



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

To protect and enrich the quality of life for the people, neighborhoods and diverse communities of Fairfax County

## Airport Noise Policy Plan Amendment (2020-CW-3CP) Frequently Asked Questions

On July 28, 2020, the Board of Supervisors authorized a Comprehensive Plan amendment (2020-CW-3CP) to consider locating residential uses between the 60 and 65 DNL airport noise contours with commitments to noise mitigation measures, notification requirements, and construction techniques. The following are questions and answers received during the community outreach.

### General Questions:

#### 1. What is the Airport Noise Policy Plan Amendment?

- The Airport Noise Policy Plan Amendment was authorized by the Board of Supervisors (Board) on July 28, 2020. The authorization directed Staff to consider an amendment for the relevant Land Use and Environment Elements of the Policy Plan and certain portions of the Area III section of the Plan to allow for the consideration of residential uses between 60-to-65 DNL airport noise contours with appropriate commitments to noise mitigation measures, notification requirements, and construction techniques. Any revised Policy Plan guidance would apply countywide.
- The area impacted by the proposed Plan amendment are depicted on these [maps](#).

#### 2. Why should I care about this study?

- If adopted, the new proposed Plan language would serve as the basis for evaluating future development proposals in the impacted area.

#### 3. How do I get involved?

- Visit the Plan Amendment webpage for past meeting materials and recordings ([Plan Amendment 2020-CW-3CP | Planning Development \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)).
- Subscribe to the Plan Amendment email listserv ([E-Mail Subscriptions \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#))
- Visit Fairfax County's Land Use Planning Facebook page ([Fairfax County Land Use Planning | Facebook](#)).
- Attend upcoming meetings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors:
  - Planning Commission Public Hearing: May 18, 2022 ([Meeting Calendar | Planning Commission \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)).
  - Board of Supervisors Public Hearing: June 28, 2022 ([2022 Board of Supervisors Meetings and Committee Meetings | Board Of Supervisors \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)).



4. [What is the Comprehensive Plan?](#)

- The Comprehensive Plan (the Plan) is required by state law to be used as a guide to decision-making about the natural and built environment by the county's Board and others, including the Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals. It is also a guide for county staff and the public to use in the planning process. The Comprehensive Plan consists of the Policy Plan, four Area Plan volumes, and a Plan Map. The Policy Plan volume includes general countywide policy on land use, transportation, housing, the environment, heritage resources, economic development, and public facilities, including public parks, recreation, and trails. The Area Plans contain detailed long-range planning recommendations organized by geographic areas of the county. The Plan recommends how land should be used, but not when development will occur. The Plan Map illustrates the recommended land use but must be used with the associated Plan text to fully understand what is planned.

5. Land Unit J of the Dulles Suburban Center was previously replanned to permit residential uses in the 60-65 airport noise contours. Could other noisy areas of the County be replanned in the same way if this Plan Amendment is adopted since this is a Countywide Plan amendment?

- This Plan amendment is only applicable to a portion of Area III, which covers the Western portion of the County, in the vicinity of Dulles Airport as this is the only place in the County with adopted 60-65 DNL airport noise contours. The County has not adopted airport noise contours associated with Davison Army Airfield at Fort Belvoir and the noise contours associated with National Airport do not extend into Fairfax County.
- Additionally, if County policy is changed to permit consideration of new residential uses within the 60-65 DNL noise contours, prior to redevelopment, future site-specific Plan amendments would be needed to consider residential uses within areas that are not currently planned to permit new residential uses. During that process, as well as the subsequent entitlement (rezoning) process, proposals for residential uses would need to address how noise impacts would be adequately mitigated and would need to ensure that future residents are fully aware of airport operations.

6. Why did the County not adopt the MWAA 2019 noise contours? Was cost a consideration?

- In 2019, the Board retained an independent consultant (Johnson Aviation) to review the MWAA report ([Aircraft Noise Contour Map Update \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)), including the methodology used to develop the MWAA 2019 contours, and to provide input related to the consideration of new residential uses within the 60-65 DNL contours ([Microsoft](#)

[Word - 031520 Fairfax County-Dulles Aircraft Noise Peer Review-Johnson Aviation](#)).

