

## **Air traffic assignment based on daily population mobility to reduce aircraft noise effects and fuel consumption**

Ho-Huu, Vinh; Ganić, Emir; Hartjes, Sander; Babić, Obrad; Curran, Richard

**DOI**

[10.1016/j.trd.2019.04.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2019.04.007)

**Publication date**

2019

**Document Version**

Accepted author manuscript

**Published in**

Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment

**Citation (APA)**

Ho-Huu, V., Ganić, E., Hartjes, S., Babić, O., & Curran, R. (2019). Air traffic assignment based on daily population mobility to reduce aircraft noise effects and fuel consumption. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 72, 127-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2019.04.007>

**Important note**

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

**Takedown policy**

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## Air traffic assignment based on daily population mobility to reduce aircraft noise effects and fuel consumption

Vinh Ho-Huu<sup>a,\*†</sup>, Emir Ganić<sup>b,\*†</sup>, Sander Hartjes<sup>a</sup>, Obrad Babić<sup>b</sup>, Richard Curran<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Faculty of Aerospace Engineering, Delft University of Technology, P.O. Box 5058, 2600 GB Delft, The Netherlands

<sup>b</sup>Faculty of Transport and Traffic Engineering, University of Belgrade, 305 Vojvode Stepe Street, Belgrade, Serbia

E-mails: [v.hohuu@tudelft.nl](mailto:v.hohuu@tudelft.nl) (Vinh Ho-Huu)

[e.ganic@sf.bg.ac.rs](mailto:e.ganic@sf.bg.ac.rs) (Emir Ganić)

[s.hartjes@tudelft.nl](mailto:s.hartjes@tudelft.nl) (Sander Hartjes)

[o.babic@sf.bg.ac.rs](mailto:o.babic@sf.bg.ac.rs) (Obrad Babić)

[r.curran@tudelft.nl](mailto:r.curran@tudelft.nl) (Richard Curran)

\*Corresponding authors: [v.hohuu@tudelft.nl](mailto:v.hohuu@tudelft.nl); [e.ganic@sf.bg.ac.rs](mailto:e.ganic@sf.bg.ac.rs)

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

### Abstract

The paper first investigates the influence of daily mobility of population on evaluation of aircraft noise effects. Then, a new air traffic assignment model that considers this activity is proposed. The main objective is to reduce the number of people affected by noise via lowering as much as possible the noise exposure level  $L_{den}$  of individuals or groups of people who commute to the same locations during the day. It is hereby intended to reduce the noise impact upon individuals rather than to reduce the impact in particular— typically densely populated – areas. However, sending aircraft farther away from populated regions to reduce noise impact may increase fuel burn, thus affecting airline costs and sustainability. Therefore, a multi-objective optimization approach is utilized to obtain reasonable solutions that comply with overall air transport sustainability. The method aims at generating a set of solutions that provide proper balance between noise annoyance and fuel consumption. The reliability and applicability of the proposed method are validated through a real case study at Belgrade airport in Serbia. The investigation shows that there is a difference between the number of people annoyed (NPA) evaluated based on the census data and the NPA evaluated based on the mobility data. In addition, these numbers differ significantly across residential locations. The optimal results show that the proposed model can offer a considerable reduction in the

60  
61  
62 NPA, and in some cases, it can gain up to 77%, while maintaining the same level of fuel  
63  
64 consumption compared with the reference case.  
65  
66

67 **Keywords:** Air traffic noise; airport noise; aircraft noise; noise annoyance; fuel consumption;  
68 multi-objective optimization.  
69  
70

## 71 72 **1. Introduction** 73

74  
75 Proper allocation of aircraft to departure and arrival routes may play an important role in  
76  
77 reducing aircraft noise effects on communities located near airports, and this issue has  
78  
79 attracted considerable attention of researchers and authorities over the years. Although this  
80  
81 topic has been well studied, research is often conducted based on census data, and hence it is  
82  
83 assumed that people remain at the same location throughout the day. In reality, however,  
84  
85 people spend substantial portion of the day at school, work or other places outside their  
86  
87 homes. Consequently, analyses of daily population mobility have been considered in many  
88  
89 transportation studies (Hatzopoulou and Miller, 2010; Jiang et al., 2017; Kaddoura et al.,  
90  
91 2016; Novák and Sýkora, 2007) as an important factor for a more precise estimation of noise  
92  
93 effects. Nevertheless, there is a lack of this kind of research for air traffic assignment  
94  
95 problems. This paper, therefore, first investigates the influence of population's daily mobility  
96  
97 upon evaluation of aircraft noise effects. Then, a new air traffic assignment model that takes  
98  
99 daily movement of population into account is proposed. In the proposed model, the main  
100  
101 objective is to minimize the number of people affected by aircraft noise while maintaining  
102  
103 fuel consumption as low as possible. In order to achieve this purpose, a multi-objective  
104  
105 optimization approach is utilized herein. The method aims at producing a set of solutions that  
106  
107 are able to deliver a proper balance between conflicting objectives, i.e., noise annoyance and  
108  
109 fuel consumption. An extensive review of the literature that served as the background and that  
110  
111 motivated the authors to conduct this research is presented below.  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118

119  
120  
121 Over the years, significant efforts have been devoted to relieving the noise impact as well  
122  
123 as to reducing fuel consumption and pollutant emissions. At the European level, a legislative  
124  
125 framework **has been introduced**, namely the Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC  
126  
127 (END) (EC, 2002) for the assessment and management of environmental noise. **The Directive**  
128  
129 **regulated the obligation to develop strategic noise maps and noise action plans with the aim of**  
130  
131 **avoiding, preventing and reducing the harmful effects of noise on public health, and these**  
132  
133 **have been successfully implemented at many airports (Glekas et al., 2016; Vogiatzis, 2014,**  
134  
135 **2012). After more than 15 years of enforcement, both the implementation review and the**  
136  
137 **evaluation of END have been done twice so far, addressing questions related to effectiveness,**  
138  
139 **efficiency, coherence, relevance and EU added value (European Commission, 2016). In**  
140  
141 **addition, common noise assessment methods (CNOSSOS-EU) for the determination of the**  
142  
143 **noise indicators  $L_{den}$  and  $L_{night}$  have been adopted by the EC through the revision of Annex II**  
144  
145 **of the END in 2015 (Coelho et al., 2011; Kephelopoulos et al., 2014; Vogiatzis and Remy,**  
146  
147 **2014). CNOSSOS-EU has been developed to improve the consistency and the comparability**  
148  
149 **of noise assessment results across the EU member states, providing a harmonized framework**  
150  
151 **for assessment of each noise source covered by END. Upon the release of the Directive,**  
152  
153 numerous initiatives to reduce fuel consumption and emissions have been launched in recent  
154  
155 years, **as well**. The examples include the Atlantic Interoperability Initiative to Reduce  
156  
157 Emissions (AIRE)<sup>1</sup>, Asia and South Pacific Initiative to Reduce Emissions (ASPIRE)<sup>2</sup>, ACI  
158  
159 Airport Carbon Accreditation<sup>3</sup>, and **the** European Advanced Biofuels Flightpath<sup>4</sup>.  
160  
161  
162  
163

