APPENDIX C NOISE ANALYSIS

# DRAFT

# Aircraft Noise Analysis Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona

In Support of the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Update and Implementation of the Total Force Training Mission for Visiting Units (Operation Snowbird, Multi-Service, Foreign Military Sales)





### 1 Table of Contents

2	1.0 Introduction	1
3	1.1 Background	1
4	1.2 Scope	4
5	1.3 Organization	4
6	2.0 Methodology	5
7	2.1 Technical Approach	5
8	2.2 Assumptions	6
9	2.3 Aircraft Noise	7
10	2.3.1 Basics of Sound	7
11	2.3.2 Noise Metrics	9
12	2.3.3 Noise Models	11
13	3.0 Flight Operations for Visiting Units	13
14	3.1 Annual Aircraft Sorties for Visiting Units	13
15	3.2 Air Traffic Control Flight Operations	14
16	3.3 Runway/Pad Utilizations for Visiting Units	16
17	3.4 Flight Tracks for Visiting Units	17
18	3.5 Flight Profiles for Visiting Units	17
19	4.0 Noise Exposure	18
20	References	22
21	Acronyms	23
22		
23	Attachment A. Modeled Flight Tracks for Visiting Units	

24 Attachment B. Modeled Flight Profiles for Visiting Units

# 1 List of Figures

2	Figure 1-1. Vicinity of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona	2
3	Figure 1-2. Modeled Runway and Pad at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona	3
4	Figure 2-1. Noise Analysis Approach	6
5	Figure 2-2. Frequency Response of A-Weighted Curve	8
6	Figure 2-3. Common A-Weighted Sounds	9
7	Figure 2-4. Sound Exposure Level	10
8	Figure 2-5. Day Night Average Sound Level	10
9	Figure 2-6. Percent of Communities Highly Annoyed (Schultz Curve)	11
10	Figure 3-1. Runway/Pad Utilization for Visiting Units	17
11	Figure 4-1. No Action and Alternative 1 DNL Contours	19
12	Figure 4-2. No Action and Alternative 2 DNL Contours	20
13	Figure 4-3. No Action Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 DNL Contours	21
14	List of Tables	
15	Table 2-1. List of Assumptions	7
16	Table 3-1. Annual Aircraft Sorties for Visiting Units	14
17	Table 3-2. Annual ATC Flight Operations for Visiting Units	15
18	Table 3-3. Total Annual ATC Flight Operations by Alternative	16

### 1 1.0 Introduction

2 This report documents the aircraft noise analysis in support of the Environmental Assessment

3 (EA) for the Proposed Update and Implementation of the Total Force Training Mission for

4 Visiting Units (Operation Snowbird [OSB], Multi-Service, Foreign Military Sales [FMS]) at

5 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base (DMAFB), Arizona [1]. The results of this analysis will help

6 inform the U.S. Air Force (USAF) decision maker of potential environmental changes during the

7 Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) for the proposed action and alternatives [2].

### 8 1.1 Background

9 Headquarters (HQ) Air Combat Command (ACC) prepared a Draft EA of current National

- 10 Guard Bureau (NGB)/ACC training at DMAFB and released it for public review in July 2012
- 11 [3]. Since that time, ACC, NGB, and the 355 Fighter Wing (355 FW) have reviewed the training
- 12 mission and operations and determined that the Proposed Action addressed in the Draft EA
- 13 required clarification. Of particular importance is the fact that NGB/Air National Guard (ANG)
- 14 is responsible only for those units/aircraft that are planned specifically for OSB training

15 missions. Other Depart of Defense (DoD) and FMS units that might participate in deployments

16 to DMAFB would do so under the authority/coordination of 355 FW and ACC/International

17 Aircraft Sales (IAS), respectively. Thus, ACC has decided to revise the 2012 Draft EA to more

18 accurately describe the Visiting Units' flight operations that occur at DMAFB and to assess their

19 potential impacts. It should also be noted that other routine ANG activities conducted by the 162

20 FW out of Tucson International Airport (TIA), located approximately 4 nautical miles (NM)

21 southwest of DMAFB (Figure 1-1), are completely separate from the actions described herein

and, thus, are not discussed in this EA. Additional information is available in Reference 1.

- 23 DMAFB is located within the city limits of Tucson in southern Arizona. The installation is
- southeast of downtown Tucson and northeast of TIA. DMAFB has one runway (RW) 12/30 that

25 is 13,643-feet long and 200-feet wide. Also located on the airfield are one helicopter pad labeled

26 09/27 and a Helicopter Training Area (HTA) (not modeled for Visiting Units). Figure 1-2 depicts

27 only the landing surfaces modeled in this analysis. DMAFB elevation is 2,704 feet above Mean

28 Sea Level (MSL), and the magnetic declination is 12 degrees east.



Figure 1-1. Vicinity of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona



Figure 1-2. Modeled Runway and Pad at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona[4]

### 1 **1.2 Scope**

2 The scope of this noise analysis includes three alternatives and the interpretation of the results.

3 The noise analysis follows directions/guidance received from HQ ACC and DMAFB for

4 modeling the following three alternatives (Additional information on the alternatives is available

