

**FAR Part 150 Study  
Noise Compatibility Program Checklist - Part II**

**Airport Name:** Buffalo Niagara International Airport

**Reviewer:**

**Yes/No/  
NA**

**Reference/Comments**

**I. IDENTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION OF PROGRAM:**

- A. Submission is properly identified
  - 1. FAR Part 150 NCP?
  - 2. NEM and NCP together?
  - 3. Program revision?
- B. Airport and airport operator's name identified?
- C. NCP transmitted by airport operator cover letter:

**II. CONSULTATION: [150.23]**

- A. Documentation includes narrative of public participation and consultation process?
- B. Identification of consulted parties:
  - 1. All parties in 150.23 (c) consulted?
  - 2. Public and planning agencies identified?
  - 3. Agencies in 2. Above, correspond to those indicated on the NEM?
- C. Satisfies 150.23 (d) requirements:
  - 1. Documentation shows active and direct participation of parties in B, above.
  - 2. Active and direct participation of general public.
  - 3. Participation was prior to and during development of NCP and prior to submittal to FAA.
  - 4. Indicates adequate opportunities afforded to submit views, data, etc.
- D. Evidence included of notice and opportunity for a public hearing on NCP.
- E. Documentation of comments:
  - 1. Includes summary of public hearing comments, if hearing was held.
  - 2. Includes operator's responses/disposition of written and verbal comments.
- F. Informal agreement received FAA on flight procedures.

- A. Inclusion of NEMs and supporting documentation:
  - 1. Map documentation either included or incorporated by reference.
  - 2. Maps previously found in compliance by FAA.
  - 3. Compliance determination still valid.
  - 4. Does 180-day period have to wait for map compliance finding?
- B. Revised NEMs submitted with program: (Review using NEM checklist if map revisions included in NCP submittal.)
  - 1. Revised NEMs included with program.
  - 2. Has airport operator requested FAA to make a determination on the NEM(s) when NCP approval is made?
- C. If program analysis uses noise modeling:
  - 1. INM, HNM, or FAA-approved equivalent?
- D. Existing condition and 5-year maps clearly identified as the official NEMs.

**FAR Part 150 Study (continued)  
Noise Compatibility Program Checklist- Part II**

	Yes/No/ NA	Reference/Comments
<b>IV. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES: [B150.7, 150.23(e)]</b>		
A. At a minimum, are the alternatives below considered?		
1. Land acquisition and interests therein, including air rights, easements, and development rights.		
2. Barriers, acoustical shielding, public building soundproofing.		
3. Preferential runway system.		
4. Flight procedures		
5. Restrictions on type/class of aircraft (at least one restriction below must be checked).		
a. Deny use based on Federal standards		
b. Capacity limits based on noisiness		
c. Noise abatement takeoff/approach procedures		
d. Landing fees based on noise or time of day		
e. Nighttime restrictions		
f. Other actions with beneficial impact		
g. Other FAA recommendations		
B. Responsible implementing authority identified for each considered alternative.		
C. Analysis of alternative measures:		
1. Measures clearly described		
2. Measures adequately analyzed		
3. Adequate reasoning for rejecting alternative		
D. Other actions recommended by the FAA: Should other actions be added? (List separately or on back of this form actions and discussions with airport operator to have them included prior to the start of the 180-day cycle).		
<b>V. ALTERNATIVES RECOMMENDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION: [150.23(e), B150.7(c); 150.35(b), B150.5]</b>		
A. Document clearly indicates:		
1. Alternatives recommended for implementation.		
2. Final recommendations are airport operator's, not those of consultant or third party.		
B. Do all program recommendations:		
1. Relate directly or indirectly to reduction of noise and incompatible land uses.		
2. Contain description of contribution to overall effectiveness of program.		
3. Noise/land use benefits quantified to extent possible.		
4. Include actual/anticipated effect on reducing noise exposure within incompatible area shown on NEM.		
5. Effects based on relevant and reasonable expressed assumptions.		
6. Have adequate supporting data to support its contribution to noise/land use compatibility?		

**FAR Part 150 Study (continued)**  
**Noise Compatibility Program Checklist- Part II**

	Yes/No/ NA	Reference/Comments
C. Analysis appears to support program standards set for the in 150.35(b) and B150.5.		
D. When use restrictions are recommended:		
1. Are alternatives with potentially significant noise/compatible land use benefits thoroughly analyzed so appropriate comparisons and conclusions can be made?		
2. Use restriction coordinated with APP-600 prior to making determination on start of 180-days.		
E. Do the following also meet Part 150 analytical standards?		
1. Formal recommendations which continue existing practices.		
2. New recommendations or changes proposed at end of Part 150 process.		
F. Documentation indicates how recommendations may change previously adopted plans.		
G. Documentation also:		
1. Identifies agencies which are responsible for implementing each recommendation.		
2. Indicates whether those agencies have agreed to implement.		
3. Indicates essential government actions necessary to implement recommendations.		
H. Timeframe:		
1. Includes agreed-upon schedule to implement alternatives.		
2. Indicates period covered by the program.		
I. Funding/Costs:		
1. Includes costs to implement alternatives.		
2. Includes anticipated funding sources.		
<b>VI. PROGRAM REVISION:</b> [150.23(e) (9)] Supporting documentation includes provision for revision?		

Issued in Washington, APP-600, March 1989.