164 In addition to **the above** initiatives that require enormous budgets and focus more on  
165  
166 strategical levels, at a practical level it has been observed that the variation of aircraft/airport  
167  
168 operational procedures is one of the feasible options **that** could bring short-term  
169  
170

---

171 <sup>1</sup>[https://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/air/environment/aire\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/air/environment/aire_en) (assessed 9 September 2018)

172 <sup>2</sup><https://aviationbenefits.org/case-studies/aspire/> (assessed 9 September 2018)

173 <sup>3</sup><https://www.airportcarbonaccreditation.org/> (assessed 9 September 2018)

174 <sup>4</sup><https://www.biofuelsflightpath.eu/about> (assessed 9 September 2018)  
175  
176  
177



178  
179  
180 improvements and could be less costly (Marais et al., 2013). From this perspective, literature  
181  
182 shows that research efforts in designing optimal departure and arrival routes with less noise  
183  
184 and fuel burn have been well studied over the past decades, and various strategies have been  
185  
186 proposed (Prats et al., 2011; Visser, 2005; Visser and Wijnen, 2001). Recently, with the  
187  
188 utilization of multi-objective optimization techniques, research has also demonstrated that the  
189  
190 obtained optimal routes are beneficial not only from the noise perspective, but also in terms of  
191  
192 fuel burn (Ho-Huu et al., 2017; Vinh Ho-Huu et al., 2018; Torres et al., 2011; Zhang et al.,  
193  
194 2018). In addition to efforts invested to improve environmentally friendly departure and  
195  
196 arrival routes, optimal distribution of aircraft and operational procedures to specific routes  
197  
198 could also contribute significantly to environmental impact decrease (Frair, 1984; Heblj et  
199  
200 al., 2007; Kuiper et al., 2013; Netjasov, 2008; Nibourg et al., 2012; Zachary et al., 2011,  
201  
202 2010).

203  
204  
205 In order to assess the impact of flight operations on communities located near airports, it  
206  
207 is critical to include distribution data of populations in the vicinity of airports, as done in a  
208  
209 number of previous studies. However, census data takes into account only the homes of  
210  
211 people, whereas, in reality, people spend substantial portions of the day at work, school,  
212  
213 university or other places away from their residential locations. Consequently, the population  
214  
215 may experience noise exposures which are very different from the ones predicted when using  
216  
217 only the census data. One of the first studies that has called attention to the drawback of  
218  
219 relying on census data was carried out by Ott (1982). In this study, the author shows that  
220  
221 employees and students usually spend a long time away from their residential locations, and  
222  
223 this leads to a different overall impact of, in this case, air pollutants. The same observation is  
224  
225 also recognized in a recent study by Kaddoura et al. (2017). In this work, the authors suggest  
226  
227 that the evaluation of population's exposure to road traffic noise should take spatial and  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236

237  
238  
239 temporal variations in the population into account, because the use of static data would lead to  
240  
241 an overassessment.  
242

243 One of the first **air traffic assignment** studies that **takes** daily mobility of population into  
244  
245 account was done by **Ganić et al. (2018)**. In this study, however, the evaluation of noise  
246  
247 effects is based only on the change of population at several locations through three different  
248  
249 periods of **day**, and is hence treated as three separate optimization problems. Furthermore, the  
250  
251 model of air traffic assignment developed in **Ganić et al. (2018)** has some limitations, as well.  
252  
253 The problem was formulated as a binary nonlinear optimization problem, in which, for each  
254  
255 operation, every feasible assignment of routes was considered a decision variable. Therefore,  
256  
257 the size of the problem is **rather** large and hence **it is** difficult to solve **the problem** when the  
258  
259 number of aircraft operations increases. In addition, only the noise objective is considered,  
260  
261 while fuel consumption and local air quality are not considered, and these may very well be  
262  
263 adversely affected.  
264  
265

266  
267 Motivated by the above limitations, the authors of this paper considered the information  
268  
269 **on** daily mobility of population in the air traffic assignment model. To evaluate whether the  
270  
271 inclusion of mobility data is necessary or not, the influence of census and mobility data on  
272  
273 evaluation of noise effects is investigated first. Then, a new air traffic assignment model that  
274  
275 is capable of taking daily mobility of population into account is developed. In order to reduce  
276  
277 the number of people affected by aircraft noise, the noise exposure level  $L_{den}$  is **calculated** for  
278  
279 each individual or group of people who commute to the same locations during **an** entire day  
280  
281 from 00:00 to 24:00 hours. Afterwards, a noise annoyance criterion recommended by **EEA**  
282  
283 **(2010)** is employed to obtain the number of people annoyed. Furthermore, to acquire optimal  
284  
285 solutions which are able to balance **between** noise impact and fuel consumption **effectively**, a  
286  
287 bi-objective optimization problem is formulated. In addition, since the considered problem is  
288  
289 an integer nonlinear multi-objective optimization problem, it is **rather** difficult to solve **it** by  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295

296  
297  
298 nonlinear optimization programming models as applied in [Ganić et al. \(2018\)](#). To allow the  
299  
300 problem to be solved **with** a multi-objective evolutionary algorithm, a new problem  
301  
302 formulation is proposed. In the proposed formulation, each operation is considered a decision  
303  
304 variable, and its feasible assignments of routes, after taking into account wind conditions,  
305  
306 runway configurations and separation minima, are considered its search space. **With the**  
307  
308 **application of** this formulation, the size of the problem reduces significantly, and hence the  
309  
310 problem can be solved **effectively** by employing an evolutionary algorithm. The proposed  
311  
312 approach is then applied to a real case study at Belgrade airport in Serbia.  
313  
314

315 The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, first the problem definition is  
316  
317 presented, and then the mathematical formulation and data preparation are described in detail.  
318  
319 Section 3 provides a brief description of the optimization method, namely the non-dominated  
320  
321 sorting genetic algorithm (NSGA-II) which is applied to solve the formulated problem. The  
322  
323 Belgrade airport case study is presented in Section 4. The results and discussion are presented  
324  
325 in Section 5. Finally, some conclusions, remarks and ideas for future work are **presented** in  
326  
327 Section 6.  
328  
329

## 330 **2. Problem definition**

331  
332  
333 **This section presents** the model of the air traffic assignment problem in detail. The main idea  
334  
335 of the formulated problem is to assign aircraft to suitable routes with the aim of minimizing  
336  
337 noise impact on communities close to the airport and fuel consumption. First, the  
338  
339 mathematical form is presented. Then, the preparation of the input data is described.  
340  
341  
342

