AD-A174 129	NOISE LEV ORLEANS L	ELS FROM UR	BAN HELIC	OTPTER O	PERATI	ONS NE	H TON	1/	1
UNCLASSIFIED	HASHINGTO	-04		<u> </u>	HLBERS	F/G 2	UN 86	NL	
EN0 12-44									
-									



ł



U.S. Department of Transportation

**Federal Aviation Administration** 



June 1986

**Report No.** 

FAA-EE-86-04

NOISE LEVELS FROM **URBAN HELICOPTER OPERATIONS** NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA



Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipiont's Catalog No.
FAA-EE-86-04	AD. A174129	
d. Title and Subtitle		5. Report Date
Noige Lougla Dave Unkan 1	lelieusten (reactions	June 1986
New Orlean, Louisiana	artcohren operations,	6. Parloming Organization Code
		8. Parloraing Organization Report No.
Steven R. Albersheim		
9. Performing Organization Name and Adde Federal Aviation Administ	ess cration	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)
Office of Environment and	l Energy	11. Contract or Grant No.
Washington, DC 20591	I	13. Type of Report and Pariad Covered
12. Spansoring Agency Name and Address	<u> </u>	7
		1d. Sponsoring Agency Code
5. Supplementary Notes		
16. Abstract The FAA conducted a noise wakefront Airport in New ( measurements from helicop monitoring program the FA	e monitoring program of heli Orleans, Louisian. The pur oter operations in an urban A concentrated solely on he	copter operations at the pose was to obtain noise environment. During this licopter approaches to
16. Abstract The FAA conducted a noise Eakefront Airport in New measurements from helicop monitoring program the FA Lakefront Airport. The n since the manitoring prog opportunity" as opposed to predefined flight path pro- different helicopter mode opportunity was provided same helicopter model for were located in a resident information on noise leveloperations.	e monitoring program of heli Orleans, Louisian. The pur oter operations in an urban A concentrated solely on he doise data collected and cla gram's measurements data obt o a "controlled test" when ofiles. During the testing of the high fr to determine the consistence different events. Since s tial community, an opportun ls associated with a high f	copter operations at the pose was to obtain noise environment. During this licopter approaches to ssified as survey type data, ained were from "target of the helicopter follow period, there were ten equency of operations an y between ALM values for the ome of the monitoring sites ity was provided to gather requency of helicopter
<ul> <li>Abstreet</li> <li>The FAA conducted a noise takefront Airport in New measurements from helicop monitoring program the FA Lakefront Airport. The n since the manitoring progoportunity" as opposed to predefined flight path prodifferent helicopter mode opportunity was provided same helicopter model for were located in a resident information on noise leve operations.</li> <li>Werds</li> </ul>	monitoring program of heli Orleans, Louisian. The pur ter operations in an urban A concentrated solely on he oise data collected and cla gram's measurements data obt o a "controlled test" when ofiles. During the testing is. Because of the high fr to determine the consistence different events. Since s tial community, an opportun is associated with a high f	copter operations at the pose was to obtain noise environment. During this licopter approaches to ssified as survey type data, ained were from "target of the helicopter follow period, there were ten equency of operations an y between ALM values for the ome of the monitoring sites ity was provided to gather requency of helicopter
<ul> <li>Abstreet</li> <li>The FAA conducted a noise takefront Airport in New measurements from helicop monitoring program the FA Lakefront Airport. The n since the manitoring prog opportunity" as opposed to predefined flight path prodifferent helicopter model opportunity was provided same helicopter model for were located in a resident information on noise leve operations.</li> <li>17. Key Words</li> <li>18. Locarity Clease (. (of this report)</li> </ul>	monitoring program of heli Orleans, Louisian. The pur ter operations in an urban A concentrated solely on he loise data collected and cla gram's measurements data obt o a "controlled test" when ofiles. During the testing is. Because of the high fr to determine the consistence different events. Since a tial community, an opportun is associated with a high f	copter operations at the pose was to obtain noise environment. During this licopter approaches to ssified as survey type data, ained were from "target of the helicopter follow period, there were ten equency of operations an y between ALM values for the ome of the monitoring sites ity was provided to gather requency of helicopter

SEL SISTER

( ( ) Chink hand

24242426249062

i.

0.035°

ľ,

#### Table of Contents

Accesion For

NTIS CRA&I DTIC TAB

Unannounced

Availability Codes

Avail and for Opercial

**KYYY**Y

	Appendix	30
9.0	Summary	26
	8.1 Sample Size 8.2 Evaluation of the Data 8.3 Community Noise	
8.0	Discussion of the Data	9
	7.1 Noise Monitoring Equipment 7.2 Photographic Scaling	
7.0	Instrumentation	8
6.0	Meteorological Conditions	7
5.0	Flight Operations	7
4.0	Microphone Deployment	5
3.0	Site Description	3
2.0	Noise Measurement Program	2
1.0	Introduction	1

**Haddadad** 



ant and the

### List of Tables

10

-----

13.5. A

		Page
1	Data Recovery for the New Orleans	
	Helicopter Noise Monitoring Program	10
	at Lakerront Airport (rescent)	10
2	Helicopter Noise Measurements for New Orleans January 17-20, 1985	13
3	Statistical Analysis of Helicopter Noise	
	Measurements for New Orleans for Slant Range, ALm, and Adjusted ALm	18
4	Summary of the Standard Deviation of ALm and the 90% Confidence Interval by Heliconter	
	at the Centerline Center Location	22
5	ALm Values for Those Helicopters Where Thcre	
	were Readings at All Three Sideline Sites	24

# List of Figures

Page

1	Lakefront Airport, New Orleans Louisiana	4
2	Location of Noise Monitoring Sites at Lakefront Airport	6
3	ALm vs Slant Range Distance	25
4	Time History of Selected Noise Events at Site 3	27
5	Time History of Selected Noise Events at Site 3	28

220000

1.0 Introduction

During the period of January 14-18, 1985, the FAA conducted a noise monitoring program of helicopter operations at the Lakefront Airport in New Orleans, Louisiana. This is a companion report to a previous report which analyzed noise levels from helicopter operations in Las Vegas (Helicopter Noise Survey Performed at Las Vegas, Nevada FAA-EE-84-15). As in the previous analysis, the purpose was to obtain noise measurements from helicopter operations in an urban environment. The Las Vegas noise monitoring program conducted in 1984, foscused primarily on helicopter takeoffs. In this program, the FAA concentrated solely on the approaches. In addition, this field measurement program afforded the FAA the opportunity to conduct a noise monitoring program in a residential area near concentrated helicopter operations.