- 5 in Reference 1):
- No Action Alternative: This alternative describes the baseline of current operations that
   will be used to compare against the Proposed Action (Alternative 1) and Alternative 2. In
   this case, it consists of the Continuation of the Total Force Training Mission at 2009
   levels, in addition to other based operations at DMAFB.
- Alternative 1 (Proposed Action/Preferred Alternative): This alternative updates and
   implements the Total Force Training Mission, which would involve year-round training
   at DMAFB using ANG, Reserve, and DoD aircraft, as well as occasional FMS
   deployments.
- Alternative 2: This alternative updates and implements the same levels of training
   described for Alternative 1, except that FMS aircraft would be limited to one deployment
   per year.
- 17 The noise analysis involved collection of flight operations data and modeling for the above-
- 18 described alternatives. Using the 2009 Draft Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) for
- 19 DMAFB [5] electronic noise files provided by the government as a starting point, OSB

20 designated flight operations were replaced with flight operations for Visiting Units (OSB, Multi-

21 Service, FMS) for the three alternatives. No other changes were made to the electronic noise

22 files.

### 23 1.3 Organization

24 The remainder of this report is organized in three sections, including the Methodology (Section

25 2), Flight Operations (Section 3) and Noise Exposure (Section 4). Section 2 reviews the technical

26 approach, assumptions and aircraft noise (sound, metrics and tools). Section 3 discusses the data

27 collection process, and updated flight operations, flight tracks and flight profiles for each

- 28 alternative. Section 4 describes the resulting noise contours, including interpretation of the
- 29 results.

### 1 2.0 Methodology

2 This section describes the methodology used to conduct the noise analysis for the *Proposed* 

3 Update and Implementation of the Total Force Training Mission for Visiting Units (OSB, Multi-

4 Service, FMS) at DMAFB, Arizona EA, including the overall approach and assumptions, noise

5 models and noise metrics.

### 6 2.1 Technical Approach

7 The technical approach consists of five phases including Data Collection, Data Validation, Noise

8 Analysis, Draft Report and Final Report (Figure 2-1). The following paragraphs summarize

- 9 activities for each phase:
- Data Collection: A data collection package was issued to ACC and DMAFB
   representatives to collect information for the noise analysis. At the same time, previous
   studies such as EAs, AICUZ and DOPAAs were collected. AICUZ noise files were
   provided by the government.
- Data Validation: A data validation package was issued to ACC and DMAFB
   representatives for final coordination. Comments and inputs were incorporated into the
   noise analysis.
- Noise Analysis: Three model runs were completed using the data collected during the
   previous two phases. Differences between the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1
   and Alternative 2 were assessed.
- Draft Report: This draft noise analysis report was issued for review by DMAFB/ACC.
   Comments will be discussed and resolved in coordination with DMAFB/ACC. No re analysis is anticipated at this stage of the process.
- Final Report: A final noise analysis report will be issued that includes all changes agreed
   to during the review of the draft report. Completion of this phase will mark the end of
   the noise analysis effort.

26 Except for the noise analysis phase, all other phases required significant coordination with

27 DMAFB/ACC representatives to ensure that the data collected was as accurate as possible and

28 reflective of current operations and future plans, and/or that assumptions made were acceptable

29 to all stakeholders.



#### 3 2.2 Assumptions

1

- 4 In recognition of the evolving nature of this project, assumptions were made to enable noise
- 5 modeling within the agreed-upon timelines; these assumptions reflect the scope of the project
- 6 and/or the best judgment of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in the areas of airbase operations,
- 7 airspace management, aircraft performance, aircraft maintenance, etc. These assumptions are
- 8 documented in Table 2-1, including a description of each assumption, their categorization
- 9 (project, technical, and modeling), a qualitative discussion of impacts, the likelihood that the
- 10 assumption might change and the impact if it does change, and a conceptual risk profile. For
- 11 example, an assumption that is highly likely to change resulting in a high impact to the project is
- 12 deemed a high risk item.

