PROGRAM REQUIREMENT	YES	NO	SUPPORTING PAGES/REVIEW COMMENTS
I. Submitting And Identifying The NCP:			
A. Submission is properly identified:			
1. 14 C.F.R. Part 150 NCP?			
2. NEM and NCP together?			
3. Program revision? (To what extent has it been revised?)			
B. Airport and Airport sponsor's name are identified?			
C. NCP is transmitted by airport sponsor's cover letter?			
II. Consultation (including public participation): [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?			
Public and planning agencies identified?			
3. Agencies in 2., above, correspond to those affected by the NEM			
noise contours?			
C. Satisfies 150.23(d) requirements by:			
Documentation shows active and direct participation of parties in			
B., above?			
Active and direct participation of general public and opportunity to			
submit their views, data, and comments on the formulation and adequacy of			
the NCP?			
3. Participation was prior to and during development of NCP and prior			
to submittal to FAA?			
Indicates adequate opportunity afforded to all consulted parties to			
submit views, data, etc.?			
D. Evidence is included there was notice and opportunity for a public			
hearing on the final NCP?			
E. Documentation of comments:			
I. Includes summary of public hearing comments, if hearing was			
held?			
Includes copy of all written material submitted to operator?			
Includes operator's responses/disposition of written and verbal			
comments?			
F. Is there written evidence from the appropriate office within the FAA			
that the sponsor received informal agreement to carry out proposed flight procedures?			
III. NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS: [150.23, B150.3; 150.35(f)] (This section of			
the checklist is not a substitute for the Noise Exposure Map checklist. It deals			
with maps in the context of the Noise Compatibility Program submission.)			
A. Inclusion of NEMs and supporting documentation:			
A. Inclusion of NEWs and supporting documentation.		<u> </u>	

PROGRAM REQUIREMENT	YES	NO	SUPPORTING PAGES/REVIEW COMMENTS
III. NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS: [150.23, B150.3; 150.35(f)] [CONTINUED]			
Map documentation either included or incorporated by reference?			
2. Maps previously found in compliance by FAA?			
3. FAA's compliance determination still valid?			
(a) Existing condition NEM represents conditions at the airport at			
the time of submittal of the NCP for FAA approval?			
(b) Forecast condition NEM represents conditions at the airport at			
least 5 years into the future from the date of submittal of the NCP			
to the FAA for approval?			
(c) Sponsor letter confirming elements (a) and (b), above, if date of			
submission is either different than the year of submittal of the			
previously approved NEMs or over 12 months from the date			
shown on the face of the NEM?			
(d) If (a) through (c) cannot be validated, the NEMs must be			
redone and resubmitted as per 150.21.			
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. Report the applicable findings in			
the spaces below after a full review using the NEM checklist and narrative.)			
1. Revised NEMs included with program?			
2. Has airport sponsor requested in writing that FAA make a			
determination on the NEM(s), showing NCP measures in place, when NCP approval is made?			
C. If program analysis uses noise modeling:			
1. INM, HNM, or FAA-approved equivalent?			
2. Monitoring in accordance with A150.5?			
D. One existing condition and one forecast-year map clearly identified as			
the official NEMs?			
IV. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES: [B150.7, 150.23(e)(2)]			
A. At a minimum, were the alternatives below considered, or if they were			
rejected was the reason for rejection reasonable and based on accurate			
technical information and local circumstances?			
Land acquisition and interests therein, including air rights,			
easements, and development rights?			
Barriers, acoustical shielding, public building soundproofing			
3. Preferential runway system			
4. Voluntary flight procedures			
	1		l .