The noise data collected are classified as survey type data, since the monitoring program's measurements data obtained were from "targets of opportunity" as opposed to a "controlled test" where the helicopters follow predefined flight path profiles. The helicopter flight corridors into and out of the departure and landing sites were prescribed by the airport operator to separate the helicopter operations from the fixed wing aircraft. However, there were no limitations placed on the helicopter pilots to control individual flight paths, rate of climb, rate of descent, airspeed, operational weight, etc. As such, the landings and takeoffs represent operations into and out of this particular site for the particular test day meteorological conditions. During the testing period, there were ten different helicopter models monitored. Because of the high frequency of operations (i.e an average of 15-20 per hr) the opportunity was provided to determine the consistency between maximum A-weighted sound level (ALm) values for the same helicopter model for different events, with variations in operations due to change in speed, glide slope, load, climb angle, pilot techniques, etc. within the prescribed flight corridor. This test also obtained sideline measurements of helicopter noise beyond 500 ft. The sites were located in established residential areas. This provided an opportunity to compare real time noise levels associated with a high frequency of helicopter operations in a nearby community. This report also contains noise measurements of helicopter models which are not in data bases previously reported by the FAA, notably the Eell 412 and Westland WG-30.

#### 2.0 Noise Measurement Program

The FAA with support from Bell Helicopter Textron and Sikorsky Aircraft, conducted the noise measurement program. The test plan, developed and implemented by the FAA, laid out the conceptual approach for locating the monitoring sites and the objectives to be achieved. Industry participation consisted of providing coordination with helicopter traffic control and noise measurement crews who worked under the guidance of the FAA and supplemented the FAA's measurement crew. With industry's assistance it was possible to deploy two noise monitoring stations in the residential area adjacent to Lakefront Airport. The noise data collected were from helicopters during their tinal approach into Lakefront Airport. An array of microphones were set out to measure noise from the helicopters in the approach flight corridor. One microphone was located beneath the approach path while the other three were located to the left and normal to the approach path of the helicopters.

#### 3.0 Site Description

Lakefront Airport is located approximately 5 miles northeast of downtown. New Orleans on the southern edge of Lake Pontchartrain. The area is relatively flat with winds predominately from the northwest during the winter season. Lakefront Airport is principally a general aviation airport with 221,264 operations during 1984. Figure 1 shows the layout of the airport. The HAI flight line was located on the southeast corner of the airport occupying runways 31 and taxiway Echo. The Lakefront control tower controlled both the helicopter traffic for the HAI Convention and the general aviation activity at the airport.

South of the airport is a levee which is approximately 20 ft in height. The levee is part of the flood protection system which protects the City of New Orleans from Lake Pontchartrain. The levee at this location also serves as a railroad right-of-way with the tracks on top of the levee. Beyond the levee south of the airport is a residential community of single family detached homes. This area has been designated as a noise sensitive area by the airport operator. Aircraft operating at Lakefront are instructed to avoid flying directly over this area when feasible. The



helicopters approached the airport from the east by following Haynes boulevard which runs parallel to the noise sensitive area. Since the airport has received several noise complaints from residents in this area from aircraft flying over their neighborhood, the FAA was afforded the opportunity to measure noise in the community from the helicopters during approach to the airport while gathering information with respect to any noise complaints attributed to the helicopter fly-bys during approach.

#### 4.0 Microphone Deployment

Figure 2 shows the respective locations of the noise monitoring stations. Site 1 which was designated the centerline center microphone was located at a distance of approximately 790 ft from the designated landing zone. Site 2 was located 325 ft; site 3, 1455 ft; and site 4, 2410 ft to the southwest of the centerline microphone. All of the sites were located on a grassy surface. Site 2 was situated on the airport grounds approximately 30 ft from the railroad right-of-way. The railroad right-of-way was used infrequently during the measurement program and therefore did not result in any loss of data due to noise interference. Sites 3 and 4 were located in a residential area to obtain measurements of the helicopters in relation to existing ambient conditions. Between sites 2 and 3 adjacent to the levee there is a four lane highway. Traffic volume during the testing was relatively light with the majority of the vehicles consisting of automobiles. The only physical barriers in the line of sight between monitoring sites 3 and 4 and the landing zone are one story houses and the 20 ft levee. These barriers created some shielding during the near-hover operation over the landing area and during



XIN.

air taxiing to the landing spot.

#### 5.0 Flight Operations

The flight line for the HAI Convention was located at Lakefront Airport. The helicopters departed from mid-field toward the north over Lake Pontchartrain turning to the east heading to the decomonstration area. On returning to Lakefront Airport, when the helicopters were within approximately 2 miles of the airport, the pilots were instructed to fly parallel to Haynes Boulevard during their final approach to the numbers at the end of runway "27". The helicopters slowed to a near-hover over the designated landing zone "27". Then they air taxied to their designated landing spot.

#### 6.0 Meteorological Conditions

Weather conditions were quite suitable for noise monitoring during the measurement program, that is, the skies were clear and the winds were light. A self-contained onsite meteorological system was deployed near the centerline microphone to monitor real-time temperature, wind speed, and wind direction. The surface temperature as measured from this system ranged from  $40^{\circ}$  to  $50^{\circ}$ F during the the three-day monitoring program. The winds were principally from the west, northwest, or north at an average speed of 7 mph. On a few occasions, the wind direction swung dround to the southwest. Meteorological conditions during the test period did not affect the standard landing operations of the helicopters.

#### 7.0 Instrumentation

#### 7.1 Noise Monitoring Equipment

The following equipment was used at different times during the roise monitoring program, B&K Model 2233 and Model 4165 Precision Integrating Sound Level Meter (PISLM), Gen Rad 1945 Community Noise Analyzer, and NAGRA IVSJ magnetic tape recorder. A Nagra and B&K 2233 PISLM were located at site 1, a B&K 2218 PISLM was used at site 2, another Nagra and the Gen Rad 1945 were deployed at site 3 and a B&K 4165 was used at site 4.

