

## **6.0 COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

---

Chapter 6.0 of *Volume I: Noise Exposure Maps* describes the extensive coordination effort and public involvement program that were undertaken as part of this FAR Part 150 Study. The coordination and public involvement efforts continued through the remainder of the Study and the development of the NCP. Principal components of the outreach effort for the NCP included:

- Meetings with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
- Public workshops conducted in an open house format
- Formal public hearing
- Stakeholder interviews and focus group meetings

### **6.1 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Advisory committee meetings provided a forum for discussing possible solutions for the noise issues that were identified during the preparation of the NEMs. The Committees met five times during the course of the Study. Three of the meetings principally dealt with the development of the Existing (2003) NEM and the Future (2008) Baseline NEM. At the third meeting, Committee members were introduced to the types of strategies (operational, remedial, and land use management) that could be considered for the BNIA's NCP. However, NCP recommendations were primarily discussed at the fourth and fifth meetings that were held on:

- July 27, 2004 – TAC and CAC
- November 18, 2004 – TAC and CAC

---

## **6.0 COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

Overall, Committee members were generally receptive to the operational measures that were ultimately recommended in the NCP. Those concerns that were expressed largely focused on three issues: aircraft engine run-ups during Quiet Time; the potential for increasing use of the crosswind runway, Runway 14/32; and straight-in approaches to Runway 23. Some members expressed frustration that engine maintenance run-ups continued to occur despite the NFTA's informal Quiet Time policy. The NFTA staff re-emphasized the need for annoyed individuals to advise the NFTA when a run-up occurred so that the incident could be further investigated. With respect to the crosswind runway, both the NFTA and FAA ATC personnel indicated that use of Runway 14/32 as a primary runway would only be temporary and was necessary to facilitate construction activity on Runway 5/23. The NCP's recommendation for straight-in approaches from five miles out was not acceptable to one of the Committee members that resides beneath the approach. This individual considered it unfair that the approaches were concentrated in one area and proposed several alternative approach paths. Coordination with FAA ATC personnel concluded that the alternative approach paths were not practical and did not provide for the safe operation of an aircraft in the event of an incident such as an engine failure.

Committee members were receptive to the remedial measures that were recommended, particularly the sound insulation program. A specialist from Wyle Laboratories discussed sound insulation techniques in depth at the fourth meeting with the TAC and CAC. The most significant Committee concern was the desire that the program be implemented as quickly as possible. Also, one Committee member questioned the value of providing sound insulation treatment because of the expense and because a large number of homes were not for sale in the designated area which indicated, in his opinion, that residents did not need the program.

Land use management measures that are recommended in the NCP were discussed at these meetings with the TAC and CAC. Both of the communities that are closest to the BNIA and most affected by its operation, Cheektowaga and Amherst, expressed a

willingness to consider using the recommended measures, particularly the airport noise overlay recommendations.

CAC and TAC members that participated in the fifth meeting received copies, in CD format, of all draft documentation.

## **6.2 PUBLIC WORKSHOPS**

Three public workshops were conducted during the course of the Part 150 Study. Input received from the first two workshops is presented in Chapter 6.0 of Volume I. The types of strategies under consideration were introduced to the public at the second workshop and were more completely discussed at the third workshop.

The third workshop was held on September 30, 2004 and presented for public comment the measures that were under consideration for the NCP. Seventy-three (73) individuals attended the workshop. Appendix F contains the sign-in sheets; informational booklet; newsletter; related news articles, editorials, and announcements; and a copy of all written comments and emails that were received in association with the workshop.

Thirty-one (31) individuals submitted written comments at the workshop. The types of comments that were received are summarized below:

- Specific noise complaints from individuals that reside in the area designated for sound insulation treatment (16)
- Appreciation/thank you for the assistance and information provided at the workshop (8)
- Request that the sound insulation program be implemented as soon as possible (6)
- Concerns about air quality issues, other environmental issues, or need for a health study (4)

- Request for off-set approaches to Runway 23, e.g, following Transit Road (2)
- Request for a straight-in approach to Runway 23, as proposed (1)
- Request for a curfew on all activity (1)
- Request for different aircraft flight profiles (1)

Additionally, it was evident that the term Quiet Time was confusing the public and many were interpreting the phrase as meaning a nighttime curfew on all types of activity at the BNIA. Care was taken from that point on in the Study to clearly state that Quiet Time referred only to a limit on engine maintenance run-ups and preferential use of Runway 5/23 by jet and multi-engine aircraft.

Three letters and three emails were received during this period of the Study and are included in Appendix F. All three letters expressed concern about the use of 14/32. One of the three emails also expressed concern about the use of 14/32 during construction. The other emails either questioned the relative noisiness of certain aircraft types or expressed a noise concern for which the Study recommended a preferential departure corridor.