PROGRAM REQUIREMENT	YES	NO	SUPPORTING PAGES/REVIEW COMMENTS
IV. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES: [B150.7, 150.23(e)(2)]		İ	
5. Restrictions described in B150.7 (taking into account Part 161			
requirements)			
6. Other actions with beneficial impact not listed in the regulation			
7. Other FAA recommendations (see D, below)			
B. Responsible implementing authority identified for each considered			
alternative?			
C. Analysis of alternative measures:			
1. Measures clearly described?			
Measures adequately analyzed?			
Adequate reasoning for rejecting alternatives?			
D. Other actions recommended by the FAA: As the FAA staff person			
familiar with the local airport circumstances, determine whether other actions			
should be added? (List separately, or on back, actions and describe			
discussions with airport sponsor to have them included prior to the start of			
the 180-day cycle. New measures recommended by the airport sponsor			
must meet applicable public participation and consultation with officials			
before they can be submitted to the FAA for action. See E., below.)			
V. ALTERNATIVES RECOMMENDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION:			
[150.23(e), B150.7(c); 150.35(b), B150.5]			
A. Document clearly indicates:			
Alternatives that are recommended for implementation?			
2. Final recommendations are airport sponsor's, not those of			
consultant or third party?			
B. Do all program recommendations:			
Relate directly or indirectly to reduction of noise and All property of the leading of the second of the sec			
noncompatible land uses? (Note: All program recommendations, regardless			
of whether previously approved by the FAA in an earlier Part 150 study,			
must demonstrate a noise benefit if the airport sponsor wants FAA to			
consider the measure for approval in a program update. See E., below.) 2. Contain description of each measure's relative contribution to			
overall effectiveness of program?			
3. Noise/land use benefits quantified to extent possible to be			
quantified? (Note: some program management measures cannot be			
readily quantified and should be described in other terms to show			
their implementation contributes to overall effectiveness of the			
program.)			
F. • 5)			
		<u> </u>	L

PROGRAM REQUIREMENT	YES	NO	SUPPORTING PAGES/REVIEW COMMENTS
V. ALTERNATIVES RECOMMENDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION:			
[150.23(e), B150.7(c); 150.35(b), B150.5]			
4. Does each alternative include actual/anticipated effect on reducing			
noise exposure within noncompatible area shown on NEM?			
5. Effects based on relevant and reasonable expressed assumptions?			
6. Does the document have adequate supporting data that the			
measure contributes to noise/land use compatibility?			
C. Analysis appears to support program standards set forth in 150.35(b)			
and B150.5?			
D. When use restrictions are recommended for approval by the FAA:			
Does (or could) the restriction affect Stage 2 or Stage 3 aircraft			
operations (regardless of whether they presently operate at the airport)? (If			
the restriction affects Stage 2 helicopters, Part 161 also applies.)			
2. If the answer to D.1 is yes, has the airport sponsor completed the			
Part 161 process and received FAA Part 161 approval for a restriction			
affecting Stage 3 aircraft? Is the FAA's approval documented? For			
restrictions affecting only Stage 2 aircraft, has the airport sponsor			
successfully completed the Stage 2 analysis and consultation process			
required by Part 161 and met the regulatory requirements, and is there			
evidenced by letter from FAA stating this fact?			
3. Are non-restrictive alternatives with potentially significant			
noise/compatible land use benefits thoroughly analyzed so that appropriate			
comparisons and conclusions among all alternatives can be made?			
4. Did the FAA regional or ADO reviewer coordinate the use			
restriction with APP-400 prior to making determination on start of 180-days?			
E. Do the following also meet Part 150 analytical standards?			
 Recommendations that continue existing practices and that are 			
submitted for FAA re-approval? (Note: An airport sponsor does			
not have to request FAA re-approval if noise compatibility			
measures are in place from previously approved Part 150			
studies. If the airport has implemented the measures as			
approved in the previous NCP, the measures may be reported			
and modeled as baseline conditions at the airport.)			
2. New recommendations or changes proposed at the end of the			
Part 150 process?			
F. Documentation indicates how recommendations may change			
previously adopted noise compatibility plans, programs, or measures?			
G. Documentation also:			
Identifies agencies that are responsible for implementing each			
recommendation?	<u> </u>		

PROGRAM REQUIREMENT	YES	NO	SUPPORTING PAGES/REVIEW COMMENTS
2. Indicates whether those agencies have agreed to implement?			
V. ALTERNATIVES RECOMMENDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION: [150.23(e),			
B150.7(c); 150.35(b), B150.5] [CONTINUED]			
Indicates essential government actions necessary to implement			
recommendations?			
H. Timeframe:			
Includes agreed-upon schedule to implement alternatives?			
2. Indicates period covered by the program?			
I. Funding/Costs:			
Includes costs to implement alternatives?			
Includes anticipated funding sources?			
VI. PROGRAM REVISION: [150.23(e)(9)] Supporting documentation includes			
provision for revision? (Note: Revision should occur when it is likely a			
change has taken place at the airport that will cause a significant increase or			
decrease in the DNL noise contour of 1.5 dB or greater over noncompatible			
land uses. See §150.21(d))			