The B&K systems used a 1/2 inch condenser microphone. The system is self-contained in that the microphone was directly attached to the PISLM. Output was observed on an analog scale and digital read out on the PISLM. The Gen Rad 1945 used a P-42 microphone-preemplifier driving a Gen Rad 1/2 inch electret microphone. The microphone preemplifier assembly was mounted on a tripod four (4) it above ground level with the diaphragm oriented for grazing incidence.

At the end of each event, the observers noted the digital read out of the ALm (Maximum A-weighted Sound Level); Leq (Equivalent sound level); SEL (Sound Exposure Level); and the duration of the event. Measurements made with the Gen Rad 1945 were digitally outputed on an LED screen and at the end of the sampling period, the Leq values were annotated on the chart paper. The observers were located 20-30 ft from the microphone to avoid any shielding or interference.

The NAGRA IVSJ recorder analog signal was amplified to a suitable recording level and was recorded on channel one. A time code was recorded on the queue channel for traceability of events. The queue channel was also used by the observer to annotate the tape orally. The magnetic tapes recorded by the FAA were later reduced and analyzed at the FAA Noise Lab at Dulles International Airport. The magnetic tapes recorded by bell and Sikorsky were reduced and analyzed at the Bell Helicopter Textron Acoustic Lab.

#### 7.2 Photographic Scaling

Centerline altitude for the helicopters were determined according to SAE Aerospace Information Report 902. Each helicopter was photographed as it passed over the centerline center microphone position. The image in each photo was then scaled to the dimensions of the helicopter to determine the altitude of the helicopter at that point in its approach. Even though the helicopters did not always pass directly over the centerline position, an error of 27 degrees in the angle between the line of sight and the normal to the flight path would only result in a 1 dB SPL.

#### 8.0 Discussion of the Data

#### 8.1 Sample Size

During the three day monitoring program, there were 108 approach events. The data recovery (Table 1) for each site based on ALm readings is as

#### Table 1

#### Data Recovery for the New Orleans Helicopter Noise Monitoring Program at Lakefront Airport (Percent)

Site (Distance from Centerline, ft)	Percent ALm Values	Recovered SEL Values	Percent R For Those E Passed Over	ecovered vents That Centerline
			ALm	SEL
1 (0)	87	69	100	79
2 (354)	73	43	77	40
3 (1455)	67	21	73	7
4 (2410)	46	0	52	0

follows: Site 1, 87%; Site 2, 73%; Site 3, 67%; and Site 4, 46%. Sites 1 and 2 had the highest percentage of valid readings. These sites had the least amount of noise interference. The loss of data at sites 1 and 2 was the result of interference due to routine vehicular and aircraft ground activity in the vicinity of the noise monitoring sites. The lower data recovery at sites 3 and 4 was due primarily to the relatively low signal-to-noise ratio and interference from community activity (i.e. automobiles, children playing, fly-bys from the airport, etc).

The data recovery based on SEL values is significantly lower than the ALm values especially for sites 3 & 4 which were located off the airport grounds. In order to have a valid SEL, the noise from the helicopter has to be 10 dBA higher then the existing ambient. Site 3 located at a distance of 1455 ft had a SEL data recovery of 7% while Site 4 recorded no valid SEL readings at a distance of 2410 ft. The nearness of sites 1 and 2 to the approach flight corridor enabled these sites to have a much higher data recovery than the two farther sideline sites. However, even site 2 lost a considerable amount of data at an average slant range distance of 375 ft from the glide slope. Loss of valid SEL readings at the two close-in sites is attributed to noise interference.

At the farther distances from the source of noise, it is hard to identify clearly the helicopter noise from other sources of noise. It is extremely difficult to record valid SEL readings at distant points from a noise generator. In actuality the helicopter noise is not lost data, but is part of the ambient. Very few events were lost due to equipment malfunction. The first five events were disregarded as they were used to

determine the range settings for the equipment.

Since the noise measurements were targets of opportunity, the helicopters did not necessarily always pass directly over the centerline microphone. In the evaluation process, events were screened to delete those outside certain criteria (i.e. when helicopters during their final approach to the designated landing zone did not pass over the centerline microphone). Of all the approach events recorded, 48 passed over the centerline microphone. It is these events which were considered for further evaluation and analysis in section 8.2. The data recovery for these 40 events is as follows: site 1, 100%; site 2, 77%; site 3, 73%; and site 4, 52%. The remaining helicopter approaches were too far left or right of the centerline microphone to be considered for any further analysis.

8.2 Evaluation of the Data

Table 2 presents the recorded ALm readings as measured for the centerline and sideline sites for those events where the helicopter passed directly over the centerline microphone. In addition, the sideline elevation angles, and the absolute decrease in dBA between the centerline reading and sideline sites are presented. The ALm values as recorded at the centerline microphone from all the helicopters ranged from 80.8 to 96.4 dBA. The highest recorded noise level of 96.4 dBA at the centerline microphone was associated with the Westland WG-30, which passed by at an altitude of 152 ft. The lowest reading was 80.8 dBA associated with the A-Star which flew by at an altitude of 231 ft. The average ALm readings for each helicopter type at the centerline microphone ranged from 85 to 91 dBA.



