonic boom. No hens were flushed off the nests, and productivity estimates revealed no effect from the booms. Twenty brood groups were also subjected to simulated sonic booms. In no instance did the hens desert any poults (young birds), and the poults did not scatter or desert the rest of the brood group. In every observation, the brood group returned to normal activity within 30 seconds after a simulated sonic boom. Similarly, researchers cited in Manci et al. (1988) observed no difference in hatching success of bobwhite quail (*Colinus virginianus*) exposed to simulated sonic booms of 100 to 250 micronewtons per square meter.

#### Migratory Waterfowl

Fleming et al. (1996) conducted a study of caged American black ducks (*Anas rubripes*) and found that noise had negligible energetic and physiologic effects on adult waterfowl. Measurements included body weight, behavior, heart rate, and enzymatic activity. Experiments also showed that adult ducks exposed to high noise events acclimated rapidly and showed no effects.

The study also investigated the reproductive success of captive ducks and indicated that duckling growth and survival rates at Piney Island, North Carolina, were lower than those at a background location. In contrast, observations of several other reproductive indices (i.e., pair formation, nesting, egg production, and hatching success) showed no difference between Piney Island and the background location. Potential effects on wild duck populations may vary because wild ducks at Piney Island have presumably acclimated to aircraft overflights. It was not demonstrated that noise was the cause of adverse impacts. A variety of other factors, such as weather conditions, drinking water and food availability and variability, disease, and natural variability in reproduction, could explain the observed effects. Fleming noted that drinking water conditions (particularly at Piney Island) deteriorated during the study, which could have affected the growth of young ducks. Further research would be necessary to determine the cause of any reproductive effects (Fleming et al., 1996).

Another study by Conomy et al. (1998) exposed previously unexposed ducks to 71 noise events per day that equaled or exceeded 80 dB. It was determined that the proportion of time black ducks reacted to aircraft activity and noise decreased from 38 percent to 6 percent in 17 days and remained stable at 5.8 percent thereafter. In the same study, the wood duck did not appear to habituate to aircraft disturbance. This supports the notion that animal response to aircraft noise is species-specific. Because a startle response to aircraft noise can result in flushing from nests, migrants and animals living in areas with high concentrations of predators would be the most vulnerable to experiencing effects of lowered birth rates and recruitment over time. Species that are subjected to infrequent overflights do not appear to habituate to overflight disturbance as readily.

Black brant (*Branta bernicla nigricans*) studied in the Alaska Peninsula were exposed to jets and propeller aircraft, helicopters, gunshots, people, boats, and various raptors. Jets accounted for 65 percent of all the disturbances. Humans, eagles, and boats caused a greater percentage of brant to take flight. Brant demonstrated a markedly greater reaction to Bell-206-B helicopter flights than fixed wing, single-engine aircraft flights (Ward et al., 1986).

The presence of humans and low-flying helicopters in the Mackenzie Valley North Slope area did not appear to affect the population density of Lapland longspurs (*Calcarius lapponicus*), but the experimental group was shown to have reduced hatching and fledging success and higher nest abandonment. Human presence appeared to have a greater impact than fixed-wing aircraft on the incubating behavior of the black brant, common eider (*Somateria mollissima*), and Arctic tern (*Sterna paradisaea*) (Gunn and Livingston, 1974).

Gunn and Livingston (1974) found that waterfowl and seabirds in the Mackenzie Valley and North Slope of Alaska and Canada became acclimated to float plane disturbance over the course of three days. Additionally, it was observed that potential predators (e.g., the bald eagle) caused a number of birds to leave their nests. Non-breeding birds were observed to be more reactive than breeding birds. Waterfowl were affected by helicopter flights, while snow geese (*Chen caerulescens*) were disturbed by Cessna 185 flights. The geese flushed when the planes were less than 1,000 feet AGL compared to higher flight
elevations. An overall reduction in flock sizes was observed. It was recommended that aircraft flights be reduced in the vicinity of premigratory staging areas.

Manci et al. (1988) reported that waterfowl were particularly disturbed by aircraft noise. The most sensitive appeared to be snow geese. Canada geese (*Branta Canadensis*) and snow geese were thought to be more sensitive to aircraft noise than other animals such as turkey vultures (*Cathartes aura*), coyotes (*Canis latrans*), and raptors (Edwards et al., 1979).

#### Wading and Shorebirds

Black et al. (1984) studied the effects of low-altitude (less than 500 feet AGL) military training flights with sound levels from 55 to 100 dB on wading bird colonies (i.e., the great egret [*Ardea alba*], snowy egret [*Egretta thula*] tricolored heron [*Egretta tricolor*], and little blue heron [*Egretta caerulea*]). The training flights involved three or four aircraft and occurred once or twice per day. This study concluded that the reproductive activity--including nest success, nestling survival, and nestling chronology--was independent of F-16 overflights. Dependent variables were more strongly related to ecological factors, including location and physical characteristics of the colony and climatology.

Another study on the effects of circling fixed-wing aircraft and helicopter overflights on wading bird colonies found that at altitudes of 195 to 390 feet, there was no reaction in nearly 75 percent of the 220 observations. Approximately 90 percent displayed no reaction or merely looked toward the direction of the noise source. Another 6 percent stood up, 3 percent walked from the nest, and 2 percent flushed (but were without active nests) and returned within 5 minutes (Kushlan, 1978). Apparently, non-nesting wading birds had a slightly higher incidence of reacting to overflights than nesting birds. Seagulls observed roosting near a colony of wading birds in another study remained at their roosts when subsonic aircraft flew overhead (Burger, 1981). Colony distribution appeared to be most directly correlated to available wetland community types and was found to be distributed randomly with respect to military training routes. These results suggest that wading bird species' presence was most closely linked to habitat availability and that they were not affected by low-level military overflights (U.S. Air Force, 2000).

Burger (1986) studied the response of migrating shorebirds to human disturbance and found that shorebirds did not fly in response to aircraft overflights but did flush in response to more localized intrusions (i.e., humans and dogs on the beach). Burger (1981) studied the effects of noise from JFK Airport in New York on herring gulls (*Larus argentatus*) that nested less than 1 kilometer from the airport. Noise levels over the nesting colony were 85 to 100 dB on approach and 94 to 105 dB on takeoff. Generally, there did not appear to be any prominent adverse effects of subsonic aircraft on nesting, although some birds flushed when the Concorde flew overhead and, when they returned, engaged in aggressive behavior. Groups of gulls tended to loaf in the area of the nesting colony, and these birds remained at the roost when the Concorde flew overhead. Up to 208 of the loafing gulls flew when supersonic aircraft flew overhead. These birds would circle around and immediately land in the loafing flock (U.S. Air Force, 2000).

In 1970, sonic booms were potentially linked to a mass hatch failure of sooty terns (*Onychoprion fuscatus*) on the Dry Tortugas (Austin et al., 1970). The cause of the failure was not certain, but it was conjectured that sonic booms from military aircraft or an overgrowth of vegetation were factors. In the previous season, sooty terns were observed to have reacted to sonic booms by rising in a "panic flight," circling over the island, then usually settling down on their eggs again. Hatching that year was normal. Following the 1969 hatch failure, excess vegetation was cleared, and measures were taken to reduce

supersonic activity. The 1970 hatch appeared to proceed normally. A colony of noddies (*Anous* spp.) on the same island hatched successfully in 1969, the year of the sooty tern hatch failure.

Subsequent laboratory tests of exposure of eggs to sonic booms and other impulsive noises (Cottereau, 1972; Cogger and Zegarra, 1980; Bowles et al., 1991, 1994) failed to show adverse effects on hatching of eggs. A structural analysis by Ting et al. (2002) showed that, even under extraordinary circumstances, sonic booms would not damage an avian egg.

Burger (1981) observed no effects of subsonic aircraft on herring gulls in the vicinity of JFK International Airport. The Concorde aircraft did cause more nesting gulls to leave their nests (especially in areas of higher density of nests), causing the breakage of eggs and the scavenging of eggs by intruder prey. Clutch sizes were observed to be smaller in areas of higher-density nesting (presumably due to the greater tendency for panic flight) than in areas where there were fewer nests.

## Raptors

In a literature review of raptor responses to aircraft noise, Manci et al. (1988) found that most raptors did not show a negative response to overflights. When negative responses were observed, they were predominantly associated with rotor-winged aircraft or jet aircraft that were repeatedly passing within 0.5 mile of a nest.