This information, along with a staff presentation, were presented at a July 21, 2020, Board Land Use Policy Committee meeting ([Board of Supervisors Land Use Policy Committee Meeting: July 21, 2020 | Board Of Supervisors \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)). At that meeting, the Board discussion centered around the following:

- Most jurisdictions surrounding other international airports permit residential uses in the 60-65 DNL contours and focus on noise abatement measures for noise-sensitive uses located within those 60-65 DNL contours;
- The MWAA contours are based on a projected full operational capacity not a demand analysis;
- The variables that went into the creation of these contours may likely change over time;
- Such long-term projections might not predict as yet unknown technological, operational, economic, and other unknown variables, and may be inaccurate over time.
- Cost to the County of adopting the new contours was not discussed.
- Both Johnson Aviation and staff recommended that the Board consider a policy change to allow consideration of new residential uses between the 60 and 65 DNL aircraft noise contours, as there is already existing residential development between the 60 and 65 DNL aircraft noise contours, and such a policy would be consistent with the County's Zoning Ordinance, Land Unit J of the Dulles Suburban Center section of the Comprehensive Plan, and other jurisdictions near international airports.

7. Do the maps in staff's presentations reflect the Board adopted contours from 1993 or the updated MWAA noise contours?

- Yes. The maps in staff's Issues Papers from July 2020 ([Washington Dulles International Airport \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)), November 2021 ([Comprehensive Plan Amendment \(2020-CW-3CP - Airport Noise Policy\) Issues Paper \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)), presentations and staff report reflect the Board-adopted 1993 noise contours.

8. How much area within the Board-adopted 60-to-65 DNL airport noise contours will this Plan Amendment impact? Does this impact new development only?

- There are approximately 3,117 acres of land within the 60-to-65 DNL airport noise contours.
- Of this, approximately 85% is already developed to include approximately 22% residential uses and 78% non-residential uses. Almost all the existing residential uses

were entitled and/or constructed prior to the adoption of the initial Airport Noise Impact Overlay District in 1978.

- Excluding areas that are developed; contain parks, recreation, public facilities; stable residential development; recently approved entitlements; and areas previously planned to permit new residential uses within the Board-adopted 60-to-65 DNL airport noise contours (Land Unit J of the Dulles Suburban Center), approximately 237 acres (or 8% of the total acreage within the contours) may be available for redevelopment subject to future site-specific Comprehensive plan amendments. However, some of this acreage potentially available for redevelopment already has a current Plan recommendation for residential use and some of this acreage may not be suitable for residential use for other reasons. While the impacts of this Plan amendment are minimal, adoption of this Plan amendment would now align the Comprehensive Plan with the Zoning Ordinance and other jurisdictions that permit residential in the 60-65 DNL noise contours.
- The new Plan guidance, if adopted, will apply to new development only.

9. Is this Plan Amendment about average or peak noise?

- This Plan Amendment is about average noise. The Environment element of the Policy Plan and Zoning Ordinance measures transportation noise impacts in terms of the day-night average sound level (DNL). This is also the standard noise metric used for FAA studies of aviation noise exposure and by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the Department of Defense.

10. How will the noise modeling ensure the proposed building will be properly mitigated? Did the previous applications in Land Unit J mitigate aircraft noise?

- As part of the considerations reviewed with this Plan Amendment, staff proposes that pre-construction noise modeling for building components be conducted, and documentation submitted to the County for review and approval prior to building permit issuance. Noise modeling is a well-established practice and is a proactive measure to ensure that aircraft noise will be properly mitigated by building materials. Noise studies are completed by acoustical engineers prior to construction to both determine the level of noise to be mitigated and to model noise attenuation for buildings and from building materials. The level of background noise can be determined both through field studies and, depending on the location of the proposed development, using existing, noise monitoring stations used by MWAA to record noise levels for all aircraft operating into and out of Dulles Airport. While noise monitoring

stations provide a wealth of information, they are limited in number and may not be located near a proposed development. On the other hand, field studies, which can be performed at any location, would not have the ability to differentiate between aircraft and other community noise, such as vehicular noise. Aircraft operations might also be highly variable, depending on the weather and level of flight activity, such that determining aircraft noise levels becomes challenging. However, both noise modeling and noise studies provide information that can be used to assess aircraft noise impacts at a particular location. Once background noise levels are determined, acoustical models can be used to explore building components with various Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings to determine how to best achieve a desired noise attenuation. In addition to the selection of appropriately rated building materials, floor plans can be modified within these models to reduce occupant exposure to aircraft noise.

