

APPENDIX E

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

E.1 INTRODUCTION

14 CFR § 150.21 (b) states, “The airport operator shall certify that it has afforded interested persons adequate opportunity to submit their views, data, and comments concerning the correctness and adequacy of the draft noise exposure map and descriptions of forecast aircraft operations. Each map and revised map must be accompanied by documentation describing the consultation accomplished under this paragraph and the opportunities afforded the public to review and comment during the development of the map. One copy of all written comments received during consultation shall also be filed with the Regional Airports Division Manager.”

This appendix includes comments received throughout the development of the Noise Exposure Maps. Public comments include written comments received by mail and in-person, verbal comments made during the Ad Hoc Committee meetings, verbal comments recorded on the airport’s noise hotline, and comments sent by electronic mail (email).

Section E.2 of this appendix contains comments that were received during the development of the NEMs (October 1, 2020, through September 18, 2022). All comments (and responses) were made during Ad Hoc Committee meetings and are summarized in **Section E.2**.

Section E.3 of this appendix contains comments that were received during the public review period for the Draft NEM Update Report (September 19 - October 20, 2022). Comments (and responses) made during the Ad Hoc Committee meeting on October 4, 2022 are summarized in **Section E.3**. A list of all parties that commented during the public review period is included in **Section E.3**.

E.2 COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS RECEIVED DURING DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEMs

All comments and questions received during the development of the NEMs were received during Ad Hoc Committee meetings. They are summarized below, along with responses as appropriate.

E.2.1 October 6, 2020, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Robert Gold asked what the process would be and whether it would be a public process. Pam Meck asked if information would be posted on the Ad Hoc Committee website. It was explained that progress reports would be provided to the committee at each meeting and information that has been approved by the FAA would be posted on the website. Interim and/or deliberative information would not be posted.

Peter Horton commented that noise contours representing 2020 would be very narrow because of the reduced number of operations during the COVID-19 pandemic. It was explained that this will be discussed with the FAA.

E.2.2 December 1, 2020, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

A very preliminary noise contour was presented that roughly represented operations for 2020. Peter Horton commented that these contours representing 2020 do not serve the public in illustrating the impact they

experience. Michael Sullivan commented that these contours are inaccurate, and that sentiment was shared by many others in attendance. A lengthy discussion followed, including questions regarding field noise measurements, flight tracks, and number of operations. It was explained that the NEM Update was being prepared in accordance with all FAA guidelines and requirements and would be as accurate as possible.

E.2.3 March 2, 2021, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

David Rooney asked why the daytime period in the formula for DNL went all the way until 10 p.m., rather than something like 6 p.m. Robert Gold asked if there was any opportunity to change the formula, i.e., the definition of the daytime period; is it defined by the FAA; has the formula ever been changed; and is the same standard applied to all airports regardless of size. It was explained that this is how the metric is defined; the FAA requires that this be used for development of airport noise contours; and it is applied to all airports regardless of size. It was further explained that a metric called CNEL is used in California and includes an evening period in addition to daytime and nighttime. David Rooney asked if the DNL 65 was the FAA's limit for Key West, i.e., if the noise level is higher is mitigation required? It was explained that noise levels of DNL 65 dB and above are considered noncompatible for residential and other noise-sensitive land uses and areas exposed to DNL 65 dB and above are considered eligible for noise mitigation by the FAA.

David Rooney asked if any aircraft types are forbidden from using EYW because of their noise level. It was explained that as long as aircraft meet the FAA's noise standards the airport has very little control over which aircraft types can use the airport.

E.2.4 June 1, 2021, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Bud Griner commented that the A319s (in particular) lock their brakes, spool up, and then release their brakes to take off. Andrea Haynes commented that this was referred to as a static takeoff. Regarding the use of the full runway length for departures on Runway 09, Bud Griner commented that some of the EMB170s and EMB175s and all Silver departures are asking (more and more frequently) to back-taxi to use the extra 271 feet or runway length. Peter Horton asked if the extra runway can be used for landing, or just takeoff. It was explained that it was only available for takeoff on Runway 09.