		<b></b>	•	NA	57 0 : 57 0 :	62 0 : ·	NN NN		62.0	  	NA 1	62.0	~ ~ ~	62.0	 V N V N	-		I VN	72.0	. NA	68.0 : NA :	 V	NA :	68.0	NA :		59 0	114	70 C	67 5 :	
•` 80	for Each		m	NN	0 0 9 9	610	VN VN	N NN	NN .	NA NA	64 6	VN	AN 0 44	NN NN	66.0 66.3		62.0	65.0	65.0 NA	VN	NA 70.0	66.5	64.0	NN	۲۷ ۲۷	62 O	67 8	65 0 2 2 2	21 0	71 0	665
23 	La (dBA)	51te	2	7 4 7	4 X X	75 0	77 3	4 X X	76.6	73.8	77 3	76.2	77.5	75.1	A N N	-	NA NA	83.1	79.7 80.0	78.4	76.4 NA	79.6	79.8	5 0 8	78.9	76 4	813	0.08	80 1 80 1	88 1	860
			-	9 9 0	6 / 6 7 8	87 4	8 ¢ 5		84.6		87.9	87.3	87.1	84.2	83.3 83.0		87.9	64.7	8 8 9 9 9 9 9	87.9	84 8 84 1	91.0	88.5	87.9	87.1	9 - C	94.0	E 06	8 6 3 8 6 3	94 2	926
 с. Н П П	0 1 5 4	\$ u o	•••	2414 :	2413 :	2412	2416	2418 :	2425 :	2417	2416 :	2414 :	2419 :	2416	2427 : 2424 :		2416	2415 1	2415 : 2421 :	2413	2414 : 2415 :	2415 :	2916	2416	2414 :	2420	2414	2415	2427	2416 :	2417 :
2 Fur Ner	nge for N	(Ing Stati	e	1461	1460	1458	1465	1468	1480	1467	1464	1462	1464 1470	1465	1482 1478		1465	1464	1463 1473	1460	1962 1969	1463	1465	1464	1962	1471	1461	1464	1484	1465	1467
ASUREMENT 6	Slant Re	Monitor	7	352	346 347	339	367	2 C M	422	404	365	354	362 387	366	431 414		363	363	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	348	355 362	358	368	364	356	392	351	363	9 C <b>7</b>	368	375
COPTER NOISE ME		Centerline: Altitude :	( <b>f</b> t) 	134 :	120	96	171		269	1 4 0	166 :	. 141 -	211 :	169 :	283 :	-	167 :	162 :	231 :	124	143	151 :	172 1	163	146	219	132	161		: 173 :	168 :
HELIC		Heltcopter		500-E	500-E 500-E	200-1	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2001 E	300-6	200 - E	530-F	530-F		530-F	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		ASTAR	ASTAR	ASTAR Astar	B-206L3	8-206L3 8-206L3	B-214	8-214	B-222UT	8 - 2 2 2 U T 8 - 2 2 2 U T	8-222UT	B-412	8-412 5 4.2	8-412	Dauphin	Diuphin
		Event -	Number	18 63 :	18 70 :	18 27 :	18.55	18 61 -	18 36 1	1 9 0 9 1	19 05 :	18.46	19 23 1	18.11	18.67 : 18.74 :	. 60 81	18.68	18 56	1904	18 62 ;	18 21 : 18 69 :	19 64 :	18 44 :	17.18 :	12 27 12	19 09	18 53 1	17 71	18 16 -	18 45 :	18 54 :

Table 2 Helicopter n∩ise measurements for new orleans, January 17-20, 1985

				Center line :	Monte						IOL LACN	
Event		Helicopter	•••	Altitude								
Number	••			(11)	2	ę	4		1	7	e	•
	•-							•				
18.71		Dauphin		219 :	392	1471	2420		86.3	NN	70.5	63.0
18.49		Twin Star	••	181 :	372	1966	2417	_	88.5	82.8	70.0	62.0
17.08		Twin Star	••	202 :	383	1469	2418	-	87.0	0.08	69.0	64.0
18.65		Twin Star		220 1	392	1472	2420 4		86.0	٧N	61.5	62.0
18.24	••	Twin Star		191	377	1967	2418		85.5	84.8	69 0	65 0
19.03		Twin Star	••	146 :	366	1465	2416	-	84.8	62.9	67.1	VN
18 29		NG - 30		152 :	95 E	5951	2415	_	96.4	86.0	69.7	69.0
18 73		NG - 30	•••	250 :	410	1476	2423	_	85.6	NN	76.6	68.0

.



Table 2 (Continued) Helicofter Noise Measurements for New Orleans, January 17–20, 1985

			SEL	(dBA) for	Each	E 1 e v	41100	Andle	Diffe	r e n c e	bets		
				Site		tor	Each	Site	Center	line	510	le l i r	
Event		Helicopter							ALI	a in	18 ( V )		••
Numbel			-	2	 n	7	m	•	1-2		~	1 - 4	••
81	 m c	500-E	93.6	83.8		22.4	8 9 9 9	3 2	06 E1	27	40	Z e	
	 	200-E	94.9			27.6	6.7	0	NA.	21.6			
18 2		500-E				16.5	3.8	2 3 1	12 40	26 4	10	5.40	
8		200-E	2 16			27.8	6.9		9 20	- ·	` ج	2 i	••••
		300-1	•			9 . 4 Z		а- ч а- ч		4 N		0.2	
	 - <u>-</u>	3-005	0.04			39.6	10.5	• •	8.00	. ~	, , ,	2.60	
1.8.1		500-E	92.0			29.5	7.2	• •	9.60	19.5	0	Z	
19 (	 8)	S00-E	0 0 6			36.4	9.4	2 7 3	0 E 2	-	47	Z	
19.0	 	530-F	92.5		76.2	27.1	6 . 5 9	9 . E	10 60	23	0	Z	
18	: 9	530-F	93.2			23.5	5	н В. В.	11.10	~	4 Y	5.30	
1.0.1		530-F				26.1	6.2	3.8	9.40	-	47	Z	
- 61		530-F	2 06	63.6		33.0	6. v	00	1.0	21	0	ZZ S	
	• •	33015				4	110		NA			Ż	
		530-F	90.4		78.0	36.3	10.0	9	YN	9	0	Z	
		ACTAB			•		4	- - -	4 4 4				•
		ASTAR	9 10 . 			27.2	9 10 10 10		NA	1 10		Ż	
18	9	ASTAR	91.6			26.5	6.4	3.8	1.60	19	0	Z	
19.1		ASTAR	90.4	87.9		24.9	5.9	3.6	9.30	19.(	00	Z	•••
18 (		ASTAR :	89.1	40 47		35.4	<b>6</b>	5	0.80	~	4	8.8	
18	. 2	B-206L3	1. 54		-	20.9	4.9	2.9	9.50	-	۲,	Z	
60 6 •1 •		B-206L3	92.5			23.7	10 ( 17)		8 40	~ `	- 	9.9	
			C 74			7 9 7	•	- - -	¥ X	- <b>-</b>	2	Ż	-
18.4	 T	B-214	98.6	91.0		24.9	5.9	3.6	11.40	24	02	Ż	
18		8-214		91.0		27.9	6.7	4.1	8.70	4	20	Ż	••
17 1	 00	B-222UT ;	95.6	6.06		26.6	6.4	3.9	7 40	-	- 	96 6	
<b>60</b> (		B-222UT	95.4	87.9	••	242	5 2	 5 6	8 20	~	47	Ż	 
1 1		B-222UT :	94.0			26.6	6.4	6 E	6.40	21.6	200	<b>6</b>	
61	•	B-222UT :	91.6			340	8	5 2	8 20	17.6	50	Ż	
18	 E 5	B-412	100.9	91.4	75.1 1	22.1	5.2	3 1	12.70	26	203	15 00	
6 1		8-412	97.8	90.04		264	ξ. δ	 8 0	10.30	52	30	Ż	
- 0 -		B-412				42.2	11.5	2.0	5.60	15.1	80	2	
8	9	B-412		89.9	81.4	41.7	11 3	6 9	6 10	15	07	9 9	
16	 	Dauphin	100 4	95 6		280	6 · 9	4 1 :	6 10	23	202	12 63	
••••••	4	Dauphin	99 5	93 5		30.0	74	4	6 60	26	2	5	
80 0		Dauphin	9 6 0	5.04		215	5.0	: 0 8	8 30	26	203	รั้ง	•••
2 C		nauphin .	6 2 6			268	8 6	е С	5 50	61	2 0 9 J		
	-1	Darjere,	9 C 3	5 66		296	7 2	<b>4</b>	2 50	33	0	-	