Table	2-1.	List	of	Assum	ptions
-------	------	------	----	-------	--------

Date	ID	Description	Category	Qualitative Description of Impact	Likelihood Rating (1-Low 2-Medium 3-High)	Impact Rating (1-Low 2-Medium 3-High)	Risk Profile
5/12/2014	1.0	For flight operations other than Visiting Units, use the 2009 Draft AICUZ electronic noise files as provided by the Government, without modification ("AS IS").	Project	Data to support the TFT training EA was taken from the 2007 noise study. TFT sorites were adjusted to 2009 levels.	3	3	6
5/12/2014	2.0	Run Noisemap in topography mode when developing new contours for this EA; AICUZ and previous Draft EA noise analysis did not include topography	Modeling	Contour changes due to Noisemap topography which may result in inconsistencies with previously developed contours for DMAFB	2	2	4
5/12/2014	3.0	As pilot representatives for the F/A-18E/F, MV-22 and AV-8B were not available, flight profiles for these aircraft were assumed from previous noise analyses and were not re-confirmed by DMAFB	Modeling	Impact of this assumption would be expected to be negligible on the cumulative noise contours	3	1	4
5/12/2014	4.0	For the F-16, F-15, F-22 and F/A-18E/F, 95% of takeoff operations were modeled as Afterburner (AB) takeoffs, and 5% as Military (MIL) takeoffs	Modeling	Impact of this assumption would be expected to be negligible on the cumulative noise contours	1	2	3
5/12/2014	5.0	As pilot representatives for the SA330 PUMA were not available, H-60 power and speed data points were used along with SA330 PUMA noise source data in NOISEFILE	Modeling	Impact of this assumption would be expected to be negligible on the cumulative noise contours	2	1	3
5/12/2014	6.0	GR7/9 Harrier was modeled as AV-8B Harrier	Modeling	Impact of this substitution would be expected to be negligible on the cumulative noise contours	1	1	2
5/12/2014	7.0	Different Model Design Series (MDS) of the same airraft were modeled using one engine type	Modeling	Impact of this assumption would be expected to be negligible on the cumulative noise contours	1	1	2

1

### 3 2.3 Aircraft Noise

4 Aircraft noise remains a significant constraint to military aviation training. In general, aircraft

5 sound can be measured and/or modeled relatively easily, but community response continues to

6 be difficult to predict. Individual response is even more complex owing to a wide range of

7 confounding emotional factors: feelings about noise, feelings about the activity, own activity at

8 the time of the noise, attitudes towards the environment, knowledge of health effects, etc. The

9 following sections cover the basics of sound, noise metrics and modeling tools.

#### 10 2.3.1 Basics of Sound

11 Sound is associated with small mechanical vibrations transmitted through a medium such as air,

12 water, etc. Three attributes define sound: intensity, frequency, and duration. The following

13 sections discuss these attributes.

- 14 Intensity is the energy of the sound or Sound Pressure Level (SPL). In other words, higher SPLs
- 15 indicate louder sounds. The human ear can perceive a wide range of sound intensities and,
- 16 further, the ratio of the highest to the lowest sound intensity that can be perceived by an average

- 1 healthy human ear is on the order of 10 trillion. As a result, a logarithmic scale is used to
- 2 transform sound intensities to decibels (dB) where the threshold of audibility is approximately 0
- 3 dB and the maximum audible sound (the threshold of pain) approaches 130 dB [6]. On a
- 4 logarithmic scale, a change of 3 dB is a doubling /halving of sound intensity, and is generally
- 5 considered noticeable. A 10-dB change is a 10-fold increase/decrease in sound intensity.
- 6 Frequency or pitch is defined as the number of vibrations per second measured in Hertz (Hz)
- 7 which equates to one cycle per second (cps). Thunder is an example of a low frequency sound
- 8 (more energy content in lower frequencies) whereas a bird chirping is an example of a high
- 9 frequency sound (more energy content in higher frequencies). A sound may vary in intensity at
- 10 different frequencies; equally, it may vary in both intensity and frequency at different locations.
- 11 Not all frequencies are perceived equally by the human ear. The average healthy human ear
- 12 perceives sounds ranging from 20 Hz to 15,000 Hz with greater sensitivity from 1,000 Hz to
- 13 4,000 Hz. Therefore, the A-weighted curve is used to approximate the sensitivity of the human
- 14 ear to different types of sound. The A-weighted curve de-emphasizes very high and very low
- 15 frequencies (less than 500 Hz and more than 10,000 Hz). A-weighted sound levels are
- 16 symbolized using a dBA unit; for transportation noise, dB is often used to imply dBA. Figure 2-2
- 17 illustrates the A-weighted curve.



19

#### Figure 2-2. Frequency Response of A-Weighted Curve

20 The duration is the time span over which the sound is perceived. The duration is an important

21 factor in the total annoyance from a noise event. The duration of an aircraft noise event is a

22 function of the speed of the aircraft and the background sound levels. For example, a faster

23 aircraft would result in a sound of a shorter duration.

24 Sound becomes noise when it is perceived to interfere with human activity. For example, in the

25 vicinity of airports, the sound associated with aircraft operations often exceed the general

- 26 background and may interfere with activities such as classroom learning, sleep, speech or other
- 27 activities requiring some level of quiet. These sounds may be perceived as annoyance and,

- 1 therefore, characterized as noise. Figure 2-3 depicts common sounds measured using the A-
- 2 weighted curve.

Sound Level (dBA)	Common Sounds	Perceived Loudness
130	Threshold of pain	UNCOMFORTABLE
120	Jet taking off	
100	Discotheque with loud music	
80	Vacuum cleaner	LOUD
60	Urban background	11
40	Rural background	QUIET
20	Recording studio	
0	Threshold of hearing	BARELY AUDIBLE

#### 4



#### 5 2.3.2 Noise Metrics

- 6 Metrics are used to measure an attribute, in this case, noise. Several metrics have been
- 7 developed over the years to quantify aircraft noise and its effects on the environment. This
- 8 discussion focuses on relevant metrics used in accordance with the EIAP. The two metrics of
- 9 interest are the Sound Exposure Level (SEL) and Day Night Average Sound Level (DNL):

10 SEL is a metric used to quantify the acoustic value of an event characterized by changing sound

11 levels over a period of time. As the foundational element of DNL, SEL could be defined as the

12 equivalent sound that, over one second, would contain the same total acoustic energy of a single

event that varies over time (Figure 2-4). SEL accounts for both the intensity and duration of a

14 sound and provides a good measure of the net acoustic value of a single event.