- Yes, the approved Land Unit J entitlement applications included mitigations for aircraft noise. Both the previously adopted Land Unit J Plan language and staff's proposed Plan language for this amendment recommend commitments for construction standards that mitigate interior noise levels to not exceed 45 dBA. The proffers associated with the recent Land Unit J applications are not all identical. Each reflects the individual circumstances of the proposed development, including road and/or aircraft noise impacts. Each proffer was the result of successive discussions between staff and applicants for an individual project.

11. Related to noise mitigation construction techniques, there is a difference between what is certified and what is built. How will County staff verify compliance? What will be done along the way during construction to ensure the noise will be mitigated?

- In order to ensure that building components with the appropriate STC ratings are installed within a particular building, staff is recommending Plan language that encourage builders to submit verification letters, specification sheets, or testing reports at time of building plan review that demonstrate that the building components meet the modeled STC ratings. Post-construction noise studies can also be used, particularly for interior living spaces, to determine whether noise has been adequately attenuated to 45 dBA for interior living spaces. Recent post construction noise studies associated with Land Unit J cases have demonstrated the buildings meet the required attenuation.

12. Has the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA) received any noise complaints?

- Yes. The MWAA Noise Information Office accepts and analyzes aircraft noise complaints associated with airplanes operating in and out of Reagan National (DCA) and Dulles International (IAD) airports. The complaint dashboard can be found here: [flydulles.com](https://flydulles.com) - [IAD Dulles Int'l - Complaint Dashboard](#). Recent noise complaints are primarily repetitive claims by a few individuals.

13. How will the proposed Avigation Easement and Disclosures be used and when will they be established? Will MWAA agree to the Avigation Easements?

- Avigation easements are legal recorded documents that run with the land and are passed on to prospective purchasers and future homeowners to make them aware of the potential impacts of aircraft operations and of the right of aircraft to overfly the property. At the time of rezoning, via a proffered commitment, the property owner would agree to record an avigation easement in the land records prior to final site plan approval. Given that avigation easements would be recorded in the land records, all successive purchasers would be made aware of an easement and its terms.
- MWAA has developed an Avigation Easement template and has requested local jurisdictions, including Fairfax County, to utilize this template. County staff and MWAA have agreed upon a standard Avigation Easement template.
- Commitments are expected to be provided by a property owner at the time of rezoning to ensure that prospective purchasers and future residents are made aware of the presence of the airport and potential aircraft noise impacts prior to purchasing or renting homes, and to the rights of the airport regarding its operations. Disclosures could include:
  - Marketing information such as site plans, home brochures, and standard features lists that are located in sales and leasing offices and other places could note that the property is impacted by noise from overflying aircraft.
  - Statements that disclose the presence of the airport and potential associated impacts, as well as a map of Dulles Airport, the DNL 60 and DNL 65 dBA noise contour lines, and the general locations of the residential units and private active recreation spaces, could be included in promotional and marketing materials, in leasing and purchase agreements for residential and other noise-sensitive uses, and could be recorded in the land records. Notice of such statements could be made to all initial and subsequent lessors and purchasers.

- Recent rezoning applications for residential uses within Land Unit J of the Dulles Suburban Center have included proffered commitments related to airport noise disclosures and aviation easements.

14. What are real estate agents supposed to say for houses that are in this area? (Related to noise impacts)

- Real estate agents can direct prospective purchasers to the following:
  - Marketing information such as site plans, home brochures, and standard features lists that are located in sales and leasing offices that note that the property is impacted by noise from overflying aircraft.
  - Contact the Department of Planning and Development, Planning Division, Environment and Development Review Branch at 703-324-1380 for information regarding noise contours.

15. With respect to the discussion of mitigation techniques, how will outdoor spaces and rooftop terraces be mitigated?

- Current Plan guidance states that new development should not expose people to noise in excess of DNL 65 dBA in the outdoor recreation areas of homes; no changes to this guidance are proposed.

16. The staff presentation is focused on airplane noise, but will the Board of Supervisors (BOS) consider traffic noise, especially that related to loud mufflers and exhaust?