ł

**-**27

.

HELICOPTER NOISE MEASUREMENTS FOR NEW ORLEANS, JANUARY 17-20, 1985

1

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	<b>T</b>	. 30	. 50	00.0	. 00	. 50	VN	0.	. 60
3.0		12	26	2	4	20		27	1 3
	, ,	8	20	00	20	20	70	70	00
0 L L		15.	18.	18	24.	16.	17.	26.	•
Differ Centeri	1-2	VN	5.70	4.00	٧N	0.70	1.90	10.40	N
		!		-					
Angle Site	4	5.2	6. •	4.8	5.2	4.5	4	Э. 6 У	6. S
t i on Each	m	9	7.1	٥.	8.6	7.5	6.6	6 . O	9.7
Elev. for	7	34.0	29.1	31.9	34.1	30.4	27.3	1.52	37.6
			••					••	
4 ch	ţ						77.8	81.1	14.7
ter 1			1.0	5.5		3.0	0.2		
(dBA S	14		•	ò		•	ě.		
13S	-	92.6	95.3	94.6		94.1	92.2	104.6	
					••	••	~		
Heltconter		Dauphin	Twin Star	VG-30	VC - 30				
	l a da u	18.71	18 49	17.08	18.65	18.24	19.03	18.29	18.73

.

٠.

Because of the variance in the helicopter altitudes during each pass the centerline ALm noise readings were adjusted to a reference altitude. The reference altitude ( $R_{\rm o}$ ) of 182 ft is the average altitude of all the valid centerline noise measurement events. The adjustment of ALE was based on the relation of 22  $\log(R/R_0)$  which approximates attenuation associated with spherical spreading and atmospheric absorption. There are other propagation factors which have not been accounted for, most notably source directivity, ground effects, and individual helicopter performance characteristics (i.e. RPM and power level). Table 3 is similar to Table 2, however, it provides statistical information for each helicopter measured. Also presented is the centerline ALm readings adjusted to the reference altitude (182 ft). The ALm values for the sideline sites were not adjusted since analysis of the sideline distances indicates that for distances of 1455 and 2410 ft from the centerline, the slant range distances did not change significantly between events.

In general, the data demonstrate that the noise level is fairly consistent between the various helicopter models and multiple flights of the same model. This is best shown by the standard deviation and 90% confidence level as presented in Table 3. The B-222UT showed the most consistent readings with an average ALm of  $89.8 \pm 1.23$  dBA. The 500-E, which had the most recordings, showed a strong consistency between events with an average of  $89.2 \pm 1.86$  dBA. The Dauphin and the WG-30, however, showed a greater opread in the data. Possible causes for this variation are numerous. Table 4 presents a summary of the standard deviations for each helicopter and the 90% confidence intervals for the centerline line center position. The average standard deviation for all the events is  $\pm 2.05$  dBA.

ALE	10	erence		87 1		 0 0-00	6	862	85 7	81 3	85.6	83.5	85.3	10 0	1 9		-	87.0	85.8	84.9	86.7	87.5	יו לי יין לי אין בי	)	86.0	~ ~	n o ⊣ c		83.5		867	87 1	83 ó	82 2		84 5	5 5	2 0	6 - - t	a / 1 2 - 1	3 7 0
		. Ref	×	2 0			7 0	. 0 1	VN	2 0 :	VN		NA	. VN	VN	N N	 	NA I	I VN	2.0 :	- VN	- VN	×× ~		. VA	NN	× × ×		NA		: 0 1	VN	. AN	. AN		11A	NA .	NA	N N	 47	
r Each	•			66 0 5	× × × ×	N N	60.0	62.0 6	NN	61.0 6	NN	63 5	NA	٨٨	VN	AN 1	4		NA	NA 6	64.0	66.0	7		٧N	N N	22		NA		66 0 6	62 0	65 0	65 0	NA 7	NA	NA	NA	N N	A N	
(dBA) fo Site	2			N N	7 8 7	77 3	NA	٩N	N N	75.0	75 7	73 8	NN	VN	٨A	AN AN	42	77.3	77.5	76.2	83.9	٧X	<b>7</b> 2		VN.	V N	Y Z		NA			N N	83 1	2 8 2	800	NA	NA	٧N	N N	4 X X	52
ALB	1			878			87.9	56.0	85 0	874	83.0		86 02	10 00	1.66	0.97		87.9	87.1	87.3	85.3	83.3	20. 00 00		85.44	7.00		87 00	83.00		1 <b>1 1 8 8</b>	87.9	84 7	84 0	808	85 16	5 00	2 78	2 04	) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )	מה
• •				2416 :	2 4 1 4 :	2416 -	2413	2417 :	2418 :	2412 :	2422	2417	16 95 :	10.00 1	3 78 1	1 97 :		2416	2415 1	2414 :	2419 :	2427 :	2 9 2 9 2	 - -	118.43 1	2 00 1		2 4 5 4 1	14 12		2415	2416 :	2415 :	2415 :	2421 :	116 36 1	5 00 1	2 38 :	1 75 1	1 20 121	
nge for No ing Statio (ft)				1465	1961	1465	1460	1467	1468	1458	1475	1467	466.48 24	10 00	6.23	3.24	-7 01 0CF	1464	1464	1462	1470	1482	1478		469.24 24	2 00	7 25	10 10 480	461.82 24	i	1463	1465	1964	1463	1473	465.50 24	5 00	3 92	2 88	2 22 22 22	40, 01 ,
Slant Ra Monitor	14			367	7 C E	367	9 <b>9</b> E	374	379	339	404	E / E	372.32 1	10.00	24.05	12.51		365	362	354	387	104	4 1 4 7 7 C	5	382 87 1	7.00	27 20	4 30 95 1	354 27 1		359	365	363	358	399	3 6 8 8 8 8 1	5 00	15 16	11 15	398 73 1 760 37 1	1 . C acr
nterline: Jr.P.de		·		170 :		1 2 1	120 :	185	195 :	96 :	240 :	4	176.40	10 00 :	49.61	25.81		166	159 :	141 :	211 :	283 :			198.00 :	7 00 :	10.05	283 00 5	141 00 1		152 1	167 :	162 :	151	231 :	172 60 :	5 00 1	2982:	21 94	231 00 :	' ^^ ICT
- ق 	• • ••														••		 	; 	••	•-		<b>.</b>												••		<b>.</b>				·	-
				500-E	3-005	500-E	500-E	300-E	500-E	500-E	500-E	300-E		bservations	viation	nce Interva		530-5	530-5	530-F	530-F	530-F	3-055	• •		bservations	V14110N 1				ASTAR	ASTAR	ASTAR	ASTAR	ASTAR		bservations	VIALION	nce Interva		
•	 	•••		72 :		 		99	61	27 :	80	 10 10	4 g e	r of O	ard De	onfide			23:	46 	15 :		 		4 g e	r of 0			838			 89	28	04	• 0	a Ç e	o je i	ard De	onfide	2 E 2 E 2 E	