Ellis et al. (1991) performed a study to estimate the effects of low-level military jet aircraft and mid- to high-altitude sonic booms (both actual and simulated) on nesting peregrine falcons (*Falco peregrinus*) and seven other raptors (common black-hawk [*Buteogallus anthracinus*], Harris' hawk [*Parabuteo unicinctus*], zone-tailed hawk [*Buteo albonotatus*], red-tailed hawk, golden eagle, prairie falcon [*Falco mexicanus*], and bald eagle). They observed responses to test stimuli, determined nest success for the year of the testing, and evaluated site occupancy the following year. Both long- and short-term effects were noted in the study. The results reported the successful fledging of young in 34 of 38 nest sites (including all eight species) subjected to low-level flight and/or simulated sonic booms. Twenty-two of the test sites were revisited in the following year, and observations of pairs or lone birds were made at all but one nest. Nesting attempts were underway at 19 of 20 sites that were observed long enough to be certain of breeding activity. Reoccupancy and productivity rates were within or above expected values for self-sustaining populations.

Short-term behavior responses were also noted. Overflights at a distance of 150 meters or less produced few significant responses and no severe responses. Typical responses consisted of crouching or, very rarely, flushing from the perch site. Significant responses were most evident before egg laying and after young were "well grown." Incubating or brooding adults never burst from the nest, thus preventing egg breaking or knocking chicks out of the nest. Jet passes and sonic booms often caused noticeable alarm; however, significant negative responses were rare and did not appear to limit productivity or re-occupancy. Due to the locations of some of the nests, some birds may have been habituated to aircraft noise. There were some test sites located at distances far from zones of frequent military aircraft usage, and the test stimuli were often closer, louder, and more frequent than would be likely for a normal training situation (Ellis et al., 1991).

Manci et al. (1988) noted that a female northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*) was observed hunting on a bombing range in Mississippi during bombing exercises. The harrier was apparently unfazed by the exercises, even when a bomb exploded within 200 feet. In a similar case of habituation/non-disturbance, a study on the Florida snail-kite (*Rostrhamus sociabilis*) stated that the greatest reaction by

that species to overflights (approximately 98 dB) was "watching the aircraft fly by." No detrimental impacts to distribution, breeding success, or behavior were noted.

## Fish and Amphibians

The effects of overflight noise on fish and amphibians have not been well studied, but conclusions regarding their expected responses have involved speculation based upon known physiologies and behavioral traits of these taxa (Gladwin et al., 1988). Although fish do startle in response to noise from low-flying aircraft, and probably to the shadows of aircraft, they have been found to habituate to the sound and overflights. Amphibians that respond to low frequencies and those that respond to ground vibration, such as spadefoot toads, may be affected by noise.

# Summary

Some physiological/behavioral responses such as increased hormonal production, increased heart rate, and reduction in milk production have been described in a small percentage of studies. A majority of the studies focusing on these types of effects have reported short-term or no effects.

The relationships between physiological effects and how species interact with their environments have not been thoroughly studied. Therefore, the larger ecological context issues regarding physiological effects of jet aircraft noise (if any) and resulting behavioral pattern changes are not well understood.

Animal species exhibit a wide variety of responses to noise. It is therefore difficult to generalize animal responses to noise disturbances or to draw inferences across species because reactions to jet aircraft noise appear to be species-specific. Consequently, some animal species may be more sensitive than other species and/or may exhibit different forms or intensities of behavioral responses. For instance, wood ducks appear to be more sensitive and more resistant to acclimation to jet aircraft noise than Canada geese in one study. Similarly, wild ungulates seem to be more easily disturbed than domestic animals.

The literature does suggest that common responses include the "startle" or "fright" response and, ultimately, habituation. It has been reported that the intensities and durations of the startle response decrease with the number and frequency of exposures, suggesting no long-term adverse effects. The majority of the literature suggests that domestic animal species (e.g., cows, horses, chickens) and wildlife species exhibit adaptation, acclimation, and habituation after repeated exposure to jet aircraft noise and sonic booms.

Animal responses to aircraft noise appear to be somewhat dependent on, or influenced by, the size, shape, speed, proximity (vertical and horizontal), engine noise, color, and flight profile of the aircraft. Helicopters also appear to induce greater intensities and durations of disturbance behavior as compared to fixed-wing aircraft. Some studies showed that animals that had been previously exposed to jet aircraft noise exhibited greater degrees of alarm and disturbance to other objects creating noise, such as boats, people, and objects blowing across the landscape. Other factors influencing response to jet aircraft noise may include wind direction, speed, and local air turbulence; landscape structures (i.e., amount and type of vegetative cover); and, in the case of bird species, whether the animals are in the incubation/nesting phase.

#### A1.4 References

- Aazh, H., Knipper, M., Danesh. A.A., Cavanna, A.E., Andersson, L., Paulin J., Schecklmann, M., Heinonen-Guzejev, M., Moore, B.C.J. (2018). Insights from the Third International Conference on hyperacusis: Causes, evaluation, diagnosis, and treatment. *Noise Health* 2018; XX.
- Acoustical Society of America. (1980). San Diego workshop on the interaction between manmade noise and vibration and arctic marine wildlife. Acoustical Society of America, Am. Inst. Physics, New York. 84 pp.
- ACRP (Airport Cooperative Research Program). (2008). *Effects of aircraft noise: Research update on selected topics, a synthesis of airport practice.* Research Sponsored by the Federal Aviation Administration, Transportation Research Board.
- American Academy of Otolaryngology--Head and Neck Surgery. (2018) Hyperacusis: An increased sensitivity to everyday sounds. Accessed on September 18, 2018: https://www.entnet.org//content/hyperacusis-increased-sensitivity-to-everyday sounds
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2005). Guidelines for addressing acoustics in educational settings. ASHA Working Group on Classroom Acoustics.
- Ancona, C., Badaloni, C., Fano, V., Fabozzi, T., Forastiere, F. & Perucci, C. (2010). "Aircraft noise and blood pressure in the populations living near the Ciampino Airport in Rome." *Epidemiology*: November 2009, Volume 20, Issue 6, pp. S125-S126.
- Anderson, D.E., Rongstad, O.J., & Mytton, W.R. (1989). "Responses of nesting red-tailed hawks to helicopter overflights." *The Condor*. Vol. 91, pp. 296-299.
- Andersson, H., Jonsson, L., & Ogren, M. (2013). "Benefit measures for noise abatement: calculations for road and rail traffic noise." *Eur. Transp. Res. Rev.* 5:135–148.
- ANR. (2010). "German airport association criticizes Greiser studies for lack of peer review." Airport Noise Report. Vol. 22, p. 58, May 14, 2010.
- ANSI. (1985). Specification for sound level meters, ANSI S1.4A-1985 amendment to ANSI S1.4-1983.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. (1988). Quantities and procedures for description and measurement of environmental sound: Part 1, ANSI S12.9-1988.
  - \_\_\_\_\_\_. (1996). Quantities and procedures for description and measurement of environmental sound: Part 4, ANSI S12.9-1996.
    - \_\_\_\_\_. (2010). Acoustical performance criteria, design requirements, and guidelines for schools, Part 1: permanent schools, ANSI S12.60-2010/Part 1.
    - \_\_\_\_\_\_. (2008). Methods for estimation of awakenings with outdoor noise events heard in homes, ANSI S12.9-2008/Part6.
- Austin, Jr., O.L., Robertson, Jr., W.B, & Wolfenden, G.E. (1970). "Mass hatching failure in dry tortugas sooty terns (*Sterna fuscata*)." *Proceedings of the XVth International Ornithological Congress*. The Hague, Netherlands, August 30 through September 5.