- The General Assembly introduced legislation in the 2022 session regarding this issue. This bill was signed into law by the Governor with an effective date of July 1, 2022. The conference report can be found here: <https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?221+ful+HB632ER+pdf>. The general legislative history of the situation can also be found on page 91 of the Board's Final Legislative Report, which can be found here: <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/legislation/sites/legislation/files/assets/documents/pdf/2022/2022-ga-final-report.pdf>.

17. How will the County work with MWA on nighttime activities?

- This recommendation from Johnson Aviation was discussed at the Board's July 21, 2020, Land Use Policy Committee meeting. Modifying published in-flight approach and departure procedures is a multi-year process controlled by the FAA. However, preferential runway use and restricted hours of operation are seen as means for airport authorities to minimize or preclude noise impacts to surrounding areas. Any such

limitations would need to be coordinated with the FAA, MWAA, and local communities.

18. What are the adverse health effects from prolonged exposure to airport noise?

- Aviation noise health effects and air quality impacts are part of the required NEPA environmental analysis required of MWAA when proposing projects at Dulles. MWAA and the FAA are the responsible parties for ensuring that the Airport does not create significant environmental effects. If it does, MWAA and the FAA mitigate those documented effects. These effects have adopted federal thresholds of significance that can be measured and reported. The FAA uses DNL 65 dBA as the threshold of “significant” aircraft noise exposure and to support a variety of policy objectives, including the assessment, identification, and mitigation of noncompatible land uses in the vicinity of civil airports, and the evaluation of environmental consequences that would occur if changes to aircraft operations or airfield infrastructure near an airport were implemented.
- The proposed plan amendment is consistent with the FAA guidance.

19. Has Loudoun County adopted the 2019 MWAA contours?

- Loudoun County proposes three coordinated actions to update the maps, policies, and zoning text related to airport noise. A Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPAM-2021-0001) proposes to amend the Airport Noise Impact Area (ANIA) map of the Loudoun County 2019 General Plan. The map provides the basis for administering the 2019 Plan policies that address airport noise impacts and for establishing the Airport Impact Overlay District (AIOD) of the Zoning Ordinance. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposes to update the ANIA map by replacing the noise contours for Dulles based on the latest projected noise contours in the 2019 Washington Dulles International Noise Contour Map Update provided by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA). Additional amendments to associated content and policy statements are also proposed as part of the Amendment. The Zoning Map Amendment (ZMAP-2021-0011) and the Zoning Ordinance Amendment (ZOAM-2021-0002) propose corresponding Zoning Ordinance updates to the map of the overlay district and to the zoning regulation text, respectively, to maintain consistency with the CPAM. The current airport noise contours were established based on noise studies for Dulles and the Leesburg Executive Airport, published in 1993 and 1985, respectively.
- Residential uses are allowed in Loudoun County within the 60-65 Ldn area, in accordance with the Airport Impact Overlay District, provided that requirements related to disclosure, acoustical treatments, and aviation easements are met.



- Loudoun County anticipates a public hearing on these items in June 2022. More information can be found here: [Airport Impact Overlay District CPAM | Loudoun County, VA - Official Website](#)

20. Has Fairfax County spoken to Loudoun County regarding Loudoun County permitting development in the 60-65 dBA noise contours? Has Loudoun County received any noise complaints?

- Fairfax County staff met with Loudoun County staff to discuss the pending Plan amendments related to airport noise that are being processed in both jurisdictions.
- Loudoun County collects information regarding airport noise complaints related to the Leesburg Executive Airport. The Leesburg Executive Airport does not control or regulate aircraft in flight and does not control flight paths, however they do maintain records of complaints, investigate atypical noise events, and encourage the pilot community to fly friendly over the area. Any complaints regarding Dulles International Airport are filed directly with MWAA as previously noted.

21. Will the proposed Plan Amendment, and any subsequent noise complaints, impact the economic viability of Dulles Airport?