â Table 

5

الكافيد وا

3

Star School Sch

aganal amadan aman'ngi bananya sanarasa sanarasa sanarasa

Table 3

Centerline 8 4 8 8 9 0 7 Adjusted Reference Altitude ~ ~ ~ **N N M 4 0** N 000000 8 2 8 . 8 -2 m o 86 88 89 89 8 9 9 9 8 86 ALm ţ .. .. .. 0 8 9 žž 68 63 63 NA ž STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF HELICOPTER NOISE MEASUREMENTS FOR NEW ORLEANS FOR SLATISTICAL ANALYSIS SLANT RANGE, ALM, AND ADJUSTED ALM Ψ Each 70 0 5 0 7 7 7 9 \* \* \* \* \* \* \* 66 0 67 0 A X X Ň ALm (dBA) for Site m 78 4 76 4 Ň 79 6 79 8 • \$ ٠ - 0 C 4 9 4 ~ 91.0 88 5 87 9 87.0 87.1 84 6 **60** ~ • 4 8 8 7 87 ---**5** m - --. 0 4 -83 24 2415 31 2413 19 2413 2414 2415 . 8 2 2416 2416 2416 2414 2420 34 00 74 93 42 2415 12 Slant Range for Noise Monitoring Stations 2414 2419 2414 4 m 00 2416 4 2 1462 1 43 1 36 3 49 2 87 1471 39 1462 31 1460 1464 1463 1465 1462 1471 02 00 1460.27 1964 4.00 27 1464 47 (ft) e 1462 1463 3 1465 348 355 362 8 7 8 8 0 0 8 7 8 8 0 0 8 7 8 8 0 0 0 358 964 356 392 368 364 347 322 362 368. 13 13 13 13 13 13 3 e ທ່າ Centerline: Altitude 124 143 160 151 163 163 146219 ( **f t** ) 142 124 172 27 27 219 146 -- --Helicopter 90% Confidence Interval 90% Contidence Interval 90% Confidence Interval B-206L3 B-206L3 B-206L3 8-222UT 8-222UT 8-222UT Number of Observations Number of Observations Number of Observations B-222UT B-214 B-214 Standard Deviation Standard Deviation Standard Deviation 18 64 : 18 44 : -- --Magigun Minigun 17 16 17 09 19 51 19 09 62 69 69 Hasimum Average Minigue Average Average MAKINUM MINIMUM Event Number 8 8 8

ł

-	Slant	Range for	Notes	<	Lm (dBA)	for Each	••	
terline:	Moni	toring Stu	tions		SIL			
titude 1		(11)						Adjusted
	7	m	•	1	2	•	•	t 0
							••	Reference
								Altitude :
132	156	1961	2414	94.0	81.3	67 8	59.0	6 06
295	959	1485	2428	88.8	83.2	73.0	VN	
141	363	1964	2415	90.3	0 08	65.0	 VN	89.1
2901	9 E 🖡	1484	2427	86.2	80.1	71.0	70.01	5 2 06
9.50	36°96E	12 6791	2421.09	89 83	81 15	69 20	ž	
00.1	4.00	4.00	00 0	00	00.4	0	AN N	
73 74 :	40 49	10 90	6.63	2.82	1.29	3.05	~ VN	
10.65 1	33 30	8.96	5 4 5	2.32	1.06	2 51	NN NN	
5.00	436 92	1484.60	2427.99	94.00	83.20	73.00	VN	- <b>P</b> E 6
	350.78	1460.98	2413.61	86.20	80.00	65.00	A N	
1 6 2 1		1465	2416	94.2		71.0		
186	375	1467	2417 :	92.6	86.0	66.5	63.01	92.9
128	349	1461	2413 :	90.6	82.3	64 0	62.0 1	87.2
185	374	1467	2417 :	87.5	85.0	64.5	" VN	87.7
164	364	1464	2416	87 6	82 1	68.0	63.0	86 6 :
	2 4 6	1471	2420	86.3	VN	70.5	63.0	
6.17	370.47	1465.88	2416.59	89.80	NA	67 42	NA	
9 00	6.00	6.00	ę 00 ł	6.00	NA	6.00	. VN	6.01
27.48 ;	12.85	3.25	1.97	2,89	NA	2.70	" YN	2.8
9 9 9	8 63	2 18	1.32	1 94	N	1.81	 VN	2 3 1
00 6	391 90	1471.39	2419.93	94.20	NN	71.00	. VN	2 66
8 00	349 30	1460.62	2413.40	86.30	NN	64.00	NA	88 6 . 6
1 1 1 1			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
181	372	1466	2417 :	88.5	82.8	70 0	620	88.4
168 :	366	1465	2416 ;	898	82.9	67.1		84 0 :
202	383	1969	2418	87 0	0.58	69 0	64.0	88.0
2 2 0	392	1972	2420	86 0	VN	61.5	62.01	87 8
191	377	1467	2418 :	80 12 12	84.8	69.0	65 0 :	86 0 :

90% Confidence Interval Number of Observations Standard Deviation Maninum Mininum Average



0 7 N P O 4

67.32 5.00 3.06 2.25 70.00

1467 77 5 00 2 36 1 73 1471 54 1464 67

0 0 8 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 192 5 17 13 13 168

**n e** v

2420 2415

392 365

;

. . . . . . . .