- Babisch, W. B., Houthuijs, D., Pershagen, G., Katsouyanni, K., Velonakis, M., Cadum, E., & Jarup, L.
  (2008). "Hypertension and exposure to noise near airports: Results of the HYENA study." 9th international congress on noise as a public health problem (ICBEN) 2008. Foxwoods, CT.
- Babisch, W., Houthuijs, D., Pershagen, G., Cadum, E., Katsouyanni, K., & Velonakis, M. (2009).
   Annoyance due to aircraft noise has increased over the years--results of the HYENA study.
   Environ Int. 2009;35(8):1169-76.
- Babisch, W. & Kamp, I. V. (2009). "Exposure-response relationship of the association between aircraft noise and the risk of hypertension." *Noise Health* 2009;11:161-8.
- Babisch, W. (2013). "Exposure-response curves of the association between transportation noise and cardiovascular diseases – An overview." First International Congress on Hygiene and Preventive Medicine, Belgrade, Serbia, 22-24 May 2013.
- Babisch, W., Pershagen, G., Selander, J., Houthuijs, D., Breugelmans, O., Cadum, E., Vigna-Taglianti, F., Katsouyanni, K., Haralabidis, A.S., Dimakopoulou, K., Sourtzi, P., Floud, S., & Hansell, A.L., et al. (2013). "Noise annoyance A modifier of the association between noise level and cardiovascular health?" *Science of the Total Environment*. Volumes 452-453, pp. 50-57, May 2013.
- Basner, M., Buess, H., Miller, U., Platt, G., & Samuel, A. (2004). "Aircraft noise effects on sleep: Final results of DLR laboratory and field studies of 2,240 polysomnographically recorded subject nights." Internoise 2004, The 33rd International Congress and Exposition on Noise Control Engineering, August 22-25.
- Basner, M., Muller, U., & Elmenhorst, E.M. (2011). "Single and combined effects of air, road, and rail traffic noise on sleep and recuperation." *Sleep 2011*. 34: 11–23.
- Berglund, B., & Lindvall, T., eds. (1995). Community Noise. Jannes Snabbtryck, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Beutel, M. E., Jünger, C., Klein, E. M., Wild, P., Lackner, K., Blettner, M., & Münzel, T. (2016). Noise annoyance is associated with depression and anxiety in the general population: The contribution of aircraft noise. *PLoS ONE*, 11(5), e0155357. Accessed online at: <u>http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0155357</u>
- Beyer, D. (1983). *Studies of the effects of low-flying aircraft on endocrinological and physiological parameters in pregnant cows*. Veterinary College of Hannover, München, Germany.
- Black D., Black, J., Issarayangyun, T. & Samuels, S. (2007). "Aircraft noise exposure and residents' stress and hypertension: A public health perspective for airport environmental management." J Air Transp Manag 2007;13:264-76.
- Black, B., Collopy, M., Percivial, H., Tiller, A., & Bohall, P. (1984). Effects of low-altitude military training flights on wading bird colonies in Florida. Florida Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Technical Report No. 7.
- Booth, D.T., Cox, S.E., Simonds, G.E., & Elmore, B. (2009). "Efficacy of two variations on an aerial lekcount method for greater sage-grouse. *The Western North American Naturalist*. Volume 69(3). Pp. 413-416.

- Bond, J., Winchester, C.F., Campbell, L.E., & Webb, J.C. (1963). *The effects of loud sounds on the physiology and behavior of swine*. U.S. Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service Technical Bulletin 1280.
- Bowles, A.E. (1995). "Responses of wildlife to noise." In Knight, R.L., & Gutzwiller, K.J., eds., *Wildlife and recreationists: Coexistence through management and research*. Island Press, Covelo, California, pp. 109-156.
- Bowles, A.E., Book, C., & Bradley, F. (1990). "Effects of low-altitude aircraft overflights on domestic turkey poults." HSD-TR-90-034.
- Bowles, A.E., Awbrey, F.T., & Jehl, J.R. (1991). "The effects of high-amplitude impulsive noise on hatching success: A reanalysis of the sooty tern incident." HSD-TP-91-0006.
- Bowles, A.E., Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, S. (1993). *Review of the effects of aircraft overflights on wildlife*. Volume II of III, Technical Report. National Park Service, Denver, Colorado.
- Bowles, A.E., Knobler, M., Sneddon, M.D., & Kugler, B.A. (1994). "Effects of simulated sonic booms on the hatchability of white leghorn chicken eggs." AL/OE-TR-1994-0179.
- Bradley, J.S. (1985). "Uniform derivation of optimum conditions for speech in rooms." National Research Council, Building Research Note, BRN 239. Ottawa, Canada.
- Bradley, J.S. (1993). "NRC-CNRC NEF validation study: Review of aircraft noise and its effects." National Research Council Canada and Transport Canada, Contract Report A-1505.5.
- Bronzaft, A.L., & McCarthy, D.P. (1975). "The effects of elevated train noise on reading ability" *J. Environment and Behavior.* 7, pp. 517-527.
- Brown, A.L., & Camp, I. van. (2005). Towards a design for studies of response to a change in noise exposure. *Proceedings InterNoise05*. Rio De Janiero, Brazil.
- Braun, C.E. (2006). *A blueprint for sage-grouse conservation and recovery*. Unpublished report. Grouse, Inc. Tucson, Arizona.
- Brisbane Airport Corporation. (2007). New parallel runway draft environmental impact statement/major development plan. September 2007. Volume D—Airspace, Chapter 7: Human Impact Assessment. Retrieved May 7, 2018: https://bne.com.au/sites/default/files/docs/BNR\_EIS\_MDP\_D7\_Health\_Impact\_Assess.pdf
- Brown, A.L. (1990). "Measuring the effect of aircraft noise on sea birds." *Environment International*. Vol. 16, pp. 587-592.
- Bullock, T.H., Donning, D.P., & Best, C.R. (1980). "Evoked brain potentials demonstrate hearing in a manatee (*trichechus inunguis*)." *Journal of Mammals*. Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 130-133.
- Burger, J. (1981). "Behavioral responses of herring gulls (*Larus argentatus*) to aircraft noise." *Environmental Pollution* (Series A), Vol. 24, pp. 177-184.
- Burger, J. (1986). "The effect of human activity on shorebirds in two coastal bays in Northeastern United States." *Environmental Conservation*. Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 123-130.
- Cantrell, R.W. (1974). "Prolonged exposure to intermittent noise: Audiometric, biochemical, motor, psychological, and sleep effects." *Laryngoscope*, Supplement I, Vol. 84, No. 10, p. 2.

- Casady, R.B., & Lehmann, R.P. (1967). "Response of farm animals to sonic booms." *Studies at Edwards Air Force Base, June 6-30, 1966*. Interim Report, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Maryland, p. 8.
- Cawthorn, J.M., Dempsey, T.K., & Deloach, R. (1978). "Human response to aircraft noise-induced building vibration." NASA Langley Research Center.
- CHABA (Committee on Hearing, Bioacoustics, and Biomechanics). (1977). *Guidelines for preparing environmental impact statements on noise*. Report of Working Group 69 on evaluation of environmental impact of noise. Office of Naval Research, Contract No. N00014-75-C-0406. National Research Council, National Academy of Science, Washington, DC.
- Clark, C., Crombie, R., Head, J., van Kamp, I., van Kempen, E., & Stansfeld, S. A. (2012). "Does trafficrelated air pollution explain associations of aircraft and road traffic noise exposure on children's health and cognition? A secondary analysis of the United Kingdom sample From the RANCH Project." American Journal of Epidemiology. 176(4), pp. 327–337
- Clark, C., Martin, R., van Kempen, E., Alfred, T., Head, J., Davies, H.W., Haines, M.M., Barrio, I.L., Matheson, M., & Stansfeld, S.A. (2005). "Exposure-effect relations between aircraft and road traffic noise exposure at school and reading comprehension: the RANCH project," American Journal of Epidemiology. 163, pp. 27-37.
- Clark, C., Stansfeld, S.A., & Head, J. (2009). "The long-term effects of aircraft noise exposure on children's cognition: findings from the UK RANCH follow-up study." In *Proceedings of the Euronoise Conference*. Edinburgh, Scotland, October.
- Cogger, E.A. & Zegarra, E.G. (1980). "Sonic booms and reproductive performance of marine birds: Studies on domestic fowl as analogues." In Jehl, J.R., & Cogger, C.F., eds., *Potential effects of space shuttle sonic booms on the biota and geology of the California Channel Islands: Research reports.*" San Diego State University Center for Marine Studies, Technical Report No. 80-1.
- Cohen, S., Glass, D.C., & Singer, J. E. (1973). "Apartment noise, auditory discrimination, and reading ability in children." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 9, pp. 407-422.
- Cohen, S., Evans, G.W., & Krantz, D. S., et al. (1980). "Physiological, motivational, and cognitive effects of aircraft noise on children: Moving from laboratory to field." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 35, pp. 231-243.
- Cohen, S., Evans, G.W., & Krantz, D. S., et al. (1981). "Aircraft noise and children: longitudinal and crosssectional evidence on adaptation to noise and the effectiveness of noise abatement." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 40, pp. 331-345.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Conomy, J.T., Dubovsky, J.A., Collazo, J.A., & Fleming, W.J. (1998). "Do black ducks and wood ducks habituate to aircraft disturbance?" *Journal of Wildlife Management*. Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 1135-1142.
- Correia, A.W., Peters, J.L., Levy, J.I., Melly, S., & Dominici, F. (2013). "Residential exposure to aircraft noise and hospital admissions for cardiovascular diseases: multi-airport retrospective study." *British Medical Journal*. 2013;347:f5561 doi: 10.1136/bmj.f5561, 8 October.