2

#### Figure 2-4. Sound Exposure Level

3 DNL describes multiple events, accounting for number of events, intensity and duration. The

4 time scale is no longer the duration of one event, but a 24-hour period. DNL is therefore the

5 average A-weighted sound level of multiple events over a 24-hour time period. DNL adds a 10

6 dB penalty for nighttime noise events between 2200 and 0700 local. The penalty represents the

7 added annoyance caused by these events during nighttime when background sound levels are

8 lower and there is an increased sensitivity to noise. Figure 2-5 shows five events at different

9 times throughout a 24-hour period, with SELs ranging from 64 dBA to 111 dBA. The resulting

10 DNL would be approximately 64 dBA.

EVENT	TIME	SEL (dBA)	PENALTY (dBA)	
45	0700	98	0	
44	1057	110	0	DNL
-	1245	m	0	64 dBA
	2257	84	+10	
1.	2343	64	+10	

11

12

#### Figure 2-5. Day Night Average Sound Level

13 In general, DNL is modeled using annual flight operations averaged over a certain number of

14 days. Annual flight operations can be averaged over the number of busy days to develop Average

15 Busy Day (ABD) DNL contours, or over 365 days to develop Average Annual Day (AAD) DNL

16 contours. DoD Instruction (DODI) 4165.57 provides guidance for averaging annual flight

- 1 operations for DoD installations [7]. DODI 4165.57 directs that aircraft noise contours should be
- 2 developed based on AAD operations. However, where the DoD component determines that AAD
- 3 does not adequately represent the aircraft noise impacts at a particular air installation, ABD
- 4 operations can be used with supporting rationale. For this analysis, ABD DNL contours are
- 5 presented to remain consistent with the previous EA and AICUZ studies.
- 6 DNL is typically used to assess long-term community annoyance as it correlates well with the
- 7 percent of communities highly annoyed [8, 9]. For example, Figure 2-6 (Schultz curve) shows
- 8 that approximately 13% of communities are highly annoyed at a DNL 65 dBA. DODI 4165.57
- 9 suggests certain land use compatibility guidelines based on DNL values.



Figure 2-6. Percent of Communities Highly Annoyed (Schultz Curve)

#### 12 2.3.3 Noise Models

13 Analyses of aircraft noise exposure around DoD facilities are normally accomplished using a

- 14 group of computer-based programs known as Noisemap, and by using the graphical interface
- 15 known as BaseOps. The BaseOps program allows entry of runway coordinates, airfield
- 16 information, flight tracks, flight profiles (engine thrust settings, altitudes, speeds, and pitch, yaw,
- 17 roll and nacelle angles for tilt rotors and helicopters), numbers of daily flight operations, and pre-
- 18 flight and engine ground run-up spots and flight operations. The Noisemap suite of computer
- 19 programs was primarily developed by USAF, which serves as the lead DoD agency for aircraft
- 20 noise modeling. While the Noisemap suite of noise models includes three modules (NMAP, the

1 Advanced Acoustic Model [AAM], and the Rotorcraft Noise Model [RNM]), only NMAP and

- 2 RNM are used for this analysis and discussed in the following sections.
- NMAP includes OMEGA10, OMEGA11, NOISEMAP and NMPlot. The suite also includes the
   NOISEFILE databases. The different modules are described in the following paragraphs:
- OMEGA10: For fixed-wing and helicopters modeled using NMAP, the OMEGA10
   program calculates SEL versus distance for each model of aircraft from the NOISEFILE
   database, taking into consideration the specified speeds, engine thrust settings, and
   environmental conditions appropriate to each type of flight operation. The NOISEFILE
   database contains one-third octave band sound data for pre-flight run-up and flight
   operations by most military aircraft and some civil aircraft. The OMEGA10 output is
   used by NOISEMAP in subsequent calculations.
- OMEGA11: The OMEGA11 program calculates maximum A-weighted sound levels
   from the NOISEFILE database for each model of aircraft taking into consideration the
   engine thrust settings and environmental conditions appropriate to ground engine
   maintenance run-up operations. Similar to the OMEGA10 output, the OMEGA11 output
   is also used by NOISEMAP in subsequent calculations.
- 17 NMAP: NMAP uses the OMEGA10 and OMEGA11 outputs, incorporates the number of • operations between 0700-2200 and 2200-0700 local, flight paths, and profiles of the 18 19 aircraft to calculate the DNL at a series of points on the ground around the facility. This 20 process results in a "grid" file containing noise levels at different points of a user 21 specified rectangular area. NMAP has been expanded to include atmospheric sound 22 propagation effects over varying terrain, including hills and mountainous regions, as well 23 as regions of varying acoustical impedance—for example, water around coastal regions. 24 This feature is used in computing the noise levels presented in this analysis.
- 25 The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)-Langley Research Center (LaRC)
- 26 developed RNM as part of the Tilt Rotor Aeroacoustic Code (TRAC) suite of computer
- 27 programs aimed at predicting far-field sound levels from tilt rotor aircraft and helicopters. DoD
- and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) have adopted RNM for the environmental
- 29 impact assessment of rotorcraft noise. RNM uses sound hemispheres to simulate noise
- 30 propagation in four dimensions, three dimensions plus time. RNM accounts for atmospheric
- 31 sound propagation effects over varying terrain and water. RNM also generates grid files which
- 32 can be used independently or combined with NMAP outputs.