-- --

2417 ----ŝ

377

.. .. ..

88

9 S ==

--------

.. .. .. .. ..





.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF HELICOPTER NOISE MEASUREMENTS FOR NEW ORLEANS FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF HELICOPTER NOISE MEASUREMENT STATISTICAL ALM

•	•• ••			   		- •							
Centerlin ALE	Adjusted to	Reference	Altitude	6 4 6	989		<b>V</b> N	٧N	A N	V N	۷X	<b>N</b> N	
	•••••••	-		: 0 6 9	680:		VN	 VN	VN	 VN	 VN	VN	••
OF EACH				69.7	76.6		VN	٧N	NA	٧N	N	٧X	
site	2			86.0	NN		٧N	AN	NN	NA	٧N	۸N	
	1			<b>\$</b> 96	85 6		<b>N</b> A	NN	NN	٧N	NN	٧N	
•				415 :	423 1		VN	VN	AN	VN	VN	VN	
nge for Nois Ing Stations	. f t ) 3			1463 2	1476 2		NA	N N	NA	NN	NN	NN	
Monitor	2			359	410		۷N	٧N	٧N	NN	N N	٧N	
Centerline:	Altitude : (ft) :			152 :	250 :		VN	NA .	VN	- VN	VN	NA .	-
·• ··		•							••				
	Helicopter			<b>V</b> G - 30	VG - 30			SELVALIONS	<b>iation</b>	ice Interval			
	Rvent Nubber			18 29	1873		Average	Number of Ob	Standard Dev	90% Confiden	Makimun	Minimum	

### Table 4

# Summary of the Standard Deviation of Adjusted ALm and the 90% Confidence Interval by Helicopter at the Centerline Center Location (dBA)

Helicopter	Standard Deviation	90Z Confidence Interval
500 E	1.9	1.1
530 F	1.3	0.9
AStar	2.0	1.9
B-206L3	0.7	1.3
B-222UT	0.7	0.8
B-412	1.5	1.8
Dauphin	2.8	2.3
Twin Star	1.6	1.2
Average	1.6	1.4

Average



Table 5 presents the sideline ALm values as recorded, the slant range, and elevation angle for the sideline sites for only those events where there were valid ALm readings at all four monitoring sites. The small number of events demonstrates the difficulty in obtaining clear signals at four distant sites on a real time basis. There was very little variation in the slant ranges between helicopter events. The average elevation angle at Site 2 was 26.9°; Site 3, 6.6°; and Site 4, 4.0°. The ALm decreased significantly from the centerline values which reflects the distance and attenuation attributed to ground and atmospheric absorption. Figure 3 shows graphically the decrease in sideline ALm values between sites 2 and 4 for the 500E, ASTAR, B-222UT, B-412, Dauphin, Twin Star, and WG-30. The graphical presentations of sideline distances vs ALm readings are based on the average of all the readings available for each helicopter model. A second order regression of ALm vs slant range distance resulted in a correlation coefficient of 0.93. Closer scrutiny of the data indicates that for the 500-E the ALm reading at 2410 ft was 1 dBA greater than the value recorded at the closer-in site at 1455 ft. The increase of 1 dBA is not considered significant and can be possibly attributed to several factors such as directivity, ground reflection, attenuation, etc. Of greater importance is that the ALm values in all cases appear to approach the ambient noise levels for this area, since the helicopters were barely distinguishable at these distances. From a practical environmental standpoint, the noise associated with helicopter operations at a heliport would not significantly affect the ambient noise levels at 1500 ft or beyond in a suburban residential area.

Table 5

÷.0.

10.000

ALS VALUFS FOR THOSE HELICOPTERS WHERE THERE WERE READINGS AT ALL THREE SIDELINE SITES

						-	-9	٠	0		•	0	'n	-	n	•	•		0	80	
160			Ŧ			2	•	~	9	e	<b>P</b>	m	-	-	÷	4	3		2.0	6.0	-
Ž	8	ŝ				_	~		~		-	~	-	-	~	_	~		1	_	~
101	ŝ	e L	~				\$	- ¥.		5	- v - v	5	~	6	~	2.1			ŏ	5	1
	E L	0.9							1										12	9	
é	ç	Ĵ				P,	٦.	10	٢.	7	40	0	0	0	•	•	-		00	6 6	•
لي			6			1	25	26	Ŧ	22	26	21	0	9	30	5 9	25		12	26.	'n
••	•-	••		••	•••	 							•-		•-	••	•-				••
						0	٥.	•	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		00	69	2
Each			4			62	61	63	70	5	6 9	62	63	63	65	62	<b>6</b> 9		12.	63	-
5					ļ	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	in.	0	0	0	۴.		00	20	•
÷.			e			61	66	66	71	67	68	• •	<b>6</b> 6	71	69	70	69		~		2
N	01																		-	-	
Š						•	60	•	-	m	-	e	0		60	80	0.		00	58	m
			1			75	8	80	80	81	82	6 . 60	5	88	8	82	86		12.	8 2	e
	•••								•••		••			••	•••		•••	•••	•••		
e						412	415	416	427	919	416	413	417	416	418	417	415		12	416	3 6
	5 U C		4			2	14	1	~	~	7	2	2	2	2	2	1			~	
ž	t T																				
2	ŝ					58	63	64	84	\$1	69	61	63	65	67	66	63		12	65	2
9	ក្ន	3	m			14	1	-	14	1	14	4	14	1	1	1	1			14	<b>\$</b>
	110	Ŭ																			
يد ب	L to					٥	0	4	ş	1	4	0	ŝ	80	2	7	•		6	80	2
4	Mon		2			33	35	36	43	35	36	9 4	37	36	3.7	3.7	35			36	23.
ŝ	-																				
	••	••	••			•	••	••			•••		••				••		•-		
															4	ч			, s d		> <b>e</b>
		p t e				ш I	AR	2 UT	12	12	hin	hin	hin	h L n	Sta	S t a	30		<b>3</b>	4 j e	р р
		00				005	LST.	- 2 2	<b>4</b> E	<b>6</b> - 6	dn	d n t	d'n 1	dnu	5	u	2-2		0	, e r	lar
								ø		ш	å	Ä	å	ā	Ę	ž	2		bei	ź	a n d
		H																	E J N		<b>8</b>
•	••	••	••	••	•••		••			••	••			••		••	••				••
		ř	L.			2.7	03	60	16	53	<b>6</b>	33	÷2 :	<b>4</b> 5	24	4	2.9				
		vel	a a			81	18	17	18	18	18	8	18	18	18	18	18				
		ω	ž																		