### 343 **2.1. Mathematical formulation**

344  
345  
346 The mathematical model of the optimization problem is formed based on several assumptions  
347  
348 which are explained in detail in subsection 2.2. The model is described through three  
349  
350 components: notations, decision variables, and objective functions, as follows.  
351  
352  
353  
354

355  
356  
357 **Notations:**  
358

359  $O$  is the set of aircraft movements departing from and arriving at an airport during a  
360 considered day;  
361  
362

363  $S_i$  is the set of feasible routes to which aircraft movement  $i$  can be assigned, and which takes  
364 into account runway configuration, wind conditions and separation minima,  $i \in O$ ;  
365  
366

367  $L$  is the number of considered locations;  
368

369  $J$  is the set of individual persons or groups of people commuting to the same location during  
370 an entire day (from 00:00 to 24:00 hour);  
371  
372

373  $T$  is the number of time periods;  
374

375  $SEL_{ilt}$  is the sound exposure noise level (SEL) generated by the movement  $i$  at the time  $t$  and  
376 the location  $l$ ,  $i \in O$ ,  $t \in T$ ,  $l \in L$ ;  
377  
378

379  $p_j$  is the number of people in the group of people  $j$  who commute to the same location at the  
380 same time during the day,  $j \in J$ ;  
381  
382  
383

384  
385 **Decision variables:**  
386

387  $x_i$  is an integer design variable of route assignment of the movement  $i$ , which is selected from  
388 the set of feasible operational options  $S_i$  ( $x_i \in S_i$ ). It should be noted that the noise level  $SEL$   
389 at all locations in  $L$  and the fuel consumption for an entire flight are predefined for each  
390 option within  $S_i$ .  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395

396  $\mathbf{x}$  is the vector of the design variable  $x_i$ , containing the optimal assignments of all movements  
397 to routes.  
398

399  
400 **Objective functions:**  
401

402 With the aim of finding optimal solutions that are capable of balancing effectively between  
403 the number of people affected by aircraft noise and fuel consumption, an optimization  
404 problem with two objectives is considered. The first one is the total number of people  
405 annoyed (hereinafter referred to as NPA), which is defined as follows:  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413

$$NPA(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in J} \%PA_j \cdot p_j \quad (1)$$

where  $\%PA_j$  is the percentage of the group of people  $j$  who are annoyed due to being exposed to a certain level of aircraft noise. According to [EEA \(2010\)](#), it is based on the  $L_{den}$  cumulative noise metric, and estimated as follows:

$$\%PA_j = 8.588 \times 10^{-6} (L_{den_j} - 37)^3 + 1.777 \times 10^{-2} (L_{den_j} - 37)^2 + 1.221 (L_{den_j} - 37) \quad (2)$$

where  $L_{den_j}$  is the day-evening-night noise level to which the group of people  $j$  is exposed during the day, and it is determined as follows:

$$L_{den_j} = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{1}{T_d} \left( \sum_{i \in O} \sum_{t \in T} 10^{\frac{SEL_{i,t} + w_{den}}{10}} \right) \right), \forall j \quad (3)$$

where  $w_{den} = \{0, 5, 10\}$  is the weighting factor to account for day, evening and night time operations, and it is defined based on the time at which the movement  $i$  takes place.  $T_d$  is the considered time period of an entire day in seconds ( $T_d = 24 \times 3600$  seconds). It should be noted that, for further analyses in the later sections, the number of people who are highly annoyed (hereinafter referred to as NPHA) is used as well. [This criterion](#) is also developed by [EEA \(2010\)](#) and defined as follows:

$$NPHA(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in J} \%PHA_j \cdot p_j \quad (4)$$

where  $\%PHA_j$  is the percentage of the group of people  $j$  who are highly annoyed due to [their exposure](#) to a certain level of aircraft noise, and it is calculated by

$$\%PHA_j = 9.199 \times 10^{-5} (L_{den_j} - 42)^3 + 3.932 \times 10^{-2} (L_{den_j} - 42)^2 + 0.2939 (L_{den_j} - 42) \quad (5)$$

473  
474  
475 The second objective is the total fuel burn. The EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission  
476 inventory guidebook – 2016 (Part B: sectoral guidance chapters, 1.A.3.a Aviation 2016)  
477 (Winther et al., 2017) is used to calculate the fuel consumption for each operation.  
478  
479

480  
481 Particularly, the LTO and Master Emission calculators in Annex 5 of this document, which  
482 use the data from the ICAO Aircraft Engine Emissions Databank (ICAO, 2017), are applied.  
483  
484 These calculations have been done in the previous study (Ganić et al., 2018), and they are  
485  
486 again to be used in this research. Then, the fuel objective is defined as follows:  
487  
488

$$489 \quad T_{fuel}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in O} fuel(x_i) \quad (6)$$

490  
491 where  $fuel(x_i)$  is the fuel consumption for the movement  $i$ .  
492  
493

## 494 495 496 **2.2. Data requirements**

497  
498 As described in the notations, the model needs the following input data:  
499

- 500 • air traffic data,
- 501
- 502 • departure and arrival routes for each runway with a predefined set of feasible routes,
- 503
- 504 • population locations,
- 505
- 506 • noise data for each location caused by all aircraft operating on all feasible routes,
- 507
- 508 • fuel consumption of all aircraft operating on all feasible routes,
- 509
- 510 • population data,
- 511
- 512 • daily mobility patterns.
- 513
- 514
- 515

516 The air traffic data includes information about origin and destination, aircraft type, actual  
517 take-off time, arrival time, and runway in use. This information can be obtained from Air  
518 Traffic Control. Real radar data can be used to represent departure and arrival routes, or the  
519 routes can be obtained from Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP). In this research  
520 radar data were used. Runway configuration, wind condition forecasts from METAR reports  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531

532  
533  
534 and separation minimum are taken into account to determine the set of feasible routes for each  
535  
536 aircraft operation.

538 The noise levels caused by each aircraft movement on all feasible routes need to be  
539 determined a priori and stored in a database. The locations at which the noise is determined  
540 coincide with the census data and the data on population's daily mobility. Considering the low  
541 level of detail required for this research, each settlement can be represented as a single point,  
542 i.e., location since it is not required to observe each housing unit in particular.

549 The fuel consumption is calculated by using the EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission  
550 inventory guidebook – 2016 (Winther et al., 2017). Fuel burn for Landing and Take-Off  
551 (LTO) flight phases is assessed by using the origin and destination information of airports, as  
552 well as aircraft type (engine type, number of engines), duration for each LTO phase (taxi, take  
553 off, climb out, approach) and rate of fuel burn (kg/s/engine). For Climb/Cruise/Descent  
554 (CCD) flight phases fuel consumption is calculated based on CCD stage length and aircraft  
555 type.