### **3.0 Flight Operations for Visiting Units**

- 2 This section describes proposed flight operations for Visiting Units for the No Action
- 3 Alternative, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Sections 3.1 through 3.4 discuss aircraft sorties, Air
- 4 Traffic Control (ATC) flight operations, runway/pad utilizations, flight tracks and flight profiles,
- 5 respectively. The focus of this effort is on analyzing the environmental changes of transient
- 6 Visiting Units which are modeled in place of OSB designated flight operations contained in the
- 7 2007 noise study. The noise analysis was based on Average Busy Day (ABD) operations with
- 8 2% of flight operations by Visiting Units modeled between 2200 and 0700 local per Reference 1.

### 9 **3.1** Annual Aircraft Sorties for Visiting Units

10 The first step in the noise analysis process was to determine the annual flying activity level for

- 11 each alternative as defined by both sortie level as well as ATC flight operations numbers.
- 12 Military operations planners discuss flying activities in terms of "sorties", i.e., the entire flight
- 13 from start to end including the departure, any closed-pattern activities, and the arrival. Because
- 14 each Visiting Unit sortie analyzed in this EA, by definition, can only include one departure and
- 15 one arrival, and NO pattern or engine maintenance run-up operations, all Visiting Unit flying
- 16 activities required for the noise analysis were collected in terms of sorties. Table 3-1 presents a
- 17 summary of aircraft sorties for each alternative per Reference 1. The only difference between
- 18 Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 is the reduced FMS sorties in Alternative 2.

Deployment	Reported Aircraft Type	Modeled Aircraft Type	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	F-16	F-16C	874	834	834
	A-10	A-10A	302	490	490
	F-22	F-22	-	54	54
ANCOSP	F-15C	F-15A	-	54	54
ANG/USD	HH-60	UH-60A	48	75	75
	C-130H/J	C-130H&N&P	-	75	75
	SA 330 PUMA	PUMA SA330J	52	-	-
	GR7/9 HARRIER	AV-8B	132	-	-
	F-16	F-16C		110	110
	C-130H/J	C-130H&N&P		8	8
DoD	F/A-18E/F	F/A-18E/F	-	110	110
	AV-8B	AV-8B	-	60	60
	MV-22	MV-22	-	60	60
	F-16	F-16C	-	192	-
FMS	C-130H/J	C-130H&N&P		12	12
	GR-4 TORNADO	TORNADO		192	192
	TOTAL		1,408	2,326	2,134

Table 3-1. Annual Aircraft Sorties for Visiting Units

1

#### 3 3.2 Air Traffic Control Flight Operations

4 ATC, on the other hand, describes flying activities in terms of "flight operations", i.e., a takeoff

5 of a single aircraft is counted as one ATC flight operation; a landing of a single aircraft is

6 counted as one ATC flight operation; a closed pattern (touch and go) is counted as two ATC

7 flight operations. Since Visiting Units' sorties can only include one departure and one arrival,

8 and NO pattern or engine maintenance run-up operations, all Visiting Units' sorties account for

9 two ATC flight operations. Table 3-2 presents a summary of annual ATC flight operations for

10 Visiting Units for each alternative.

	Reported	Modeled			
Deployment	Aircraft	Aircraft	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	Туре	Туре			
	F-16	F-16C	1,748	1,668	1,668
	A-10	A-10A	604	980	980
	F-22	F-22	-	108	108
ANC/OSP	F-15C	F-15A	-	108	108
ANG/OSD	HH-60	UH-60A	96	150	150
	C-130H/J	C-130H&N&P	4	150	150
	SA 330 PUMA	PUMA SA330J	104	_	-
	GR7/9 HARRIER	AV-8B	264	-	-
	F-16	F-16C		220	220
	C-130H/J	C-130H&N&P	-	16	16
DoD	F/A-18E/F	F/A-18E/F	-	220	220
	AV-8B	AV-8B	-	120	120
	MV-22	MV-22		120	120
	F-16	F-16C		384	-
FMS	C-130H/J	C-130H&N&P		24	24
	GR-4 TORNADO	TORNADO		384	384
	TOTAL		2,816	4,652	4,268

Table 3-2. Annual ATC Flight Operations for Visiting Units

3 As shown in Table 3-3 under the column heading "Other", with OSB flight operations deleted

4 from the 2007 noise study, the files then contain 77,229 ATC flight operations resulting from all

5 operations of BASED aircraft at DMAFB including 355 FW, 563 Rescue Group, 943 Rescue

6 Group, 55 Electronic Combat Group, Customs and Border Protection, Aerospace Maintenance

7 and Regeneration Group, 162 FW, and Transient Operations derived from Reference 5.