### **6.3 PUBLIC HEARING**

The public hearing for the BNIA's FAR Part 150 Study was held on December 8, 2004, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. A public workshop was conducted in an open house format concurrent with the hearing, and enabled individuals to speak at length with study analysts.

The hearing was advertised on November 7, 2004 and subsequent notices and press releases were carried in the local news media prior to the hearing date. Members of the TAC and the CAC were contacted by phone to remind them of the public hearing date.

---

## **6.0 COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

Appendix G contains a copy of all of the news announcements and press releases that were carried in the local papers prior to the hearing. Articles that were published following the hearing are included in Appendix G as well. Channel 4 interviewed the NFTA staff and ran a story on the 5:30 p.m. news on December 8, just before the start of the public hearing, and again at 11:00 p.m. with results from the hearing.

Thirty (30) days prior to the public hearing, complete copies of study documentation were placed in local libraries and town halls for interested citizens to review. An electronic version of the documentation was placed on the NFTA's web site 30 days prior to the hearing.

A full copy of the public hearing transcript is included in Appendix G. Eighteen (18) individuals spoke at the hearing, including the Director of Aviation who started the hearing off with a summary of the Study's recommendations. Few of the speakers commented on the Study's recommendations and most of the comments were made in relation to specific noise issues or other issues not pertinent to the Study. Those commenting directly on the Study's recommendations included a Councilman from Cheektowaga who stated support for the sound insulation program, but expressed the need to extend the program further to include other areas from which noise complaints were being received. Four speakers questioned the methodology and were concerned with the sound levels of single events or peak periods rather than an average annual day. Several expressed concern about continued noise during Quiet Time and one individual requested a night curfew. One of the speakers stated that the comments from the people of Clarence had not been included in the Study. (This individual had proposed an off set approach to Runway 23 that ATC considered to be unsafe.) Responses to each of the comments that were made by these speakers are included in Appendix G and follow the copy of the transcript.

In addition to providing formal comment, participants were able to submit written comments. Sixteen (16) comment cards were submitted at the hearing and many of those that spoke at the hearing also submitted comment cards. Nearly half of the comments

were from individuals living south of Runway 5 who complained about aircraft noise. These individuals are not in the sound insulation program area, but are likely to benefit from the preferential corridors for departures on Runway 23 and arrivals on Runway 5. The remaining comments were more diverse. Two expressed concern about aircraft noise and were from individuals living in the sound insulation program area. Two expressed concern about ground noise and Quiet Time. Two asked to be placed on future mailing lists and two individuals expressed their thanks for the information provided and the opportunity to speak with capable individuals. Copies of the written comments are included in Appendix G along with a response to each comment.

Finally, 15 emails were received in relation to the hearing. The two most prominent topics of the emails were to request information or were noise complaints from residents living south of Runway 5. Three emails expressed concerns about noise from aircraft operations on Runway 14/32. Only one email identifies an issue relating to noise from aircraft on the ground. The emails and the responses to the emails are included in Appendix G.

The public record was left open for 14 days following the public hearing. All comments received through the end of the public comment period, December 22, 2004, are included in Appendix G.

#### **6.4 STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS**

Meetings with the TAC and the CAC were the primary vehicle for incorporating stakeholder input into the Study. However, individual meetings were conducted where necessary to formulate measures that were practical for implementation. This was particularly true of the operational measures that were examined during the development of the NCP. Contact with FAA ATC personnel at the BNIA occurred often and informally by phone and email throughout both the NEM and the NCP phases of the Study. On February 17, 2004 a coordination meeting was conducted with ATC personnel and NFTA personnel to initiate the discussion of operational measures for reducing noise

---

## **6.0 COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

issues. At that meeting, both ATC and NFTA personnel suggested measures that had merit and should be evaluated. On March 8, 2004, all of the BNIA's users, including commercial airline and FBO representatives, were invited to a working session to discuss operational measures. NFTA and ATC personnel attended that meeting as well. A follow-up meeting with the users was conducted on July 27, 2004 to discuss the measures that were likely to be implemented and to discuss related implementation measures. Only the Southwest and Continental representatives attended that meeting. Both indicated that their airline would follow the recommended procedures.

As study recommendations were being developed, the Part 150 Study Team contacted pertinent stakeholders in the community and offered them the opportunity for individual interviews or meetings to discuss issues of particular interest. On November 17, the Study Team met with Cheektowaga's Town Supervisor. On December 13, the Team met with the Town of Amherst's Planning Director, the Town Supervisor and the Amherst Town Board. Other stakeholders that were offered an opportunity for an interview, but declined the opportunity or did not respond to telephone calls to schedule an interview, include: Amherst Industrial Development Agency, Erie County Department of Environment and Planning, Cheektowaga Department of Community Development, Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce, Town of Clarence, Town of Lancaster, Village of Lancaster, Village of Sloan, and the Village of Depew.