564 Static population data are collected for each location based on the census data. Census  
565 data essentially represent home addresses of the population. To account for daily mobility  
566 patterns the population is divided into groups of people commuting to the same locations  
567 during the day at the same time period. Daily mobility presented in this paper includes a  
568 special form of spatial mobility of economically active populations (who perform an  
569 occupation), pupils and students. This data for each municipality around the airport is  
570 available at National Statistical Office (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2013).

### 579 3. Optimization algorithm

582 As described in Section 2, the formulated problem is an integer nonlinear optimization  
583 problem with two objective functions. Thus, it is rather challenging to solve it using gradient-  
584 based optimization methods or nonlinear programming models. The difficulties lie in two

591 aspects. Firstly, the decision variables are options **that** do not link directly to the objective  
592 functions, and hence they are difficult to solve **with** gradient-based optimization methods and  
593 nonlinear programming models. Secondly, even under the assumption that these models can  
594 be applied, they need to be combined with other techniques, such as weight methods, to solve  
595 the multi-objective optimization problem. Nevertheless, it is still hard to decide which weight  
596 vectors should be used. **In addition**, it is challenging to obtain a well-distributed Pareto front  
597 by **applying** these approaches when the considered problem is nonlinear.

608 Fortunately, many evolutionary algorithms capable of effectively dealing with **similar**  
609 problem have been proposed in recent years. Among them, the non-dominated sorting genetic  
610 algorithm II (NSGA-II) proposed by [Deb et al. \(2002\)](#) has emerged as one of the most  
611 powerful methods. The algorithm has been successfully applied in **various** engineering  
612 applications, for instance, structural optimization problems ([Thang et al., 2018](#); [Vo-Duy et al.,](#)  
613 [2017](#)), scheduling problems ([Martínez-Puras and Pacheco, 2016](#); [Wang et al., 2017](#)),  
614 allocation problems ([Abouei and Taghi, 2018](#); [Alikar et al., 2017](#)), noise abatement departure  
615 trajectories ([Hartjes and Visser, 2016](#)), etc.

625 The NSGA-II algorithm is the improved version of NSGA developed earlier by [Srinivas](#)  
626 [and Deb \(1994\)](#) with a fast non-dominated sorting procedure and a crowded-comparison  
627 technique. Due to the outstanding features of these techniques, the performance of NSGA-II  
628 has been significantly enhanced in comparison to the previous version. In NSGA-II, the  
629 optimization process is started with a random number of solutions called the initial population  
630  $P_t$ , in which  $t$  is the generation. Then, for each candidate solution in the population, the  
631 objective functions are evaluated. In order to gradually evolve the population towards the  
632 optimal solutions, from the previous (parent) population, an offspring population  $Q_t$  is  
633 generated by using genetic operators, such as tournament selection, crossover and mutation.  
634 Similarly, the objective function information of these solutions is also assessed. Next, both the  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649



parent population and the offspring population are combined and denoted as  $R_t$ . From the combined population  $R_t$ , the fast non-dominated sorting procedure and the crowded-comparison technique are applied to obtain a new population  $P_{t+1}$  for the next generation. The algorithm repeats the same procedures until the maximum generation or a stopping condition is reached. Once the search process of the algorithm is terminated, the set of optimal solutions called the Pareto front is obtained. They are non-dominated solutions that can provide a sound basis for users to make decisions. A brief description of NSGA-II for one generation is shown in Fig. 1 (Deb et al., 2002).




Fig. 1. Illustration of NSGA-II procedure.

Due to its outstanding performance, NSGA-II has been implemented in various programming languages including MATLAB, which is used in this paper. However, this version handles only the optimization problem with continuous design variables. Therefore, to enable the algorithm to solve the presented problem with integer design variables, a rounding technique is applied. By using this technique, whenever the algorithm introduces new candidate solutions, these solutions are all rounded to their nearest integer values before their objective functions are evaluated. Although the technique is rather simple, it has been demonstrated to be effective when dealing with discrete and integer design variables in evolutionary algorithms (V. Ho-Huu et al., 2018).

#### 4. Case study: Belgrade Airport

In order to validate and demonstrate the reliability and applicability of the proposed approach, Belgrade Airport is selected as the case study in this paper. The airport is the largest and the busiest international airport in Serbia, located 18 km west of the Belgrade capital. With a single runway 3,400 m long (direction 12/30), the airport handled more than 5 million passengers and approximately 60 thousand aircraft operations in 2018.

As presented in Section 2, detailed air traffic data is required to prepare the input data for the model. The operations on September 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016 were chosen as it was a summer day with relatively heavy traffic. In addition, some of the data have been already available from the previous study (Ganić et al., 2016), which included measured noise levels at locations near the airport as well. Daily traffic comprised of 220 operations, consisting of 109 departures and 111 arrivals. The distribution of operations between runways was slightly in favor of runway 12, which handled 128 operations (58.2%), while runway 30 was used for 92 operations (41.8%). Departure and arrival routes for each runway were obtained from the radar data (flightradar24.com) because the Standard Instrument Departure (SID) and Standard Arrival Routes (STAR) could be less accurate, as most aircraft are vectored at Belgrade Airport.

From the radar tracks presented in Fig. 2a, 27 representative routes were selected, each representing a SID or STAR route. There are seven departure routes and seven arrival routes from runway 12 (Fig. 2b), and six departure routes and seven arrival routes from runway 30 (Fig. 2c). Departure routes are marked blue, and arrival routes are marked red. Note that since operations in solutions obtained by the proposed model could be assigned to arrival/departure routes that are different from the ones assigned in the reference case (the base-case scenario), the routes shown in Fig. 2b and Fig. 2c are complemented by parts of the route which connect them with border corridors applied in the reference case. For more details, interested readers may refer to Ganić et al. (2018). Noise and fuel data have to be defined for each aircraft type.

768  
769  
770 For the observed day, the fleet mix consisted of 25 different aircraft types. However, in an  
771 effort to simplify the calculations, the aircraft were classified into 11 groups based on the  
772 similarity of aircraft types **using principles of acoustic equivalency and noise significance**  
773 **(ECAC, 2016)**. Thereby, 85% of the operations are presented by the aircraft types that were  
774 actually operated that day, while the remaining 15% are presented by aircraft types that have  
775 approximately the same level of noise exposure and fuel consumption as their representative  
776 type. **Table 1** shows the number of departure and arrival operations for different periods with  
777 different aircraft types that are categorized based on the INM **(Federal Aviation**  
778 **Administration, 2007)**. **The classification of these aircraft types in AzB databases is also**  
779 **provided and it can be used as an alternative when the AzB noise model is applied (AzB-08,**  
780 **2008; Isermann and Vogelsang, 2010).**




Fig. 2. Radar data and representative departure and arrival routes (source: Flightradar24.com using QGIS).