8 Combining "Other" and "Visiting Units" yields total ATC flight operations for each alternative.

9 Table 3-3 presents a summary of total ATC flight operations for each alternative, as well as a

10 percentage of ATC flight operations due to Visiting Units.

	Fligh	nt Operat	ions	Flight Operations		
Alternative	Other	Visiting Units	Total	% Other	% Visiting Units	
No Action	77,229	2,816	80,045	96.48%	3.52%	
Alternative 1						
(Proposed Action)	77,229	4,652	81,881	94.32%	5.68%	
Alternative 2	77,229	4,268	81,497	94.76%	5.24%	

#### Table 3-3. Total Annual ATC Flight Operations by Alternative

2

1

### 3 3.3 Runway/Pad Utilizations for Visiting Units

4 The second step in the noise analysis process is the allocation of operations to runways and

5 vertical landing pads. The percentages of runway/pad utilization are normally based on wind

6 direction and other operational requirements, as provided by DMAFB personnel in Reference 4.

7 Figure 3-1 summarizes the runway utilizations for Visiting Units in east flow (landing East) and

8 west flow (landing West) conditions for the periods 0700-2200 local and 2200-0700 local which

9 correspond to required acoustical modeling criteria. For example, Visiting Units' fixed-wing

10 aircraft would typically depart/land 70% of the time to the east and 30% of the time to the west.

11 It should be noted that, during the hours of 2200-0700 local, Visiting Units' fixed-wing aircraft

12 would typically land 20% of the time to the east and 80% of the time to the west. Helicopters

13 would depart/arrive to/from the east 85% of the time and 15% to/from the west.





Figure 3-1. Runway/Pad Utilization for Visiting Units

#### 3 **3.4 Flight Tracks for Visiting Units**

The next step in the noise analysis process is to determine the distribution of operations from/to
each runway onto different flight tracks as represented in the DMAFB standard flying
procedures. This data was collected for groups of aircraft from the Visiting Units, including
cargo aircraft, tactical aircraft and helicopters. Attachment A provides details of flight tracks and
utilizations [4, 10, 11, 12].

### 9 3.5 Flight Profiles for Visiting Units

Flight profiles consist of defining the typical altitude above ground, airspeed and engine power settings along flight tracks for each modeled aircraft type and operation (e.g., overhead arrival). This data defines the vertical profile of the operation as well as the power settings used, both of which are significant factors in modeling the noise generated. Attachment B provides representative flight profiles for each modeled aircraft per Reference 10 and subsequent changes [12].

### 1 4.0 Noise Exposure

2 Using the operations data described above, NOISEMAP and RNM were used to calculate DNL

3 noise contours for DMAFB. RNM was used to model only the MV-22. The resulting ABD DNL

4 contours of 65 through 85 dBA were computed and plotted in increments of 5 dB. Overall, the

5 noise contributions of Visiting Units' flight operations to the DNL contours are extremely small

6 and due solely to the fact that Visiting Units account for less than 6% of the total operations

7 occurring at DMAFB annually under any of the three alternative conditions. As a result, the

8 contours do not change significantly from the No Action Alternative to either Alternative 1 or

- 9 Alternative 2.
- 10 The 65 dB DNL contour extends approximately 1.7 NM northwest of the departure end of RW
- 11 30 due to straight in/out operations, and it extends 1.8 NM southeast of the departure end of RW
- 12 12 due to the same kind of operations. The lobes or small bulges north and west of the departure
- 13 end of RW 12 are due to run-up noise at the start of takeoff roll. Finally, the contours extend

14 about 0.6 NM either side of the runway due to the lateral propagation of noise from operations

15 on the runway. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of observed changes.

- 16 Figure 4-1 compares the contours of the No Action Alternative to Alternative 1. The contours are
- 17 similar in shape with a minor increase in the size of the Alternative 1 DNL contours due mostly
- 18 to the very small increase in operations of Alternative 1. The most visible changes are in the
- 19 southeast quadrant and are due to additional departures of tactical aircraft such as F-22s, F/A-
- 20 18E/Fs, F-16s, etc. of Visiting Units.

21 Figure 4-2 compares the contours of the No Action Alternative to Alternative 2. The contours are

22 again, similar in shape with a minor increase in the size of the Alternative 2 DNL contours. The

23 differences are of a lesser magnitude than in Alternative 1 since Alternative 2 includes only

24 limited FMS deployments (no FMS F-16 flight operations). The most visible changes continue to

- 25 occur in the southeast quadrant due to the additional departures of tactical aircraft such as F-22s,
- 26 F/A-18E/Fs, F-16s, etc. of Visiting Units,.
- 27 Figure 4-3 compares the contours of the No Action Alternative to Alternative 1 and Alternative

28 2. The contours remain similar in shape for all three alternatives and increase only slightly in size

29 from the No Action Alternative to Alternative 2, and then from Alternative 2 to Alternative 1.