Regarding flight track development, Bud Griner asked if the modeled tracks were developed visually or otherwise. It was explained that the tracks can be drawn "by hand" and digitized, or they can be developed in GIS. Peter Horton asked about the source of the flight tracks. It was explained that these tracks came from FlightRadar24 collected using an ADS-B receiver located on the airport. Peter Horton asked about data from the Navy (like we requested in the past). It was explained that it was very difficult to obtain any data from the Navy, and once it was finally obtained, it turned out to be unusable. It was further explained that twelve months of FlightRadar24 data would be used to make the final determination of the flight tracks and utilization. Marlene Durazo asked if this could be compared to the same period in 2019. It was explained that data from 2019 was not available to the study team.

E.2.5 October 5, 2021, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Nick Pontecorvo commented that aircraft are over the water at the point of the 2,000-ft hold down on departure.

E.2.6 December 7, 2021, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Peter Horton questioned why nearly 20,000 operations seemed to be missing from the FR24 data. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding possible reasons for this, what other available data sources might be used to supplement the analysis, and how the proportionality constant was being used to account for the missing operations. Peter Horton expressed concern that the public will not trust the data being used to develop the contours. It was explained that the data would be reviewed, and additional sources of data would be investigated.

E.2.7 March 1, 2022, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Kim Ledford commented that the air traffic controllers at NAS KW handle aircraft between 9:00 pm (when the EYW ATCT closes) and 10:00 pm, and Miami Center handles aircraft between 10:00 pm (when the NAS KW ATCT closes) and 7:00 am (when the EYW ATCT opens). She commented further that OPSNET includes nighttime IFR operations.

Kim Ledford commented regarding helicopters operated by the military. She also commented that Delta operates CRJ aircraft for their final arrival, and those operations are not reflected in the presentation. Erick D'Leon agreed that was true. It was explained that this apparent discrepancy would be investigated.

E.2.8 June 7, 2022, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

James Seadler questioned the use of operations from FY'21 for the existing condition and asked if a comparison had been made to more recent operations. It was explained that the study had to "take a snapshot in time" to prepare the noise contours. It was further explained there was significant discussion regarding the use of pre-pandemic operations vs operations during the pandemic. Ultimately it was decided that operations from FY'21 would be the best for the existing condition.

E.3 COMMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

Comments and questions were received during the Ad Hoc Committee meeting on October 4, 2022. They are summarized below, along with responses as appropriate.

James Seadler commented that the presentation regarding comparison of operations and fleet mix for FY'21 and August 1, 2021 through July 31, 2022 (which was the most recent available data from the FAA) was appreciated. It was interesting to see that there were less operations during the most recent twelve month.

Peter Horton asked if the December 7, 2022 BOCC meeting would be held in Key West. It was explained that this meeting would be held in Key Largo. He questioned whether this would be appropriate since anyone who wanted to attend would have to drive all the way to Key Largo. It was explained that the November BOCC meeting would be held in Key West.

In addition to comments and questions received during the Ad Hoc Committee meeting on October 4, 2022, one written comment was received during the comment period for the Draft NEM Update Report (September 19 - October 20, 2022). A copy of this written comment is included below.



Key West International Airport

DRAFT NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION PUBLIC REVIEW - COMMENT FORM

Please use the space below to provide your comments regarding the assumptions used in the development of the Noise Exposure Maps (NEMs) for Key West International Airport. Your comments will be reviewed and considered in the Final NEM Report submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Thank you for your interest and participation.

Please note: All comments may be made publicly available.

Please scan and email this form to deborah.murphy.lagos@gmail.com or mail it to:
Key West International Airport Administrative Office, 3491 S. Roosevelt Blvd., Key West, FL 33040.

Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. local time on Thursday, October 20, 2022.

First and Last Name: Lynn Smith
Address: 712 William St.
Email Address: lynnmarie.kw@gmail.com
Phone Number: 305-619-1980
Date: 9/30/22

I lived in Old Town, 712 William St., and the huge increase in air traffic landing directly over our homes in winter months has created extreme noise many times a day. My neighbors are suffering from this additional air traffic and noise.

Please consider spending the noise maps.
We believe we should be considered and
compensated much as the condos are closer
to the airport. After all - they were built
after the airport, our homes were built before.
The planes go right over us at a low level.
During all of the landings it's impossible
to converse in person and on the phone, or
even use our outside decks.

I hope you will give this problem serious
consideration.

Paul Smith

E.4 REFERENCES

Airport Noise Compatibility Planning, 14 C.F.R.§150 (1984). <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-I/part-150>