827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885

Table 1. Flight statistics and aircraft classifications

Aircraft type	Assigned AzB class	INM airplane code	Departure			Arrival		
			Day	Evening	Night	Day	Evening	Night
Boeing 737-300	S 5.2	737300	6	1	1	5	2	2
Boeing 737-800	S 5.2	737800	2	2	1	3	0	1
Airbus A319	S 5.2	A319-131	18	5	5	19	2	8
Airbus A320	S 5.2	A320-211	15	3	3	14	3	5
Airbus A330-200	S 6.1	A330-301	1	1	0	0	1	1
Beechcraft King Air	P 1.4	CNA441	1	0	1	1	0	0
Cessna 560 XL	S 5.1	CNA560XL	3	0	1	2	1	1
Swearingen Metroliner	P 2.1	DHC6	3	1	0	3	0	1
ATR 42	P 2.1	DHC8	1	3	0	3	1	0
ATR 72	P 2.1	DO328	14	6	5	12	6	8
Embraer 190	S 5.2	EMB190	5	1	0	6	0	0
Total			69	23	17	68	16	27

The sound exposure levels (SEL) at each location caused by each aircraft type on the different routes are calculated by the INM software, which is used as input for the noise objective in the optimization model. For each operation, the standard INM profile settings are used and the fact that different aircraft types overfly locations at different altitudes and thrust settings is taken into account. In addition, different profile parameters for each aircraft type are also assigned, including take-off and landing weights, thrust and flaps settings, climb rate, and descent angle.

Before calculating the noise data, it is crucial to choose reasonable numbers and positions of locations for which the noise data and the population data will be obtained. Since the airport is surrounded by populated areas, 23 different municipalities are considered to be affected by aircraft noise, viz. 17 municipalities of Belgrade and 5 municipalities of Stara Pazova, Indjija, Irig, Ruma, Pecinći and Pančevo. In this case study, the SEL was calculated for 306 locations with each location representing one settlement in these 23 municipalities around the airport. Table 2 shows the population data and the number of settlements/locations for each municipality and for each period of time in accordance with human mobility patterns and 2011 census data (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2013).



886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944

**Table 2.** Population data and the number of settlements for municipalities around the airport.

Municipality	Number of settlements	Census population (2011)	Period				
			1	2	3	4	5
Barajevo	14	27,110	25,050	24,422	26,020	25,559	26,497
Čukarica	9	181,231	166,349	159,679	172,064	168,848	176,209
Grocka	15	83,907	76,011	73,679	78,942	78,573	81,748
Lazarevac	34	58,622	60,304	62,146	59,584	60,969	59,545
Mladenovac	22	53,096	51,297	51,024	52,022	52,108	52,752
Novi Beograd	16	214,506	222,238	226,900	218,799	222,321	217,613
Obrenovac	29	72,524	69,586	68,859	70,803	70,635	71,802
Palilula	13	173,521	176,540	174,006	175,343	172,061	172,950
Rakovica	13	108,641	96,108	90,980	100,827	98,808	104,699
Savski venac	1	39,122	75,290	88,058	61,474	65,749	49,778
Sopot	17	20,367	19,270	19,054	19,930	19,711	20,122
Stari grad	1	48,450	88,436	96,797	73,554	71,702	57,748
Surčin	7	43,819	41,546	41,638	42,342	43,130	43,544
Voždovac	24	158,213	160,242	155,406	159,370	153,766	156,380
Vračar	1	56,333	64,953	66,643	61,698	61,250	58,312
Zemun	5	168,170	170,663	169,291	169,851	167,703	167,986
Zvezdara	11	151,808	147,073	140,364	148,991	143,108	148,303
Pančevo	10	123,414	119,466	119,439	121,154	121,946	122,873
Indžija	11	47,433	45,032	44,657	46,029	46,160	46,930
Irig	12	10,866	10,336	10,328	10,533	10,669	10,786
Pećinci	15	19,720	18,965	19,155	19,447	19,579	19,670
Ruma	17	54,339	51,925	52,171	52,991	53,643	54,060
Stara Pazova	9	65,792	61,430	61,113	63,249	63,797	65,018
<b>Total</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>1,981,004</b>	<b>2,018,110</b>	<b>2015809</b>	<b>2,005,017</b>	<b>1,991,795</b>	<b>1,985,325</b>
People living in other municipalities, but commuting to these 23 municipalities or vice versa		88,942	51,836	54,137	64,929	78,151	84,621

In order to take into account human mobility patterns and to simulate working shifts of employees, pupils and students, the day has been divided into five periods, as shown in Fig. 3. The periods are defined in such a way that the number of people at each location remains constant for the duration of the period. This data was made available by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia.

Group Number	Period → Time of the day →	Period 1 08:00 - 14:00	Period 2 14:00 - 16:00	Period 3 16:00 - 20:00	Period 4 20:00 - 22:00	Period 5 22:00 - 08:00
1	Employees 1 <sup>st</sup> shift	Working location		Residential location		
2	Employees 2 <sup>nd</sup> shift	Residential location	Working location		Residential location	
3	Employees 3 <sup>rd</sup> shift	Residential location		Working location		
4	Students 1 <sup>st</sup> shift	Studying location	Residential location			
5	Students 2 <sup>nd</sup> shift	Residential location	Studying location		Residential location	
6	Staying at home	Residential location				
Number of aircraft movements		76	14	51	13	66

**Fig. 3.** Groups of people and periods based on working shifts of employees, pupils and students.

945  
946  
947 The definition provided in the 2011 Census methodology describes daily migrants as  
948 persons who work or go to school/university outside the place of their usual residence, but  
949 they return on a daily basis or several times a week (Statistical Office of the Republic of  
950 Serbia, 2013). The daily mobility data is the key to calculate the total daily inflow and  
951 outflow of inhabitants for each settlement. This was used as the basis to calculate groups of  
952 people commuting to the same location at the same period of time during the day.  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959

960 Having in mind that human mobility patterns are obtained for the whole day only, and not  
961 for separate periods of the day, some assumptions are needed in order to assess how many  
962 people would actually be present at each location during a defined period of time. Therefore,  
963 it has been assumed that 50% of employees work first shift, 30% work second shift, and 20%  
964 work night shift. Out of the total pupils and students going to schools or universities, 60%  
965 follows the first shift, and 40% the second. Hereby, 76,423 groups of people were observed,  
966 and the population data calculated based on the census data and the daily mobility data show a  
967 difference in the number of people at each location in the pre-defined periods. The total  
968 number of residents living within these 306 locations based on the census data was 1,981,004.  
969 This research also includes the mobility of people living outside the 23 municipalities  
970 mentioned above, but working or studying in some of these municipalities, and vice versa.  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982