Cottereau, P. (1972). "Les incidences du 'bang' des avions supersoniques sur les productions et la vie animals." *Revue Medicine Veterinaire*. Vol. 123, No. 11, pp. 1367-1409.

\_\_\_\_\_\_. (1978). "The effect of sonic boom from aircraft on wildlife and animal husbandry." In *Effects of noise on wildlife*. Academic Press, New York, New York, pp. 63-79.

- Crombie, R., et al. (2011). "Environmental noise exposure, early biological risk and mental health in nine to ten year old children: A cross-sectional field study." *Environmental health: a global access science source.*
- Crowley, R.W. (1973). "A case study of the effects of an airport on land values." *Journal of transportation economics and policy*. Vol. 7, May.
- Davies, H., & van Kamp, I. (2012). "Noise and cardiovascular disease: A review of the literature 2008-2011." *Noise Health*. 2012
- Davis, R.W., Evans, W.E., & Wursig, B., eds. (2000). Cetaceans, sea turtles, and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance, and habitat associations. Volume II of Technical Report, prepared by Texas A&M University at Galveston and the National Marine Fisheries Service. U.S.
   Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, USGS/BRD/CR-1999-0006 and Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, Louisiana, OCS Study MMS 2000-003.
- DNWG (Defense Noise Working Group). (2013). Department of Defense Noise Working Group. *Technical Bulletin. Noise-Induced Hearing Impairment*. December 2013.
- DoD. (2009a). "Improving aviation noise planning, analysis, and public communication with supplemental metrics." Defense Noise Working Group Technical Bulletin, December.

\_\_\_\_\_. (2009b). "Sleep disturbance from aviation noise." Defense Noise Working Group Technical Bulletin, November.

. (2009c). Memorandum from the Under Secretary of Defense, Ashton B. Carter, re: "Methodology for assessing hearing loss risk and impacts in DoD environmental impact analysis." June 16, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_\_. (2012). "Noise-induced hearing impairment." Defense Noise Working Group Technical Bulletin. July 2012.

- Doherty, K.E. (2008). Sage-grouse and energy development: Integrating science with conservation planning to reduce impacts. Presented as a dissertation to the University of Montana, Missoula, Montana. Autumn.
- Dooling, R.J. (1978). "Behavior and psychophysics of hearing in birds." J. Acoust. Soc. Am. Supplement 1, Vol. 65, p. S4.
- Dreger, S., Meyer, N., Fromme, H., & Bolte, G. (2015). "Environmental noise and incident mental health problems: A prospective cohort study among school children in Germany." *Environ Res.* 2015 Nov; 143(Pt A):49-54. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2015.08.003. Epub 2015 Oct 1
- Dufour, P.A. (1980). *Effects of noise on wildlife and other animals: Review of research since 1971*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

- Eagan, M.E., Anderson, G., Nicholas, B., Horonjeff, R., & Tivnan, T. (2004). "Relation between aircraft noise reduction in schools and standardized test scores." Washington, DC, FICAN.
- Edmonds, L.D., Layde, P.M., & Erickson, J.D. (1979). "Airport noise and teratogenesis." Archives of environmental health. Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 243-247.
- Edwards, R.G., Broderson, A.B., Harbour, R.W., McCoy, D.F., & Johnson, C.W. (1979). Assessment of the environmental compatibility of differing helicopter noise certification standards. U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 58 pp.
- Eldred, K, & von Gierke, H. (1993). "Effects of noise on people." *Noise News International*. 1(2), pp. 67-89, June.
- Ellis, D.H., Ellis, C.H., & Mindell, D.P. (1991). "Raptor responses to low-level jet aircraft and sonic booms." *Environmental Pollution*. Vol. 74, pp. 53-83.
- ENNAH. (2013). *Final report ENNAH European network on noise and health*. EU Project No. 226442, FP-7-ENV-2008-1.
- ERCD. (2014). "Aircraft noise, sleep disturbance and health effects." CAP 1164, Environmental Research and Consultancy Department, UK Civil Aviation Authority.
- Eriksson, C., Rosenlund, M., Pershagen, G., Hilding, A., Ostenson, C.G., & Bluhm, G. (2007). "Aircraft noise and incidence of hypertension." *Epidemiology* (Cambridge, MA). 2007;18(6): pp. 716-721.
- Eriksson, C., Bluhm, G., Hilding, A., Ostenson, C.G., & Pershagen, C.G. (2010). "Aircraft noise and incidence of hypertension: gender specific effects." *Environ Res* 2010; 110: pp. 764-772
- Evans, G.W., Hygge, S., & Bullinger, M. (1995). "Chronic noise and psychological stress." J. Psychological Science. 6, pp. 333-338.
- Evans, G.W., Bullinger, M., & Hygge, S. (1998). "Chronic noise exposure and physiological response: A prospective study of children living under environmental stress." *Psychological Science*, Vol. 9, pp. 75-77.
- Evrard, A.S., Bouaoun, L., Champelovier, P., Lambert, J., & Laumon, B. (2015). "Does exposure to aircraft noise increase the mortality from cardiovascular disease in the population living in the vicinity of airports? Results of an ecological study in France." *Noise Health* 2015;17:328-336
- FAA. (1985). Airport Improvement Program (AIP) Handbook. Order No. 100.38.

FICAN. (1997). "Effects of aviation noise on awakenings from sleep." June 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_\_. (2002). "FICAN on the findings of the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) lowfrequency noise (LFN) expert panel." FICAN, Washington, DC.

. (2007). "Findings of the FICAN pilot study on the relationship between aircraft noise reduction and changes in standardised test scores." Washington, DC, FICAN.

\_\_\_\_\_. (2008). "FICAN recommendation for use of ANSI standard to predict awakenings from aircraft noise." December.

\_\_\_\_\_. (2018). *Research review of selected aviation noise issues*. Prepared by Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise. April 2018.

FICON. (1992). "Federal agency review of selected airport noise analysis issues." August.

- Fidell, S., Silvati, L., Pearsons, K., Lind, S., & Howe, R. (1999). "Field study of the annoyance of low-frequency runway sideline noise." *J Acoust Soc Am.* 106(3), pp. 1408-1415.
- Fidell, S., & Silvati, L. (2004). "Parsimonious alternatives to regression analysis for characterizing prevalence rates of aircraft noise annoyance." *Noise Control Eng. J.* 52, pp. 56–68.
- Fidell, S., Pearsons, K., Howe, R., Tabachnick, B., Silvati, L., & Barber, D.S. (1994). Noise-induced sleep disturbance in residential settings. AL/OE-TR-1994-0131, Wright Patterson AFB, OH, Armstrong Laboratory, Occupational & Environmental Health Division.
- Fidell, S., Pearsons, K., Tabachnick, B., Howe, R., Silvati, L., & Barber, D.S. (1995a). "Field study of noiseinduced sleep disturbance." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. Vol. 98, No. 2, pp. 1025-1033.
- Fidell, S., Howe, R., Tabachnick, B., Pearsons, K., & Sneddon, M. (1995b). *Noise-induced sleep disturbance in residences near two civil airports*. NASA Contractor Report 198252.
- Fidell, S., Tabachnick, B., & Silvati, L. (1996). *Effects of military aircraft noise on residential property values*. BBN Systems and Technologies, BBN Report No. 8102.
- Fidell, S., Tabachnick, B., Mestre, V., & Fidell, L. (2013). "Aircraft noise-induced awakenings are more reasonably predicted from relative than from absolute sound exposure levels." J Acoust Soc Am 134(5):3645-3653.
- Fields, J.M., & Powell, C.A. (1987). "Community reactions to helicopter noise: Results from an experimental study." *J Acoust Soc Am.* 82(2), pp. 479-492.
- Finegold, L.S., Harris, C.S., & von Gierke, H.E. (1994). "Community annoyance and sleep disturbance: updated criteria for assessing the impact of general transportation noise on people." Noise Control Engineering Journal. Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 25-30.
- Finegold, L.S. (2010). "Sleep disturbance due to aircraft noise exposure." *Noise Health*. 2010;12(47):88-94. doi:10.4103/1463-1741.63208.
- Fleischner, T.L., & Weisberg, S. (1986). "Effects of jet aircraft activity on bald eagles in the vicinity of Bellingham International Airport." Unpublished Report, DEVCO Aviation Consultants, Bellingham, WA.
- Fleming, W.J., Dubovsky, J., & Collazo, J. (1996). An assessment of the effects of aircraft activities on waterfowl at Piney Island, North Carolina. Final report by the North Carolina Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, North Carolina State University, prepared for the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point.
- Floud, S., Vigna-Taglianti, F., Hansell, A., Blangiardo, M., Houthuijs, D., Breugelmans, O., et al. (2011). "Medication use in relation to noise from aircraft and road traffic in six European countries: results of the HYENA study." *Occupational and environmental medicine*. 2011;68(7):518-524.
- Floud, S. (2013). "Exposure to aircraft and road traffic noise and associations with heart disease and stroke in six European countries: A cross-sectional study." *Environmental Health*. 2013, 12:89.
- Frankel, M., (1991). "Aircraft noise and residential property values: Results of a survey study," *The Appraisal Journal*, Jan. 1991, pp. 96–108.