Figure 4-1. No Action and Alternative 1 DNL Contours



Figure 4-2. No Action and Alternative 2 DNL Contours



Figure 4-3. No Action, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 DNL Contours

### 1 References

- 2 [1] U.S. Air Force Air Combat Command. 2014. Description of Proposed Action and
- 3 Alternatives for the Proposed Update and Implementation of the Total Force Training Mission
- 4 for Visiting Units (Operation Snowbird, Multi-Service, Foreign Military Sales) at Davis-
- 5 Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona. April.
- 6 [2] U.S. Air Force. 2003. Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-7061 (32 CFR 989), Environmental
- 7 Impact Analysis Process (EIAP). 12 March.
- 8 [3] U.S. Air Force Air Combat Command. 2012. *Environmental Assessment for Proposed*
- 9 Update and Implementation of the National Guard Bureau Training Plan 60-1 In Support of
- 10 Operations Snowbird, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona at Davis-Monthan Air Force
- 11 Base, Arizona. July.
- 12 [4] U.S. Air Force Air Combat Command/355 OSS/OSA. 2014. *E-mail from Holland, Rolland R*
- 13 Jr. to Rueschhoff, Jason M Lt Col USAF ACC 355 OSS/CC; Krischke, James H Lt Col USAF
- 14 ACC 355 OSS/DO. 29 January.
- 15 [5] U.S. Air Force Air Combat Command/355CES/CEAO. 2011. *E-mail from Born, Kenneth C.*
- 16 to Long, G., 2009 Draft AICUZ Electronic Noise File. 13 September.
- 17 [6] Berglund, B., and T. Lindvall. 1995. *Community Noise*. Institute of Environmental Medicine.
- [7] Department of Defense. 2011. DODI 4165.57 Air Installations Compatible Use Zones
   (AICUZ). 2 May.
- 20 [8] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1978. Protective Noise Levels. Office of Noise
- 21 Abatement and Control, Washington, D.C.
- 22 [9] Schultz, T.J. 1978. Synthesis of Social Surveys on Noise Annoyance. Journal of the
- 23 Acoustical Society of America, 64: pp. 377-405.
- 24 [10] Long, G and Amefia, K. 2014. *Data Validation Package*. 12 May.
- 25 [11] U.S. Air Force Air Combat Command/355 OG/CC. 2014. *E-mail from Wielhouwer, Philip*
- 26 W Col. to Calder, Don HQ ACC A7/A7NS. 16 May.
- [12] U.S. Air Force Air Combat Command/NG 162 FW/DO. 2014. *E-mail from Lewis, Jason R Maj. to Long, G.* 13 May.

## 2 Acronyms

Acronym	Description				
AAD	Average Annual Day				
AAM	Advanced Acoustic Model				
ABD	Average Busy Day				
ACC	Air Combat Command				
AICUZ	Air Installation Compatible Use Zones				
ANG	Air National Guard				
ATC	Air Traffic Control				
NGB	National Guard Bureau				
cps	Cycle Per Second				
dB	Decibel				
DMAFB	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base				
DNL	Day Night Average Sound Level				
DoD	Department of Defense				
EIAP	Environmental Impact Analysis Process				
FMS	Foreign Military Sales				
FW	Fighter Wing				
HQ	Headquarters				
НТА	Helicopter Training Area				
Hz	Hertz				
IAS	International Aircraft Sales				
LaRC	Langley Research Center				
MSL	Mean Sea Level				
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration				
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization				
NM	Nautical Mile				
OSB	Operation Snowbird				
RNM	Rotorcraft Noise Model				
RW	Runway				
SEL	Sound Exposure Level				
SPL	Sound Pressure Level				
TIA	Tucson International Airport				
TRAC	Tilt Rotor Aeroacoustic Code				
USAF	U.S. Air Force				