983 By comparing the total number of people for different periods with the census population  
984 data, it can be seen that the highest absolute difference is 2% for Period 1. The reason behind  
985 is the fact that this study takes into account only the daily mobility of employees going to  
986 work and pupils and students going to schools and universities.  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992

## 993 **5. Results and discussions**

994  
995 As mentioned in Section 1, although the influence of the mobility data on evaluation of noise  
996 effects has been well recognized in previous transportation studies (Kaddoura et al., 2017,  
997 2016), the investigation of mobility data influence in air traffic models is still limited.  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003

1004  
1005  
1006 Therefore, before executing the optimization problem, the influence of the mobility patterns  
1007  
1008 on evaluation of aircraft noise effects is assessed first. Afterwards, the optimal solutions based  
1009  
1010 on the mobility data and derived from the proposed model are obtained and analyzed.  
1011  
1012

### 1013 **5.1. Influence of daily population mobility on evaluation of aircraft noise effects**

1014

1015  
1016 In order to assess the influence of census data and mobility data on evaluation of aircraft noise  
1017  
1018 effects, the real air traffic operations on 16 September 2016 are used, which is hereinafter  
1019  
1020 referred to as the reference case. The  $L_{den}$  noise contours caused by all the operations are  
1021  
1022 shown in Fig. 4, where the NPA at each (residential) location is also indicated. At first glance,  
1023  
1024 it can be observed that there is a significant difference between the census data and the  
1025  
1026 mobility data among noise-affected locations. In fact, with the census data (depicted by  
1027  
1028 triangles), only people at locations enclosed in the noise contours are affected. Meanwhile,  
1029  
1030 when using the mobility data (depicted by circles), the noise effects occur not only at these  
1031  
1032 locations, but also at locations outside of the noise contours. This can be explained by  
1033  
1034 considering that people who live outside the area affected by aircraft noise may work or study  
1035  
1036 within these areas at some time during the day, and are therefore affected by aircraft noise.  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062




Fig. 4. Illustration of people at locations affected by noise with  $L_{den} \geq 37$  dB.<sup>5</sup>

For a specific evaluation, the NPA at the locations covered by  $L_{den}$  noise contours  $\geq 37$  dB ( $L_{den} \geq 37$  dB), as shown in Fig. 4, is estimated for both datasets and presented in Table 3. As seen from the table, the total NPA at these locations for the census data is 57,519, which is by 2.18% relatively higher (by 1,228 in absolute numbers) than the NPA based on the mobility data. The same situation is observed for the NPHA, where the difference is even higher, 5.24%. These observations show that even though people live inside the noise contours, some of them are still not annoyed by aircraft noise due to their mobility for working or studying purposes to locations far away from the airport.

Table 3. Number of people affected by noise at locations enclosed in  $L_{den} \geq 37$ dB.

Criterion	Census data	Mobility data	Absolute difference	Relative difference
NPA	57,519	56,291	1,228	2.18%
NPHA	10,583	10,056	527	5.24%

Furthermore, in order to see how many people live outside the noise contours, but still experience noise impact, the NPA based on the mobility data at all locations is evaluated and presented in Table 4. The table shows that the total NPA is 60,265, more than 7.05% of whom

<sup>5</sup> All the figures with the Google earth background are created using the open source software, QGIS (<https://qgis.org/en/site/>)



live outside the  $L_{den} \geq 37$  dB. The same trend is observed for the total NPHA as well. This is easily explained when considering that people who live farther away from the airport may still work or study in the areas affected by aircraft noise.

Table 4. Number of people affected by noise based on mobility data.

Criterion	All locations	Only locations enclosed in $L_{den} \geq 37$ dB	Absolute difference	Relative difference
NPA	60,265	56,291	3,974	7.05%
NPHA	10,499	10,056	443	4.40%

Apart from the observations in the above tables, it is also noted that although the absolute difference of the total NPA between the census data and the mobility data is relatively small, the difference in the NPA at each location is rather significant, as shown in Fig. 5. Summarizing the relative difference at all locations compared to the NPA obtained by the census data can add up to 52.9%. This number indicates that there is a significant change in the number of people at each location during the day. For example, for location 220, the NPA based on the census data is 0, while the NPA based on the mobility data is 307; and for location 15, the NPA based on the census data is 8,286, whereas the NPA based on the mobility data is 7,936.




Fig. 5. Difference in the NPA between census data and daily mobility data at all locations.

For a better illustration of the daily mobility of population outside and inside the noise contours, movements at locations 15 and 220 are highlighted in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, respectively. Fig. 6 shows that location 15 is located nearby the airport and enclosed in the noise contours of  $L_{den} > 45$  dB. However, some of the people living at this location may experience less noise than others, as they work or study outside the area. Therefore, the total NPA calculated using the mobility data at this location is less than the NPA obtained by the census data. In contrast, an opposite situation can be observed for location 220 in Fig. 7. At this location, people who live outside the noise contours work or study at locations close to the airport, and hence they can experience significant noise impact. This explains the significant difference in the NPA at each location. In addition, the combined mobility at locations 15 and 220 explains why the difference in the total NPA between the census data and mobility data is relatively small.




Fig. 6. Illustration of population at location 15 commuting outside  $L_{den} \geq 37$  dB.




Fig. 7. Illustration of population at location 220 commuting inside  $L_{den} \geq 37$ .

To enable further examination of the influence that mobility data has on the number of people affected by aircraft noise during the night, the sleep disturbance criteria<sup>6</sup> based on  $L_{night}$  recommended by WHO (2009) are also evaluated. These evaluations are provided in Table 5 and Table 6. As can be seen in the tables, the results obtained by using  $L_{night}$  also have the same trend as those obtained by using  $L_{den}$  even though during the night only the mobility of employees is considered. The explanation for this is that, according to the mobility data, groups of employees account for a significant portion in the mobility of the entire population, which is approximately twice as high as the groups of students. In addition, the noise impact during the night is more sensitive compared to the noise impact during the day and evening, and hence the percentage of disturbed people in each group is higher. Consequently, the mobility data also has a noticeable impact on the estimation of aircraft noise effects during the night.

Table 5. Number of people affected by noise at locations enclosed in  $L_{night}$  noise contour  $\geq 30$  dB.

Criterion	Census data	Mobility data	Absolute difference	Relative difference
NSD	33,750	32,601	1,149	3.52%
NHSD	21,103	20,381	722	3.54%

<sup>6</sup>  $\%SD = 13.714 - 0.807 L_{night} + 0.01555 (L_{night})^2$ , and  $\%HSD = 18.147 - 0.956 L_{night} + 0.01482 (L_{night})^2$ , where  $\%SD$  and  $\%HSD$  are the percentages of the group of people whose sleep is disturbed and highly disturbed, respectively (WHO, 2009).