- No. There are approximately 3,117 acres of land within the 60-to-65 DNL airport noise contours, of which 85% is already developed with stable uses and is unlikely to be redeveloped. The areas remaining that could be impacted by this Plan Amendment is a very small percentage of the total acreage and consideration of new residential use would need to be reviewed as part of separate Plan amendment considerations, if authorized for study by the Board.
- Further, there is already residential development in this area and it has not affected the airport or any airline's decision about the airport. Airports continue to grow and operations continue to increase as demand keeps up with the economic activity of the localities they serve. By the FAA's own analysis, the number of people affected by airport noise over the last 20 years has declined as a result of reduced noise at the source, aircraft

22. What type of community outreach has staff conducted? (See “Community Engagement” block: [Plan Amendment 2020-CW-3CP | Planning Development \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)).

- A total of twenty-three (23) outreach meetings were held: Nine (9) meetings were held following authorization and through March 2021 and twelve (12) outreach meetings were held, beginning in January 2022.
- Staff has conducted outreach to the following groups since January 2022:
  - Airports Advisory Committee – January 11, 2022, March 8, 2022, and April 12, 2022
  - Acoustical Engineers Working Group – January 18, 2022
  - Northern Virginia Building Industry Association (NVBIA)/National Association for Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP) – January 20, 2022
  - Sully District Council of Citizens - January 26, 2022
  - Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority – January 27, 2022
  - Fairfax Federation – January 27, 2022 (Overview provided by a member due to staff conflict with Open House)
  - Open Houses – January 27 & 29, 2022 (Information sent to all District Supervisors to include in their newsletters)
  - Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Transportation Committee – February 7, 2022
  - Land Use Attorneys Working Group – February 9, 2022
  - Environmental Quality Advisory Council – February 9, 2022
  - Planning Commission Environmental and Land Use Joint Committee – February 10 & March 17, 2022
  - Braddock Land Use Committee – February 15, 2022
  - McLean Citizens Association – February 22, 2022
  - Loudoun County – February 28, 2022
  - Board of Supervisors Land Use Policy Committee – March 15, 2022

23. Did staff provide the same presentation to all groups during the community outreach process? Can staff share/post the presentation along with a Question and Answer (Q&A) document?

- Yes, the same presentation was provided to all groups.
- The link to the presentation can be found here under Past Meetings and Materials: [Plan Amendment 2020-CW-3CP | Planning Development \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](#)

**Compiled List of Questions and Comments Received During Community Outreach Meetings (Addressed in the FAQ Document)**

Facebook

1. The contours being uses are the old contours; the Board of Supervisors (BOS) refuses to adopt the new 2019 MWAA contours at the urging of MWAA, FAA and other experts. This Plan Amendment is a setback for all who want to live and currently live in Fairfax County.

Airports Advisory Committee January 11, 2022

1. When will the need for Avigation Easements and Disclosures be determined? Loudoun does this before people move in.
2. Will the Airports Advisory Committee receive updates on how the Amendment is progressing and public comments?
3. Has there been any organized opposition/criticism to the Plan Amendment? Any individuals? What are MWAA's concerns?

Acoustical Engineer Working Group January 18, 2022

1. Staff indicates that outdoor areas can be maintained below 65 dBA with a dome; what does this mean?
2. The County is not adopting the 2019 MWAA contours, correct? How long will that hold?
3. Is this Plan Amendment about average or peak noise?

NVBIA/NAIOP January 20, 2022

1. What is the community outreach plan?
2. The avigation easements may be difficult to get MWAA to agree to.

Sully District Council of Citizens January 26, 2022

1. This was a good presentation at an appropriate level of detail. The Sully Council has had continuing questions on the process Fairfax has followed regarding adoption of new noise contours. The 1997 contours are based on 1993 data provided by MWAA. MWAA provided 2019 contours which the County is not adopting, and it has been a long time since the contours were updated. What justification did the Board of Supervisors (BOS) use to not accept the current contours? Not adopting the current contours and will lead to issues.
2. Are the maps in staff's presentation all using the contours from 30 years ago, rather than the updated MWAA noise contours?