- Franssen, E.A., van Wiechen, C.M., Nagelkerke, J.J., & Lebret, E. (2004). "Aircraft noise around a large international airport and its Impact on general health and medication use." Occupational and Environmental Medicine. Vol. 61, No. 5. May 2004, pp. 405-413
- Fraser, J.D., Franzel, L.D., & Mathiesen, J.G. (1985). "The impact of human activities on breeding bald eagles in north-central Minnesota." Journal of Wildlife Management. Vol. 49, pp. 585-592.
- Frerichs, R.R., Beeman, B.L., & Coulson, A.H. (1980). "Los Angeles Airport noise and mortality: Faulty analysis and public policy." *Am. J. Public Health*. Vol. 70, No. 4, pp. 357-362, April 1980.
- Gladwin, D.N., Manci, K.M, & Villella, R. (1988). "Effects of aircraft noise and sonic booms on domestic animals and wildlife." *Bibliographic Abstracts, NERC-88/32*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Ecology Research Center, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Green, K.B., Pasternack, B.S., & Shore, R.E. (1982). Effects of aircraft noise on reading ability of schoolage children. *Archives of Environmental Health*. Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 24-31.
- Griefahn, B. (1978). "Research on noise disturbed sleep since 1973." *Proceedings of Third Int. Cong. on Noise as a Public Health Problem*. pp. 377-390 (as appears in NRC-CNRC NEF Validation Study: (2) Review of Aircraft Noise and Its Effects, A-1505.1, p. 31).
- Griefahn, B., and Muzet, A. (1978). "Noise-induced sleep disturbances and their effects on health." *Journal of Sound and Vibration*. 1978;59(1): pp. 99-106.
- Grubb, T.G., Delaney, D.K., & Bowerman, W.W. (2007). *Investigating potential effects of heli-skiing on golden eagles in the Wasatch Mountains, Utah.* Final report to the Wasatch-Cache National Forest. November 10, 2007.
- Grubb, T.G., & King, R.M. (1991). "Assessing human disturbance of breeding bald eagles with classification tree models." *Journal of Wildlife Management*. Vol. 55, No. 3, pp. 500-511.
- Gunn, W.W.H., & Livingston, J.A. (1974). "Disturbance to birds by gas compressor noise simulators, aircraft, and human activity in the MacKenzie Valley and the North Slope." Chapters VI-VIII, *Arctic Gas Biological Report*, Series Vol. 14.
- Guski, R. (2004). How to forecast community annoyance in planning noisy facilities. *Noise and Health*, Vol. 6 (22), pp 59-64.
- Haines, M.M., Stansfeld, S.A., Job, R.F., Berglund, B., & Head, J. (2001a). Chronic aircraft noise exposure, stress responses, mental health and cognitive performance in school children. *Psychological Medicine*. Vol. 31, pp. 265 277, February.
- Haines, M.M., Stansfeld, S.A., Brentnall, S., Head, J., Berry, B., Jiggins, M., & Hygge, S. (2001b). The West London schools study: The effects of chronic aircraft noise exposure on child health.
   *Psychological Medicine*. Vol. 31, pp. 1385-1396. November.
- Haines, M.M., Stansfeld, S.A., Job, R.F., Berglund, B., & Head, J. (2001c). A follow-up study of effects of chronic aircraft noise exposure on child stress responses and cognition. *International journal of epidemiology*. 2001;30(4): pp. 839-845.
- Haines, M.M., Stansfeld, S.A., Head, J., & Job, R.F.S. (2002). "Multilevel modelling of aircraft noise on performance tests in schools around Heathrow Airport London." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 56, pp. 139-144.

- Hansell, A.L., Blangiardo, M., Fortunato, L., Floud, S., de Hoogh, K., Fecht, D., Ghosh, R.E., Laszlo, H.E., Pearson, C., Beale, L., Beevers, S., Gulliver, J., Best, N., Richardson, S., & Elliott, P. (2013).
  "Aircraft noise and cardiovascular disease near Heathrow airport in London: small area study." British Medical Journal. 2013;347:f5432 doi: 10.1136/bmj.f5432, 8 October.
- Hanson, C.E., King, K.W., Eagan, M.E., & Horonjeff, R.D. (1991). "Aircraft noise effects on cultural resources: Review of technical literature." Report No. HMMH-290940.04-1, available as PB93-205300, sponsored by National Park Service, Denver CO.
- Haralabidis, A.S., Dimakopoulou, K., Vigna-Taglianti, F., Giampaolo, M, Borgini, A., Dudley, M.-L.,
  Pershagen, G., Bluhm, G., Houthuijs, D., Babisch, W., Velonakis, M., Katsouyanni, K., and Jarup, L.
  (2008). "Acute effects of night-time noise exposure on blood pressure in populations living near airports." Published for the HYENA Consortium. *European heart journal*.
  doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehn013.
- Haralabidis, A.S., Dimakopoulou, K., & Velonaki, V., et al. (2011). "Can exposure to noise affect the 24 h blood pressure profile? Results from the HYENA study." J Epidemiol Community Health. 2011;65(6):535- 541.
- Harju, S.M., Dzialak, M.R., Taylor, R.C., Hayden-Wing, L.D., & Winstead, J.B. (2010). "Thresholds and time lags in effects of energy development on greater sage-grouse populations." *Journal of wildlife management*. Volume 74, Number 3: 437–448.
- Harris, C.M. (1979). Handbook of noise control. McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Hjortebjerg, D., Andersen, A. M. N., Christensen, J. S., Ketzel, M., Raaschou-Nielsen, O., Sunyer, J., & Sørensen, M. (2016). "Exposure to road traffic noise and behavioral problems in 7-year-old children: A cohort study." *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 124(2), 228–234. <u>http://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1409430</u>.]
- Higgins, T.H. (1974). "The response of songbirds to the seismic compression waves preceding sonic booms." *Natl. Tech. Inf. Serv.*, Springfield, VA, FAA-RD-74-78. 28 pp.
- Hodgdon, K., Atchley, A., & Bernhard, R. (2007). *Low frequency noise study*. PARTNER-COE-2007-001 Federal Aviation Administration, Washington DC.
- Holloran, M.J. (2005). "Greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) population response to natural gas field development in western Wyoming." A dissertation submitted to the Department of Zoology and Physiology and the Graduate School of the University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming. December.
- Holt J.B., Zhang, X., Sizov, N., & Croft, J.B. (2015). "Airport noise and self-reported sleep insufficiency, United States, 2008 and 2009." *Preventing Chronic Disease 2015*;12:140551
- Horne, J.A., Pankhurst, F.L., Reyner, L.A., Hume, K., & Diamond, I.D. (1994). "A field study of sleep disturbance: Effects of aircraft noise and other factors on 5,742 nights of actimetrically monitored sleep in a large subject sample." *American Sleep Disorders Association and Sleep Research Society: Sleep*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 1994, pp. 146–195.
- Huang, D., Song, X., Cui, Q., Tian, J., Wang, Q., & Yang, K. (2015). "Is there an association between aircraft noise exposure and the incidence of hypertension? A meta-analysis of 16,784 participants." Noise Health 2015;17:93-7