Table 6. Number of people affected by noise based on mobility data.

Criterion	All locations	Only locations enclosed in $L_{\text{night}} > 30$ dB	Absolute difference	Relative difference
NSD	33,809	32,601	1,208	3.71%
NHSD	21,138	20,381	757	3.71%

Based on the above considerations, it can be concluded that evaluation of aircraft noise effects is significantly dependent on population data (i.e., the census data and the mobility data). Although the difference in the total NPA between these data is small, the difference in the NPA at each individual location is considerable as a result of the daily mobility. From the perspective of air traffic assignment, variations of population at each location may lead to different optimal assignments compared to the case when solely census data are used. This is because, in order to reduce the noise impact, optimal allocation of aircraft should avoid locations at which most people are present during the day, rather than just their home addresses. Consequently, developing a methodology that is capable of creating optimal air traffic assignments based on mobility data is important and necessary. In the following section, therefore, the methodology presented in the previous sections is applied to solve the optimization problem of the air traffic assignment. The obtained results are analyzed and compared to those obtained by the reference case. Since the main aim of the research is to find optimal air traffic assignments for an entire day, only the noise criteria based on  $L_{\text{den}}$  are employed for the optimization problems and further analyses as well.

## 5.2. Air traffic assignment based on daily population mobility

The NSGA-II algorithm with a population size of 70 and a maximum generation (Gen.) of 1500 is applied to solve the multi-objective optimization problem stated in Section 2. The method is set with an intermediate crossover rate of 1.5 and the Gaussian mutation technique with a scale of 0.8 and a shrink of 0.1. All the simulations are run on an Intel Core i5, 8GB RAM desktop and MATLAB 2016b.

1358  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416

Fig. 8 presents the optimal solutions obtained in comparison with that of the reference case. Fig. 8 shows that the proposed approach generates solutions which are much better than that of the reference case. When a population size of 70 is used, the Pareto front contains 70 distinct non-dominated solutions, and all of them dominate the reference case. Generally, all solutions will have the same weight of advantages, which spread from noise to fuel preference. Basically, decision makers can, therefore, choose any of the solutions based on their specific needs. However, to arrive at acceptable trade-off solutions from all of them, systematic analyses which are not considered in this study are needed. Therefore, only some representative solutions are chosen for further analyses later on.

In terms of computational cost, Fig. 9 shows the convergence history of results after specific generations with a particular amount of computational time. As seen from Fig. 9, the results seem to converge faster after 800 generations, and there are no significant improvements after 1200 generations. The computational cost (CPU time) is also recorded after each generation. To reach the last generation, the method spends almost 24 hours, mostly on calculating Eq. (3) for all 76,423 groups of people. Although the computation time is high, the algorithm is still applicable as the flight schedule can be obtained some days in advance. Moreover, with the development of powerful computers such as cluster and cloud computing, this issue can be addressed relatively easily.






Fig. 8. Illustration of optimal solutions obtained by proposed method and reference case.




Fig. 9. Convergence history of optimal solutions.

For a better overview on the optimal solutions, three distinct solutions are selected, viz. 1, 23 and 70 as marked in Fig. 8, for further examinations. For these solutions, solutions 1 and 70 represent the minimum noise and fuel solutions, respectively, while solution 23 shows the same fuel consumption as the reference case, but has significantly better noise performance. Table 7 presents the objective values of the optimization problem (i.e., the total NPA and fuel consumption) and other concerned metrics obtained by the representative solutions and the reference case. At first glance, the table indicates that all the solutions have better NPA and NPHA in comparison with the reference case. Particularly, the total NPA of solutions 1, 23 and 70 are, respectively, 10,061, 13,663 and 51,234, and hence there is a reduction of 83.31%, 77.33% and 14.99%, respectively, compared to that of the reference case (with 60,265 people annoyed). Similar relative amounts of the reduction are observed for the NPHA as well.

Regarding the total fuel consumption and route length, due to focusing on the noise preference and hence assigning aircraft to routes which are farther away from the populated regions, solution 1 generates more fuel consumption than the reference case with an increase of 0.43%. However, even though it results in a significant reduction of the noise impact, solution 23 still keeps the total fuel consumption slightly lower than that of the reference case, whilst with a still smaller amount of noise impact reduction, solution 70 provides the best option for

fuel preference. The same trend is also recognized for the total route length, except for solution 23. For this solution, although the total fuel burn is slightly less than that of the reference case, the total route length is still higher. This can be explained by considering the distribution of aircraft types. Even though the total route length has increased, the route length of aircraft with higher fuel burn has reduced, leading to an overall reduction in fuel consumption.

It is also worth noting that the reason for the relatively small difference in fuel burn between the solutions and the reference case is due to the fact that departure and arrival operations account only for a small part of the flight. Nevertheless, there is an identifiable effect when considering the absolute values. Specifically, for solution 70, 3,093 kg can save airline companies around \$ 2,327 per day (with an average cost of jet-A1 fuel of \$ 86.1 per barrel<sup>7</sup> in 2018), and generate roughly 9.7 ton of CO<sub>2</sub><sup>8</sup> emission less.

Table 7. Comparison of different metrics of representative solutions and reference case.

Method	Case number	NPA	NPHA	Fuel consumption (kg)	Route length (NM)
This study	Solution 1	10,061	2,059	775,457	124,771
	<i>Absolute reduction</i>	-50,204*	-8,440	+3,351	+935
	<i>% reduction</i>	-83.31	-80.39	+0.43	+0.76
	Solution 23	13,663	2,308	772,030	124,139
	<i>Absolute reduction</i>	-46,602	-8,191	-76	+303
	<i>% reduction</i>	-77.33	-78.02	-0.01	+0.24
	Solution 70	51,234	8,892	769,013	123,391
	<i>Absolute reduction</i>	-9,031	-1607	-3,093	-445
	<i>% reduction</i>	-14.99	-15.31	-0.40	-0.36
	Reference case	60,265	10,499	772,106	123,836

\*The signs “+” and “-” indicate increase and reduction compared to reference case, respectively.

Besides the evaluation of the criteria as given in Table 7, the number of people enclosed in specific  $L_{den}$  noise contours is also evaluated and provided in Table 8. A comparison of the representative solutions and the reference case shows that the number of people enclosed in the higher noise contours reduces for solutions with more emphasis on noise. This behavior is

<sup>7</sup><https://www.iata.org/publications/economics/fuel-monitor/Pages/index.aspx> (assessed 19 January 2019)

<sup>8</sup><https://www.icao.int/environmental-protection/Carbonoffset/Pages/default.aspx> (assessed 19 January 2019)

1535 expected, and it is comparable with the trends of the NPA and the NPHA in Table 7.