3. Is the Board vote to "work with MWAA on nighttime activities" a request by the BOS to have the airport scale back the nighttime flights, or some other reductions of airport operations at night?
4. With respect to the discussion of mitigation techniques, is there nothing that can be mitigated for the rooftop terraces? Are they going to be unmitigated?
5. Again with respect to the noise mitigation techniques, are the outdoor recreation areas and tot lots also unmitigated?
6. Has staff ruled out the possibility of adverse health effects from prolonged exposure to airport noise?
7. If the updated noise contours are "not part of the conversation" [sic] why are we even having this conversation? If the maps and the plan are going to be using the outdated data, instead of the best and most accurate scientific data available, who cares what the plan says? This defies common sense and is an insult to the citizens. Staff is doing "outreach" but is forbidden to have a "conversation" about the most important scientific issue? What kind of policy is that?
8. When they ("BOS") say "work with" MWAA on that, are they allowing meetings face to face with MWAA including a presentation on the noise contours? Or is that also not part of the conversation?
9. Relaxing the plan guidance to allow additional residential between 60-65 dBA without additional information about adverse health effects is premature.
10. Staff is caught in a very difficult position, trying to get the policy right, with a professional recommendation while maneuvering through the political distortions and gymnastics, the anti-science policy nonsense ignoring the best data, so that certain sites can get new residential approved. If staff is sincere about having a frank conversation with the citizens and the stakeholders about amending the policy, it is disingenuous to have that "conversation" and yet announce that issues like the noise contours "are not part of the conversation." Of course they are, and saying they are not doesn't make it so. This is terrible policy, and the plan shouldn't change until the maps catch up with the science. All the issues have to be on the table, for a candid and thorough debate.
11. Put another way: If Land Unit J can be replanned for residential, why can't other somewhat noisy areas be replanned in the same way? Isn't everything subject to that, if the countywide policy plan changes?
12. One development over 65 has been approved already, by pretending the old noise contours are still good.
13. Our criticism of the terrible policy is not criticism of staff's efforts. Staff is following orders, and we appreciate their willingness to present, as always.
14. Neither the Airport nor the Airports Authority has ever suggested that full buildout of Dulles won't occur for ninety years. Please do not associate such a statement with Dulles. It has no basis in fact as if coming from MWAA or Dulles.

15. Staff had a good presentation on a complex issue and did a good job of distilling down the information. The County should go slow with this Amendment. National Airport is experiencing 65+ but the County is making a choice to ignore the scientific data using an FAA approved model. A line on the map doesn't suggest where people will find airport noise annoying. When the FAA changed the use of airspace around Dulles in 2017 to allow for triple simultaneous arrivals/departures in all weather conditions 24-7, this necessitated a fresh look at the 1993 contours.
16. How many of you and your families would live in a 60-65 dBA noise impact area?

Meeting with MWAA January 27, 2022

1. Is this the same presentation staff is giving to the open houses and can staff share/post the presentation along with a Q&A?
2. MWAA requests the BOS:
  - Reconsider adopting the 2019 MWAA contours;
  - Use MWAA's Avigation Easement document and not the one in the Issues Paper; and
  - Do not refer to a 90 year build out for the airport. The 2019 MWAA contours were initiated because FAA changed the use of airspace around Dulles in 2017 to allow for trip simultaneous arrivals/departures in all weather conditions 24-7; Fleet mix changed; Runway locations changed from 1993 study; Annual service volume (max operations) changed with the addition of the 5th runway; Cargo service; Other large airports use this same methodology - not just Denver; Currently undertaking a Master Planning effort to grow airport; MWAA just has one set of contours now - they have been adopted by MWAA.
3. Loudoun County is supportive of this effort. If the Board of Supervisors (BOS) wants to be consistent, then it should do what Loudoun is doing.
4. How will Fairfax County work with MWAA on nighttime operations? MWAA has concerns because FAA directs nighttime operations and community members might see MWAA as having an obligation to mitigate nighttime noise when we have no ability to do so. This should only be done to any extent MWAA is able, subject to FAA approval.

Community Open House January 27, 2022

1. The staff presentation is focused on airplane noise, but will the Board of Supervisors (BOS) consider traffic noise, especially that related to loud mufflers and exhaust?  
LESLIE CAN ANSWER ABOUT GA BILL
2. Attendee lives in the Pleasant Valley neighborhood and purchased their home 30 years ago. At the time, Dulles had four runways and the house was in the 60-65 dBA noise contours; the house is now in the 65 dBA noise contour according to the 2019 MWAA