- Huss, A., Spoerri, A., Egger, M., & Röösli, M., "Aircraft noise, air pollution, and mortality from myocardial infarction," *Epidemiology*, Vol. 21, No. 6, November, 2010, pp. 829-836.
- Hwang, B., Chang, T., & Cheng, K., et al. (2012). "Gene–environment interaction between angiotensinogen and chronic exposure to occupational noise contribute to hypertension." Occup Environ Med 2012;69:236-242.
- Hygge, S., Evans, G.W., & Bullinger, M. (2002). "A prospective study of some effects of aircraft noise on cognitive performance in school children." *Psychological Science* Vol. 13, pp. 469-474.
- Ising, H., Rebentisch, E., Poustka, F., & Curio, I. (1990). "Annoyance and health risk caused by military low-altitude flight noise." *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 1990;62(5):357-363.
- Ising, H., Joachims, Z., Babisch, W., & Rebentisch, E. (1999). "Effects of military low-altitude flight noise I temporary threshold shift in humans." *Zeitschrift fur Audiologie* (Germany), Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 118-127.
- ISO. (1989). "Evaluation of human exposure to whole-body vibration Part 2: Continuous and shockinduced vibration in buildings (1 to 80 Hz)." International Organization for Standardization, Standard 2631-2, February 1989.
  - \_\_\_\_\_\_. (2016). ISO 1996-1. International standard, acoustics, description, measurement, and assessment of environmental noise Part 1: Basic quantities and assessment procedures. Third edition, 03-01-2016.
- Jarup, L., Dudley, M.L., Babisch, W., Houthuijs, D., Swart, W., Pershagen, G., Bluhm, G., Katsouyanni, K., Velonakis, M., Cadum, E., & Vigna-Taglianti, F. (2005). "Hypertension and exposure to noise near airports (HYENA): Study design and noise exposure assessment." *Environ Health Perspect* 2005, 113: 1473–1478. Published for the HYENA Consortium.
- Jarup, L., Dudley, M., Babisch, W., Houthuijs, D., Swart, W., & Pershagen, G. (2007). "Hypertension and exposure to noise near airports--the HYENA study." *Epidemiology*. 2007;18(5):S137.
- Jarup L., W. Babisch, D. Houthuijs, G. Pershagen, K. Katsouyanni, E. Cadum, M-L. Dudley, P. Savigny,
   I. Seiffert, W. Swart, O. Breugelmans, G. Bluhm, J. Selander, A. Haralabidis, K. Dimakopoulou, P.
   Sourtzi, M. Velonakis, and F. VignaTaglianti, on behalf of the HYENA study team. 2008.
   "Hypertension and Exposure to Noise near Airports--the HYENA study," Environ Health
   Perspect 2008, 116:329-33.
- Jehl, J.R., & Cooper, C.F., eds. (1980). Potential effects of space shuttle sonic booms on the biota and geology of the California Channel Islands. Technical Report No. 80-1, Center for Marine Studies, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.
- Jones, F.N. & Tauscher, J. (1978). "Residence under an airport landing pattern as a factor in teratism." Archives of Environmental Health, pp. 10-12, January/February.
- Kim, S.J., Chai, S.K., Lee, K.W., Park, J.B., Min, K.B., & Kil, H.G., et al. (2014). "Exposure-response relationship between aircraft noise and sleep quality: A community-based cross-sectional study." Osong Public Health and Research Perspectives. 5(2);108-114.

- Kishikawa, H., Matsui, T., Uchiyama, I., Miyakawa, M., Hiramatsu, K., Stansfeld, S.A. (2006). The development of Weinstein's noise sensitivity scale. *Noise Health 8*, pp. 154-160 [serial online] Accessed on September 18, 2018: http://www.noiseandhealth.org/text.asp?2006/8/33/154/34703
- Klatte, M., Bergström, K., & Lachmann, T. (2013). "Does noise affect learning? A short review on noise effects on cognitive performance in children." *Frontiers in Psychology*. 4:578.
- Kovalcik, K., & Sottnik, J. (1971). "Vplyv Hluku Na Mliekovú Úzitkovost Kráv [The effect of noise on the milk efficiency of cows]." *Zivocisná Vyroba*. Vol. 16, Nos. 10-11, pp. 795-804.
- Kryter, K.D., & Poza, F. (1980). "Effects of noise on some autonomic system activities." J. Acoust. Soc. Am. Vol. 67, No. 6, pp. 2036-2044.
- Kushlan, J.A. (1978). "Effects of helicopter censuses on wading bird colonies." *Journal of Wildlife Management*. Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 756-760.
- Kwak, K.M., Ju, Y.S., Kwon, Y.J., Chung, Y.K., Kim, B.K., Kim, H., & Youn, K. (2016). "The effect of aircraft noise on sleep disturbance among the residents near a civilian airport: a cross-sectional study." *Annals of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2016;28(1):38.
- Laszlo, H., McRobie, E., Stansfeld, S., & Hansell, A. (2012). "Annoyance and other reaction measures to changes in noise exposure--A review." *Sci Total Environ*. 2012;435:551-562.
- Lazarus, H. (1990). "New methods for describing and assessing direct speech communication under disturbing conditions." *Environment International*. 16: 373-392.
- LeBlanc, M.M., Lombard, C., Lieb, S., Klapstein, E., & Massey, R. (1991). "Physiological responses of horses to simulated aircraft noise." U.S. Air Force, NSBIT Program for University of Florida.
- Lercher, P., Evans, G.W., Meis, M., & Kofler, K. (2002). "Ambient neighbourhood noise and children's mental health." *J. Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 59, 380-386.
- Lercher, P., Evans, G.W., & Meis, M. (2003). "Ambient noise and cognitive processes among primary school children." *J. Environment and Behavior*. 35, 725-735.
- Leventhall, H.G. (2004). "Low frequency noise and annoyance." Noise Health. 2004;6:59-72
- Lind, S.J., Pearsons, K., & Fidell, S. (1998). "Sound insulation requirements for mitigation of aircraft noise impact on highline school district facilities." Volume I, BBN Systems and Technologies, BBN Report No. 8240.
- Lipscomb, C., (2003)."Small cities matter, too: The impacts of an airport and local infrastructure on housing prices in a small urban city." *Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies*. Vol. 15, No. 3, Nov. 2003, pp. 255–273.
- Ludlow, B., & Sixsmith, K. (1999). Long-term effects of military jet aircraft noise exposure during childhood on hearing threshold levels. *Noise and health*. 5:33-39.
- Lukas, J.S. (1978). "Noise and sleep: A literature review and a proposed criterion for assessing effect." In Daryl N. May, ed., Handbook of noise assessment., Van Nostrand Reinhold Company: New York, NY, pp. 313-334.

- Lynch, T.E., & Speake, D.W. (1978). "Eastern wild turkey behavioral responses induced by sonic boom." In *Effects of noise on wildlife*. Academic Press, New York, NY, pp. 47-61.
- Manci, K.M., Gladwin, D.N., Villella, R., & Cavendish, M.G. (1988). *Effects of aircraft noise and sonic booms on domestic animals and wildlife: A literature synthesis*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Ecology Research Center, Ft. Collins, CO, NERC-88/29. 88 pp.
- Márki, F. (2013). Outcomes of EU COSMA (Community Oriented Solutions to Minimise Aircraft Noise Annoyance) Project. Budapest University of Technology and Economics, London, May 2013.
- Matsui, T., Uehara, T., Miyakita, T., Hiramatsu, K., & Yamamoto, T. (2008). "Dose-response relationship between hypertension and aircraft noise exposure around Kadena airfield in Okinawa." 9th International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem (ICBEN). 2008. Foxwoods, CT.
- Meecham, W.C., & Shaw, N. (1979). "Effects of jet noise on mortality rates." *British journal of audiology*. 77-80. August 1979.
- Metro-Dade County. (1995). *Dade County manatee protection plan*. DERM Technical Report 95-5, Department of Environmental Resources Management, Miami, Florida.
- Miedema, H.M., & Oudshoorn, C.G. (2001). "Annoyance from transportation noise: Relationships with exposure metrics DNL and DENL and their confidence intervals." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 109.4: 409–416.
- Miedema, M.E., & Vos, H. (2003). "Noise sensitivity and reactions to noise and other environmental conditions." *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 113(3), March 2003, pp. 1492 to 1504.
- Miedema, H.M., & Vos, H. (1998). "Exposure-response relationships for transportation noise." J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 104(6): pp. 3432–3445, December 1998.
- Michalak, R., Ising, H., & Rebentisch, E. (1990). "Acute circulatory effects of military low-altitude flight noise." *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*. Vol. 62, No. 5, pp. 365-372.
- Miller, N., Sizov, N., Lor, S., & Cantor, D. (2014). "New research on community reaction to aircraft noise in the United States." 11th International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem (ICBEN). Nara, Japan
- Munzel, T., Gori, T., Babisch, W., & Basner, M. (2014). "Cardiovascular effects of environmental noise exposure." *European heart journal* 35(13):829-836.
- Muzet, A. (2007). "Environmental noise, sleep and health." Sleep medicine reviews. 2007;11:135-42.
- Myrberg, A.A., Jr. (1978). "Ocean noise and the behavior of marine animals: relationships and implications." pp. 169-208 in Fletcher, J.L., and Busnel, R.G., eds. *Effects of noise on wildlife*. Academic Press, New York.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). Assessing aircraft noise conditions affecting student learning–Case studies. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <a href="https://doi.org/10.17226/24941">https://doi.org/10.17226/24941</a>.
- National Park Service. (1994). "Report to congress: Report on effects of aircraft overflights on the national park system." Prepared pursuant to Public Law 100-91, The National Parks Overflights Act of 1987. September 12, 1994.

- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2000). "The effects of noise from weapons and sonic booms, and the impact on humans, wildlife, domestic animals and structures." *Final report of the Working Group Study Follow-up Program to the Pilot Study on Aircraft Noise.* Report No. 241, June.
- Nelson, J.P. (1978). *Economic analysis of transportation noise abatement*. Ballenger Publishing Company, Cambridge, MA.

\_\_\_\_\_. (1980). "Airports and property values: a survey of recent evidence." *Journal of transport economics and policy*. 14, pp. 37-52.

\_\_\_\_\_\_. (2004). "Meta-analysis of airport noise and hedonic property values--problems and prospects." *Journal of transport economics and policy*. Volume 38, Part 1, pp. 1-28, January.

. (2007). "Hedonic property values studies of transportation noise: Aircraft and road traffic." in *Hedonic methods on housing markets*. Andrea Barazini, Jose Ramerez, Caroline Schaerer and Philippe Thalman, eds., pp. 57-82, Springer.

- Newman, J.S., & Beattie, K.R. (1985). *Aviation noise effects*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration Report No. FAA-EE-85-2.
- Nixon, C.W., West, D.W., & Allen, N.K. (1993). "Human auditory responses to aircraft flyover noise." In Vallets, M., ed., *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress on Noise as a Public Problem*. Vol. 2, Arcueil, France: INRETS.
- Öhrström, E., Hadzibajramovic, E., Holmes, M., & Svensson, H. (2006). "Effects of road traffic noise on sleep: studies on children and adults." *Journal of environmental psychology*. 26, pp. 116-126.
- Ollerhead, J.B., Jones, C.J., Cadoux, R.E., Woodley, A., Atkinson, B.J., Horne, J.A., Pankhurst, F., Reyner, L., Hume, K.I., Van, F., Watson, A., Diamond, I.D., Egger, P., Holmes, D., & McKean, J. (1992).
   *Report of a field study of aircraft noise and sleep disturbance*. Commissioned by the UK Department of Transport for the 36 UK Department of Safety, Environment and Engineering, London, England: Civil Aviation Authority, December 1992.
- Pagel, J.E., Whittington, D.M., & Allen, G.T. (2010). *Interim golden eagle inventory and monitoring* protocols, and other recommendations. Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. February 2010.
- Parker, J.B., & Bayley, N.D. (1960). Investigations on effects of aircraft sound on milk production of dairy cattle, 1957-58. U.S. Agricultural Research Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Technical Report Number ARS 44 60.
- Passchier-Vermeer, W., & Passchier, W.F. (2000). "Noise exposure and public health." *Environ health* perspect. 2000;108 Suppl. 1:123-131.
- Pater, L.D., Delaney, D.K., Hayden, T.J., Lohr, B., & Dooling, R. (1999). Assessment of training noise impacts on the red-cockaded woodpecker: Preliminary results – Final report. Technical Report 99/51, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CERL, Champaign, IL.
- Pearsons, K.S., Barber, D.S., & Tabachnick, B.G. (1989). *Analyses of the predictability of noise-induced sleep disturbance*. USAF Report HSD-TR-89-029, October 1989.
- Perron, S., Tétreault, L.F., King, N., Plante, C., & Smargiassi, A. (2012). "Review of the effect of aircraft noise on sleep disturbance in adults." *Noise health*. 2012;14(57):58-67.

- Pikilidou, M.I., Scuteri, A., Morrell, C., & Lakatta, E.G. (2013). "The burden of obesity on blood pressure is reduced in older persons: The Sardinia study." *Obesity* (Silver Spring), Jan 21(1).
- Plotkin, K.J., Sharp, B.H., Connor, T., Bassarab, R., Flindell, I., & Schreckenberg, D. (2011). Updating and supplementing the day-night average sound level (DNL). Wyle Report 11-04, DOT/FAA/AEE/2011-03, June 2011.
- Powell, C.A., & Shepherd, K.P. (1989). "Aircraft noise induced building vibration and effects on human response." *InterNoise '89*. Newport Beach, CA, (December 1989):567-572.
- Pujol, S., et al. (2014). "Association between ambient noise exposure and school performance of children living in an urban area: a cross-sectional population-based study." *Journal of Urban Health* 91.2: pp. 256-271.
- Pulles, M.P.J., Biesiot, W., & Stewart, R. (1990). "Adverse effects of environmental noise on health: An interdisciplinary approach." *Environment International*. Vol. 16, pp. 437-445.
- Rhee, M.Y., Kim, H.Y., Roh, S.C., Kim, H.J., & Kwon, H.J. (2008). "The effects of chronic exposure to aircraft noise on the prevalence of hypertension." *Hypertension research*. 31(4), pp. 641-647.
- Richardson, W.J., Greene, C.R., Jr., Malme, C.I., & Thomson, D.H. (1995). *Marine mammals and noise*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
- Richardson, C.T., & Miller, C.K. (1997). "Recommendations for protecting raptors from human disturbance: A review." *Wildlife society bulletin*. Volume 25, Number 3: 634-638.
- Rosenblith, W.A., Stevens, K.N., & Staff of Bolt, Beranek, and Newman. (1953). *Handbook of acoustic noise control, Vol. 2, noise and man*. USAF Report WADC TR-52-204.
- Rosengren A., Wilhelmson, L., & Wedel, H. (1992). "Coronary heart disease, cancer and mortality in male middle-aged light smokers." *Journal of internal medicine*. Volume 231, Issue 4, pp.357–362, April 1992.
- Rosenlund, M., Berglind, N., Bluhm, G., Jarup, L., & Pershagen, G. (2001). "Increased prevalence of hypertension in a population exposed to aircraft noise." *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. Vol. 58, No. 12, pp. 769 773. December 2001.
- Schomer, P.D., & Neathammer, R.D. (1985). *The role of vibration and rattle in human response to helicopter noise.* CERL N-85/14, 1-162. USA-CERL.
- Schomer, P.D., & Neathammer, R.D. (1987). "The role of helicopter noise-induced vibration and rattle in human response." *J Acoust Soc Am*. 81(4), pp. 966-976.
- Schreckenberg, D., & Guski, R. (2015). "Transportation noise effects in communities around German airports Summaries of the sub-studies of the NORAH Project." Summary (in English) of the study "Verkehrslärmwirkungen im Flughafenumfeld."
- Schreckenberg, D., Meis, M., Kahl, C., Peschel, C., & Eikmann, T. (2010). "Aircraft noise and quality of life around Frankfurt Airport." *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health.* 2010, 7, pp. 3382-3405.
- Schreckenberg, D., & Schuemer, R. (2010) "The impact of acoustical, operational and non-auditory factors on short-term annoyance due to aircraft noise," *Internoise 2010*, Lisbon, Portugal, June 2010.