Attachment A

# **Modeled Flight Tracks for Visiting Units**

17 June 2014



Figure A-1. Cargo Aircraft Arrival Flight Tracks Landing East



Figure A-2. Cargo Aircraft Departure Flight Tracks to the East



Figure A-3. Cargo Aircraft Arrival Flight Tracks Landing West



Figure A-4. Cargo Aircraft Departure Flight Tracks to the West


Figure A-5. Tactical Aircraft Arrival Flight Tracks Landing East



Figure A-6. Tactical Aircraft VFR Departure Flight Tracks to the East



Figure A-7. Tactical Aircraft IFR Departure Flight Tracks to the East



Figure A-8. Tactical Aircraft Arrival Flight Tracks Landing West



Figure A-9. Tactical Aircraft VFR Departure Flight Tracks to the West



Figure A-10. Tactical Aircraft IFR Departure Flight Tracks to the West



Figure A-11. Helicopter Flight Tracks

					Percent	Percent
Category	ID	<b>Operation</b> Type	Track ID	Track Description	0700-	2200-
					2200	0700
Cargo	1	Departure	12D01	Davis Monthan Three	100.00%	100.00%
	2		30D01	Davis Monthan Three	100.00%	100.00%
	3	Arrival	12A03A	TACAN/Visual Straight-in	90.00%	90.00%
	4		12A03B	Straight-in (Overhead Break)	10.00%	10.00%
	5		30A03A	Visual Straight-in	20.00%	20.00%
	6		30A04A	TACAN	70.00%	70.00%
	7		30A04C	Straight-in (Overhead Break)	10.00%	10.00%
Tactical	8	VFR Departure to the East	12D02	Vail 1 VFR Departure	0.00%	0.00%
	9		12D04	Reddy 1 VFR Departure	2.50%	2.50%
	10		12D05	Tubac 1 VFR Departure	2.50%	2.50%
	11		12D07	Kitt 1 VFR Departure	70.00%	70.00%
	12	IFR Departure to the East	12D01A	Tombstone East/West IFR Departure	15.00%	15.00%
	13		12D02A	Sells 1/Gila Bend 1 IFR Departure	5.00%	5.00%
	14		12D03A	Ruby 1 IFR Departure	2.50%	2.50%
	15		12D04A	Jackal Low 1/Outjack IFR Departure	2.50%	2.50%
	16	VFR Departure to the West	30D04	Reddy 1 VFR Departure	2.50%	2.50%
	17		30D05	Tubac 1 VFR Departure	2.50%	2.50%
	18		30D07	Kitt 1 VFR Departure	70.00%	70.00%
	19	IFR Departure to the West	30D01A	Tombstone East/West IFR Departure	15.00%	15.00%
	20		30D02A	Sells 1/Gila Bend 1 IFR Departure	5.00%	5.00%
	21		30D03A	Ruby 1 IFR Departure	2.50%	2.50%
	22		30D04A	Jackal Low 1/Outjack IFR Departure	2.50%	2.50%
	23	Arrival Landing East	12A01A	Davez Five VFR Recovery (Overhead Break)	75.00%	75.00%
	24		12A06	La Cholla VFR Recovery Procedure (Overhead Break)	4.00%	4.00%
	25		12A08	Green Valley VFR Recovery (Overhead Break)	8.00%	8.00%
	26		12A03A	Straight-in (TACAN, etc.)	10.00%	10.00%
	27		12A04	Hung Ordnance	3.00%	3.00%
	28	Arrival Landing West	30A01A	Davez Five VFR Recovery (Overhead Break)	89.00%	89.00%
	29		30A07	La Cholla VFR Recovery Procedure (Overhead Break)	0.00%	0.00%
	30		30A08	Green Valley VFR Recovery (Overhead Break)	8.00%	8.00%
	31		30A03A	Straight-in (ILS, etc.)	0.00%	0.00%
	32		30A05	Hung Ordnance	3.00%	3.00%
Helicopter	33	Departure	09PD01	Via Gulf Link Road to Northeast	25.00%	25.00%
	34		09PD02	Via Gulf Link Road to Southeast	75.00%	75.00%
	35		27PD01	To Sentinel Peak "A-Mountain"	100.00%	100.00%
	36	Arrival	09PA01	From Sentinel Peak "A-Mountain"	100.00%	100.00%
	37		27PA01	Via Gulf Link Road to Northeast	25.00%	25.00%
	38		27PA02	Via Gulf Link Road to Southeast	75.00%	75.00%

#### Table A-1. Flight Track Utilization

## **Davis Monthan AFB - ALTERNATIVE 1**

# ATTACHMENT B.1 - F-16C Flight Profile Maps

11:50 AM Sunday, June 15, 2014 BaseOps 7.357









## **Davis Monthan AFB - ALTERNATIVE 1**

# ATTACHMENT B.2 - A-10A Flight Profile Maps

11:51 AM Sunday, June 15, 2014 BaseOps 7.357







## **Davis Monthan AFB - ALTERNATIVE 1**

## ATTACHMENT B.3 - UH-60A Flight Profile Maps

11:51 AM Sunday, June 15, 2014 BaseOps 7.357





## **Davis Monthan AFB - NO ACTION**

# ATTACHMENT B.4 - PUMA SA330J Flight Profile Maps

11:55 AM Sunday, June 15, 2014 BaseOps 7.357




## ATTACHMENT B.5 - AV-8B Flight Profile Maps (AV-8B and GR-7/9 Harrier)







# ATTACHMENT B.6 - F-22 Flight Profile Maps









# ATTACHMENT B.7 - F-15A Flight Profile Maps









# ATTACHMENT B.8 - C130H&N&P Flight Profile Maps







# ATTACHMENT B.9 - F/A-18E/F Flight Profile Maps








## **Davis Monthan AFB - ALTERNATIVE 1**

## ATTACHMENT B.10 - MV-22 Flight Profile Maps

11:53 AM Sunday, June 15, 2014 BaseOps 7.357

Flight Profile Maps







## **Davis Monthan AFB - ALTERNATIVE 1**

## ATTACHMENT B.11 - TORNADO Flight Profile Maps

11:53 AM Sunday, June 15, 2014 BaseOps 7.357

Flight Profile Maps