- maps. The attendee is concerned that the BOS is not adopting the 2019 MWAA contours.
3. If Loudoun County allows development in the 60-65 dBA noise contours, has County staff reached out to Loudoun? Has Loudoun received any noise complaints?
  4. Why were the Johnson Aviation report and recommendations not discussed in the Issues Paper? Johnson Aviation recommended the BOS adopt the 2019 MWAA noise contours.
  5. What are real estate agents supposed to say for houses that are in this area? (Related to noise impacts)
  6. (Related to noise mitigation construction techniques) There is a difference between what is certified and what is built. How will County staff verify compliance? What will be done along the way during construction to ensure the noise will be mitigated?
  7. Attendee lives near the airport. Are we talking about new development only?
  8. Has MWAA received any noise complaints?
  9. Will the BOS hire another consultant to study the 2019 MWAA contours using a methodology they do approve of using?
  10. Is the BOS not adopting the new contours due to cost?
  11. Could staff's presentation include a graphic depiction of the other airports that allow residential in the 60-65 dBA noise contours?
  12. Why is staff focusing on the 65 dBA noise contour versus the 50 dBA noise contour?

#### Community Open House January 29, 2022

1. Attendee has historical experience with being a manager at Dulles and is concerned with the presentation that discusses how the County would work with MWAA for nighttime noise considerations. He is concerned that the public may only experience elevated noise levels at night after all of the development is constructed; then the only recourse is for the County to ask the airport to revise its flight patterns and/or limit flights. The County should not negatively impact Dulles' operations. MWAA completed current noise contour updates and County isn't adopting. County should not permit further residential in this area.
2. Attendee currently lives in the 60-65 dBA noise contours and noticed a reduction of airport noise during COVID-19 and that overnight cargo airline traffic is very impactful to the area. New residential areas will likely be more impacted by the new runways. How does the County really know what the impact will be if the County won't use the 2019 contours? Johnson report recommended that the MWAA contours be used by the County. "If you build residences in those flight paths then how can there possibly be any "preferential runways" for overnight heavy, loud cargo flights?"
3. County should be coordinating with FAA and MWAA and should be using the 2019 MWAA contours. FAA is in tune with what communities want to do; communities

should decide and let FAA and Airports know. See yourself in the driver's seat with FAA - don't write off comments because of FAA. Consultant ("Johnson Aviation") recommended the Board of Supervisors (BOS) accept the new contours and if they don't accept, this exercise is meaningless. The Airport is the expert and we should pay attention to our consultant recommendations. This is meaningless without accepting the new contours. County staff should write these community comments down and include them in the staff report. An example of how community comments were not captured accurately for the zMOD process. The County should follow what the FAA does for community outreach, via the Federal Register where comments are captured verbatim.

4. Attendee expressed the ongoing concerns with Arlington and National noise issues and how various County and Federal entities discuss the issues regularly. Allowing for more residential development near Dulles will create the same issue with Dulles - why would the county want to replicate that? Follow the science - it is the 2019 contours and work off that. If the County persist and puts houses here, then we really have to make sure those people are aware when they buy the house or sell it that there are airplanes up there and will be subjected to noise. The Airport does want to be a good neighbor. In the past, realtor wouldn't show houses in the peak operation time for Dulles. Now, the County and developers has been better about the disclosures - make sure includes all subsequent purchasers.
5. If you build residences in those flight paths then how can there possibly be any "preferential runways" for overnight heavy, loud cargo flights?
6. The danger here for the airport is simple - if residents complain about noise, over time this goes to the airport with requests to curtail operations and that cripples the airport. This has happened in other places and notices and avigation easements don't prohibit residents from complaining. BOS needs to be educated that this proposal is dangerous for the airport. This should be done carefully and in the way our consultant recommended. Why are we rushing this?
7. Key airlines in Dulles are for-profit companies and if the restrictions that this places on airlines become too much, airlines will be less interested in expanding at Dulles. Hubs at airports are not a guarantee, and United Airlines pulling their hub from Dulles would cause a negative financial impact to Dulles.
8. When the 2019 contours were developed by MWWA, Fairfax was part of that discussion so new contours are not a surprise.
9. Need to revise the section on National Airport to reflect the significant changes in the latest noise study just completed as they contradict the current content in the issues paper.