- Schultz, T.J. (1978). "Synthesis of social surveys on noise annoyance." J. Acoust. Soc. Am. Vol. 64, No. 2, pp. 377-405, August 1978.
- Seidler, A., Wagner, M., Schubert, M., Dröge, P., Römer, K.I., & Pons-Kühnemann, J., et al. (2016). "Aircraft, road and railway traffic noise as risk factors for heart failure and hypertensive heart disease—A case-control study based on secondary data." International journal of hygiene and environmental health. 219(8): pp. 749-758.
- Seidler, A., Wagner, M., Schubert, M., Dröge, P., & Pons-Kühnemann, J., et al. (2016). "Myocardial infarction risk due to aircraft, road and rail traffic noise Results of a case-control study based on secondary data." *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International*. 113, pp. 407-414.
- Sharp, B., Connor, T., McLaughlin, D., Clark, C., Stansfeld, S., & Hervey, J. (2013). "Assessing aircraft noise conditions affecting student learning, ACRP Web Document 16. Accessed at: <u>http://www.trb.org/Aviation1/Blurbs/170328.aspx</u> Airport Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board, Washington, DC.
- Sharp, B.H., & Plotkin, K.J. (1984). "Selection of noise criteria for school classrooms." Wyle Research Technical Note TN 84-2 for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, October.
- Simmons, J.A. (1983). "Localization of sounds and targets in air and water by echolocating animals." (Abstract only). *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 73(Suppl.1):18.
- Smith, D.G., Ellis, D.H., & Johnston, T.H. (1988). "Raptors and aircraft" In Glinski, R.L., Gron-Pendelton,
   B., Moss, M.B., LeFranc, M.N., Jr., Millsap, B.A., & Hoffman, S.W., eds. Proceedings of the
   Southwest Raptor Management Symposium. National Wildlife Federation, Washington, D.C., pp. 360-367.
- Stansfeld, S.A., Berglund, B., Clark, C., Lopez-Barrio, I., Fischer, P., Öhrström, E., Haines, M.M., Head, J., Hygge, S., van Kamp, I., & Berry, B.F., on behalf of the RANCH study team. (2005). "Aircraft and road traffic noise and children's cognition and health: a cross-national study." *Lancet*. 365, 1942-1949.
- Stansfeld, S.A. & Clark, C. (2015). "Health effects of noise exposure in children." *Current environmental health reports.* 2(2): pp. 171-178.
- Stansfeld, S.A., Clark, C., Cameron, R.M., Alfred, T., Head, J., Haines, M.M., van Kamp, I., van Kampen, E., & Lopez-Barrio, I. (2009). "Aircraft and road traffic noise exposure and children's mental health," *Journal of environmental psychology*. 29, pp. 203-207.
- Stansfeld, S.A., & Crombie, R. (2011). "Cardiovascular effects of environmental noise: Research in the United Kingdom." *Noise Health.* 2011;13(52): pp. 229-233.
- Stevens, K.N., Rosenblith, W.A., & Bolt, R.H. (1953). "Neighborhood Reaction to Noise: A Survey and Correlation of Case Histories (A)," J. Acoust. Soc. Am. Vol. 25, 833.
- Stusnick, E., D.A. Bradley, J.A. Molino, and G. DeMiranda. 1992. *The effect of onset rate on aircraft noise annoyance, Volume 2: Rented home experiment.* Wyle Laboratories Research Report WR 92-3, March.
- Sutherland, L.C., Fidell, S., & Harris, A. (2000). *Finding of the low-frequency noise expert panel*. September 30, 2000.

- Sutherland, L.C. (1990). Assessment of potential structural damage from low altitude subsonic aircraft. Wyle Research Report 89-16 (R).
- Tetra Tech, Inc. (1997). Final environmental assessment issuance of a letter of authorization for the incidental take of marine mammals for programmatic operations at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California." July 1997.
- Ting, C., Garrelick, J., & Bowles, A. (2002). "An analysis of the response of sooty tern eggs to sonic boom overpressures." J. Acoust. Soc. Am., Vol. 111, No. 1, Pt. 2, pp. 562-568.
- Tomkins, J., Topham, N., Twomey, J., & Ward, R. (1998). "Noise versus access: The impact of an airport in an urban property market." *Urban studies*, Vol. 35, No. 2, 1998, pp. 243–258.
- Trimmel, M., et al. (2012). "Effects of low intensity noise from aircraft or from neighbourhood on cognitive learning and electrophysiological stress responses." *International journal of hygiene and environmental health.* 215.6: pp. 547-554.
- Trimper, P.G., Standen, N.M., Lye, L.M., Lemon, D., Chubbs, T.E., & Humphries, G.W. (1998). "Effects of low-level jet aircraft noise on the behavior of nesting osprey." *Journal of applied ecology*. Vol. 35, pp. 122-130.
- United Kingdom Department for Education and Skills. (2003). *Building Bulletin 93, acoustic design of schools--A design guide.* London: The Stationary Office.
- U.S. Air Force. (1993). *The impact of low altitude flights on livestock and poultry, Air Force handbook*. Volume 8, Environmental Protection, January 28, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_\_. (1994a). "Air Force position paper on the effects of aircraft overflights on large domestic stock." Approved by HQ USAF/CEVP, October 3, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. (1994b). "Air Force position paper on the effects of aircraft overflights on domestic fowl." Approved by HQ USAF/CEVP, October 3, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. (2000). *Preliminary final supplemental environmental impact statement for Homestead Air Force Base closure and reuse*. Prepared by SAIC, July 20, 2000.

- U.S. Department of Labor. (1971). "Occupational Safety & Health Administration, occupational noise exposure." Standard No. 1910.95.
- USEPA. (1974). "Information on levels of environmental noise requisite to protect public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety." U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Report 550/9-74-004, March 1974.

. (1978). "Protective Noise Levels," Office of Noise Abatement and Control, Washington, D.C. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Report 550/9-79-100, November 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. (1982). "Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis," U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Report 550/9-82-105, April 1982.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). (2010). 12-Month Findings for Petitions to List the Greater Sage-Grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) as Threatened or Endangered. Federal Register, Volume 75, Number 55: 13910-14014. March 23, 2010. . (1998). "Consultation Letter #2-22-98-I-224 explaining restrictions on endangered species required for the proposed force structure and foreign military sales actions at Cannon AFB, NM" to Alton Chavis HQ ACC/CEVP at Langley AFB from Jennifer Fowler-Propst, USFWS Field Supervisor, Albuquerque, NM, December 14, 1998.

- U.S. Forest Service. (1992). *Report to congress: Potential impacts of aircraft overflights of national forest system wilderness.* U.S. Government Printing Office 1992-0-685-234/61004, Washington, D.C.
- Van den Berg, F., Verhagen, C., & Uitenbroek, D. (2015). "The relation between self-reported worry and annoyance from air and road traffic." *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 12(3), pp. 2486–2500. http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120302486
- van Kempen, E.M.M, Hanneke, K., Hendriek, C., Boshuizen, H.C., Ameling, C.B., Staatsen, B.A.M., & de Hollander, A.E.M. (2002). "The association between noise exposure and blood pressure and ischemic heart disease: A meta-analysis." *Environmental health perspectives*. Vol. 110, No. 3, March 2002.
- van Kempen, E.M.M. (2006). "Noise exposure and children's blood pressure and heart rate: the RANCH project." *Occup Environ Med.* 2006;63: pp. 632–639
- Vienneau, D., Perez, L., Schindler, C., Probst-Hensch, N., & Röösli, M. (2013). "The relationship between traffic noise exposure and ischemic heart disease: a meta-analysis." *Proceedings of InterNoise 2013*. September 2013.
- von Gierke, H.E., & Ward, W.D. (1991). "Criteria for noise and vibration exposure." Handbook of acoustical measurements and noise control. Harris, C.M., ed., third edition.
- Walker, B.L., Naugle, D.E., & Doherty, K.E. (2007). *Greater sage-grouse population response to energy development and habitat loss* (pre-print version). Wildlife Biology Program, College of Forestry and Conservation, University of Montana. Missoula, Montana. June 2007.
- Ward, D.H., & Stehn, R.A. (1990). Response of brant and other geese to aircraft disturbances at Izembek Lagoon, Alaska. Final Technical Report, Number MMS900046. Performing Organization: Alaska Fish and Wildlife Research Center, Anchorage, AK, Sponsoring Organization: Minerals Management Service, Anchorage, AK, Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Office.
- Ward, D.H., Taylor, E.J., Wotawa, M.A., Stehn, R.A., Derksen, D.V., & Lensink, C.J. (1986). *Behavior of Pacific black brant and other geese in response to aircraft overflights and other disturbances at Izembek Lagoon, Alaska*. 1986 Annual Report, p. 68.
- Weisenberger, M.E., Krausman, P.R., Wallace, M.C., De Young, D.W., & Maughan, O.E. (1996). "Effects of simulated jet aircraft noise on heart rate and behavior of desert ungulates." *Journal of Wildlife Management*, Vol. 60, No. 1, pp. 52-61.
- Wesler, J.E. (1977). "Concorde operations at Dulles International Airport." NOISEXPO '77. Chicago, IL, March 1977.
- Wesler, J.E. (1986). *Priority selection of schools for soundproofing*. Wyle Research Technical Note TN 96-8 for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, October 1986.
- WHO. (1999). "Guidelines for Community Noise," Berglund, B., T. Lindvall, and D. Schwela, eds.
  - \_\_\_\_. (2000). *Guidelines for community noise*. World Health Organization.

\_\_\_\_\_. (2009). *Night noise guidelines for Europe*. World Health Organization.

- \_\_\_\_\_\_. (2011). Burden of disease from environmental noise. World Health Organization.
- Wyle Laboratories. (1970). Supporting information for the adopted noise regulations for California airports. Wyle Report WCR 70-3(R).

Zaharna, M., & Guilleminault, C. (2010). "Sleep, noise and health: review." Noise health. 2010.

This page intentionally left blank.