.

.





(8P) WIV

8.3 Community Noise

In addition to measuring the ALm and SEL values, a community noise analyzer was deployed during the monitoring program. Lourly readings during the test period indicated that the Leq value ranged from 58 to 60 dBA. These samples included on the average 20 helicopter operations including approaches, takeoff, and flybys at Lakefront. Figures 4 and 5 show the relation of helicopter noise and the existing ambient levels. It is clearly shown that at a distance of approximately 1500 ft. and beyond from the centerline microphone, the noise associated with the helicopter was barely above the ambient levels. Other sources of noise in the community showed ALm readings ranging from 58 to 66 dBA for cars and trucks and 72 dBA for buses. During the three day monitoring period when there was a high number of helicopter operations, there were no known noise complaints received at the airport due to the operations from the helicopters based at the airport for the the HAI Convention.

#### 9.0 Summary

The FAA conducted a field noise monitoring program of helicopter operations at a busy general aviation airport. The purpose was to collect helicopter noise data as a continuing effort from the FAA to assess helicopter noise in different urban areas. The data collected emphasized landing approaches and indicated that there was a consistency between the noise levels measured for each helicopter model. The FAA had the opportunity to evaluate the potential impact of a high frequency of helicopter events in a residential community adjacent to a heliport.



0.0000



100000 

1.5.5.5

and the second second

During the test period there were no known noise complaints received at the airport from the helicopter operations. In this case, the helicopters did not appear to impact significantly sites 1500 ft away. The lower data recovery, specifically SEL, at monitoring sites in the community reflects this fact. In most instances, this was due to the fact that the noise levels from the helicopters were barely distinguishable from the existing ambient noise levels at distances of 1500 ft and beyond.

545555

STATES PROPERTY IN THE PROPERTY

Appendix A

I.

20

Selected Specifications of Helicopter Types Monitored During the Test

### Aerospatiale 355 F Twin Star

Sec.

Ser.

े. . . . .

Sixing

Power Plant	(2) Allison 250C-20F, 420 shp each
Main Rotor Diameter	35.1 ft
Tail Rotor Diameter	6.1 ft
Empty Weight	2840 lbs
Gross Weight	5071 1bs
Height	10.1 ft
Length	42.6 ft
Width	6.9 ft

### Aerospatiale AStar

Power Plant	(1) Avo Lycoming LTS 101-600A2, 615 shp
Main Rotor Diameter	35.1 ft
Tail Rotor Diameter	6.1 ft
Empty Weight	2,432 lbs
Gross Weight	4,300 lbs
Height	10.3 ft
Length	42.6 ft
Width	6.9 ft

Aerospatiale Dauphin

1.2.2

Power Plant	(1) Turbomeca Astazou XVIII, 872 shp
Main Rotor Diamter	37.7 ft
Tail Rotor Diameter	3.0 ft
Empty Weight	2,900 lbs
Gross Weight	5,291 lbs
Height	10.2 ft
Length	42.6 ft
Width	6.9 ft

Bell 206L-III

Power Plant	(1) Allison 250-C30P, 650 shp
Main Rotor Diameter	37.0 ft
Tail Rotor Diameter	5.42 ft
Empty Weight	2,200 lbs
Gross W <b>eight</b>	4,150 lbs
Height	10.25 ft
Length	42.7 ft
Width	7.7 ft

Be11 222UT

Power Plant	(2) Lycoming LTS 101-750C, 684 shp each
Main Rotor Diameter	42 ft
Tail Rotor Diamter	6.88 ft
Empty Weight	4,874 lbs
Gross Weight	8,250 lbs
Height	10.42 ft
Length	50 ft
Width	10.25 ft

# Be]] 412

Power Plant	(2) P&W PT6T-3B, 900 shp
Main Rotor Diameter	46.0 ft
Tail Kotor Diameter	8.5 ft
Empty Weight	6,470 lbs
Gross Weight	11,900 lbs
Height	15.1 ft
Length	56.0 ft
Width	9.3 ft



000000000

.



which

KG K

ALT STATE AND A THE ALT AND

 $\sim$ 

# Hughes 500E

8

ŝ

22.22

Power Plant	(1) Allison 250-C20B, 420 shp
Main Rotor Diameter	26.35 ft
Tail Rotor Diameter	4.58 ft
Empty Weight	1,455 lbs
Gross Weight	3,000 lbs
Height	9.18 ft
Length	30.8 ft
Width	6.07 ft

### Hughes 530F

Power Plant	(1) Allison 250-C30, 650 shp
Main Rotor Diameter	27.4 ft
Tail Rotor Diameter	4.75 ft
Empty Weight	1,585 1bs
Gross Weight	3,100 lbs
Height	9.18 ft
Length	32.06 ft
Width	6.07 ft



.



100.000

All a star of a star

Westland WG-30

Power Plant	(2) GE CT7-2B, 1,615 shp
Main Rotor Diameter	43.67 ft
Tail Rotor Diameter	8.0 tt
Empty Weight	7,875 1Ъв
Gross Weight	12,800 lbs
Height	15.5 ft
Length	46.67 ft
Width	10.17 ft

ł





and support sources and



No. And No.