MVCCA Joint Land Use, Public Safety, Env Committee - February 7, 2022

1. Why are we using old data?
2. Why are we not adopting the new contours? It is suspicious that it's not being adopted. Did the developers of the new property submit 74-60s?
3. What kind of aircraft was studied? Helicopters make more noise than jets.
4. Those working on the MWAA Community Noise Working Group are trying to find ways of reducing noise to local communities from DCA. Why would the BOS vote to increase the noise exposure? Did they include environmental impact measures? Rarely do these meetings include health effects as consequences like noise, pollution.

Land Use Attorneys Working Group - February 9, 2022

1. Is staff proposing Plan language that would require placement of a sign outside the sales office or development that notes the proximity to the airport?
2. How will outdoor areas be addressed?
3. In regard to the aviation easement, will MWAA be a signatory?
4. This Amendment would not change the underlying plan recommendation or zoning correct?
5. One attorney noted they support this amendment as it better aligns federal guidance and the Zoning Ordinance. They also noted the Westfield Business Owners Association will support this amendment.
6. If in the future MWAA changes the contours and the BOS adopts the new contours - would this still be applicable?

EQAC - February 9, 2022

1. How do you mitigate the outside noise?
2. Would Fairfax need permission to enhance its building code for sound reduction?
3. Did the previous applications in Land Unit J mitigate noise?
4. Loudoun is allowing residential in the 60-65 noise contour, which sounds similar to what is proposed with this Amendment; however, Loudoun has adopted the new noise contours. How much area previously in the old 60-65 noise contours is now in the 65+ noise contours?
5. How many houses can be built in the 60-65 noise contours?

Braddock District Land Use Committee – February 15, 2022

1. Airports briefing paper was well done. BLUE should have a representative from MWAA present on this information. The growth of the airport is important and we should be careful about anything that impedes that possibility. It was requested Supervisor Walkinshaw be at any meeting with MWAA.



2. BLUE does not support residential in this area. This is a quality of life issue, could be harmful to babies and children, and we should consider the overflights not just the average noise. This is a better space for industrial and office because it can be better mitigated.
3. Why did the BOS not adopt the 2019 MWAA contours? Aircraft may be quieter but the volume has increased and the idea that we can put residential in these areas because you can stay inside or have a bubble for outdoor areas is unsustainable. Is BOS waiting for new data to come in? Due to NextGen, the FAA is being sued by people – are we setting the County up for lawsuits? There are mental health impacts from noise pollution.
4. Because residential in this area may have been ok before, it doesn't mean it's ok now. Until the BOS contracts someone to measure noise in this area, can't realistically say they are working off of current information. These areas are too noisy and we shouldn't keep allowing this.

McLean Citizens Association – February 22, 2022

1. What is the Airports Authority's position on the Plan Amendment?
2. How does this impact McLean?
3. There was a recommendation to follow up with someone from the MCA Transportation Committee since this was a more technical presentation. McLean is concerned with aircraft flying out of National and the noise impacts on McLean.
4. Are the noise contours legislatively adopted?
5. Why would the County want more residential around the airport. We don't know how the airport would grow and this just adds the potential for more residential and potential complaints and damages the financial engine of Fairfax County.
6. How many new residential units could be built if this amendment is adopted?

Airports Advisory Committee March 8, 2022

1. Is the AAC preparing a formal position on this item? The Mount Vernon Transportation Committee passed a resolution against the Plan Amendment which was shared with the AAC after several members expressed interest in receiving the information.
2. The AAC should take an active role in reviewing the Plan Amendment and developing a recommendation on it.
3. The AAC can reach out to the elected officials and County representatives if the AAC decided to not take formal action on a particular issue.
4. This action is consistent with the Land Unit J action already approved by the Board of Supervisors.

5. It was suggested that AAC members reach out to their respective Supervisors on this issue.
6. A special meeting was added to the AAC calendar to further discuss the Plan Amendment and whether the AAC should provide a response to the Plan Amendment.

Airports Advisory Committee April 12, 2022

1. There are multiple opinions on the AAC regarding the Plan Amendment that would not be adequately captured through a yes/no vote or position on the item.
2. The AAC is going to draft a position paper in April that will identify items the Board should take into consideration when reviewing this Plan Amendment.
3. The AAC discussed Land Unit J approvals, the limited scope of the amendment, repetitive noise complaints in Centreville from a few people.
4. The next regularly scheduled AAC meeting is Tuesday, May 10 where the committee will continue the follow-up discussion of this item.