1536  
1537  
1538  
1539 According to the formula in Eq. (2), it is obvious that the higher the value  $L_{den}$  each group of  
1540 people is subjected to, the greater the number of people annoyed that group has.  
1541  
1542  
1543

1544 Table 8. Comparison of the number of people enclosed in specific  $L_{den}$  noise contours.

Method	Noise band							
	< 40	[40-45)	[45-50)	[50-55)	[55-60)	[60-65)	> 65	
This study	Solution 1	1,987,474	59,075	5,326	10,860	7,211	0	0
	Solution 23	1,970,373	72,420	7,897	8,891	10,365	0	0
	Solution 70	1,654,134	241,767	125,281	41,829	3,684	3,251	0
Reference case	1,595,717	253,308	156,340	57,587	1,803	5,191	0	

1552 In order to perceive the difference between the optimal solutions in terms of air traffic  
1553 assignments as well as the noise contours and the NPA at each location, the features of  
1554 solutions 1, 23 and 70 are further analyzed. The optimal assignment of these solutions is  
1555 shown in Table 9, which provides the number of aircraft assigned to each route, while their  
1556  $L_{den}$  noise contours and the NPA at each location are depicted in Fig. 10, Fig. 11 and Fig. 12,  
1557 respectively.  
1558  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564

1565 Table 9 shows that the distribution of aircraft over the routes between the solutions is  
1566 rather different. For example, for route 5, solution 1 has 31 operations, and solution 23 has 24  
1567 operations, while solution 70 has only 11 operations. On the other hand, for route 27, there is  
1568 no operation from solution 1, but 5 operations from solution 23, and 15 operations from  
1569 solution 70. More specifically, solution 1 tends to send more aircraft to route 5 as it is  
1570 positioned farther away from the populated regions. However, this selection will result in  
1571 longer routes for aircraft that have their final destination in a different direction, and it will  
1572 consequently cost more fuel. Meanwhile, solution 70 tends to directly send aircraft along  
1573 routes in the direction of their final destinations disregarding populated areas, and hence  
1574 leading to an increase in the NPA. Solution 23 tends to balance between noise and fuel  
1575 concerns, and hence its distribution falls in the middle of those of solutions 1 and 70.  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593



The above examinations are even more apparent when looking at Fig. 10, Fig. 11 and Fig. 12. In these figures, the variation in the NPA between the solutions can be observed in the region that is highlighted by the white dotted line. In fact, for solution 1, there are only 3 locations which have people affected by noise due to their daily mobility, while 8 locations are recognized in solution 23, and up to 18 locations in solution 70. Moreover, upon a closer look at the legends on the figures, it is also noted that the scale of the NPA at each location of these solutions is rather different. A further distinction of this comparison can be clearly recognized in Fig. 13. It can be seen from the figure that the difference of the NPA occurs not only at the highlighted region, but also at other locations.

Table 9. Comparison of optimal route assignments of three representative solutions.

Route number	Number of operation			Route number (continued)	Number of operation		
	Solution 1	Solution 23	Solution 70		Solution 1	Solution 23	Solution 70
1	0	3	7	15	4	10	3
2	0	1	3	16	10	7	1
3	0	0	2	17	8	2	5
4	0	2	19	18	9	7	7
5	31	24	11	19	12	12	10
6	0	1	0	20	24	26	22
7	3	11	9	21	2	7	9
8	20	13	12	22	16	8	6
9	19	15	15	23	0	1	9
10	23	19	18	24	0	2	1
11	0	6	7	25	0	0	0
12	10	6	4	26	0	1	4
13	3	8	2	27	0	5	15
14	26	23	19				

1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711




Fig. 10. Illustration of NPA at each location (solution 1).




Fig. 11. Illustration of NPA at each location (solution 23).



1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770




Fig. 12. Illustration of NPA at each location (solution 70).




Fig. 13. Comparison of NPA between solutions 1, 23 and 70 at each location.

### 5.3. Evaluation of optimal assignments based on census data and mobility data

As noted earlier at the end of Section 5.1, the variation of population at each location between the census data and the mobility data during the day may lead to a change in the optimal assignments obtained by these data as well. Therefore, to estimate this concern for the applied case study, the air traffic assignment problem based on the census data is also performed. The obtained results are then compared with those based on the mobility data.

Fig. 14 and Fig. 15 compare the objective functions (i.e., the total NPA and fuel consumption) for both datasets. In Fig. 14, the comparison is made based on the optimal assignments using the census data, whereas the comparison in Fig. 15 is made based on the optimal assignments using the mobility data. Both figures indicate that there is a small difference in the NPA between solutions evaluated based on the difference of datasets. Note that since the assignments for each comparison in each figure are the same, consequently the fuel consumption will be the same regardless of the data used. The variation increases from solution 1 to solution 70. Therefore, there is a difference in their optimal assignments. The variation of the optimal assignments between both sets of solutions can be readily explained. As mentioned earlier in Section 5.1, due to the daily mobility, the population at each location changes at different times of the day. Therefore, to reduce the noise impact, the optimal assignments should be changed as well. It should also be noted that although the change in the total NPA between the census data and the mobility data is relatively small, the change of the NPA at each location can be rather large, which has been discussed earlier in Section 5 as well.




Fig. 14. Comparison based on the optimal assignments using the census data.




Fig. 15. Comparison based on the optimal assignments using the mobility data.

In order to further analyze the difference above, the optimal assignments of two representative solutions, *viz.* 1 and 70 obtained by using both datasets are extracted and presented in Table 10. This table shows that the optimal assignments are slightly different. For example, for route 9 of solution 1, the difference in the number of operations is 6, whilst for route 15 of solution 70 it is 3. It should be also noted that although the number of operations on each route for both datasets used is more or less the same, the distribution of aircraft types also contributes to the variation in the NPA.

To get a better insight into the effect of the change in the optimal assignments, the resulting  $L_{den}$  noise contours for these assignments are illustrated in Fig. 16 and Fig. 17, for solutions 1 and 70, respectively. As seen in the figures, the noise contours are rather different, especially for solution 70.



1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947

Table 10. Comparison of the optimal route assignments of solutions 1 and 70 based on both data.

Route number	Number of operation				Route number (continued)	Number of operation			
	Solution 1		Solution 70			Solution 1		Solution 70	
	Census data	Mobility data	Census data	Mobility data		Census data	Mobility data	Census data	Mobility data
1	0	0	6	7	15	5	4	0	3
2	0	0	5	3	16	14	10	2	1
3	0	0	1	2	17	5	8	2	5
4	0	0	16	19	18	10	9	10	7
5	28	31	12	11	19	10	12	10	10
6	0	0	0	0	20	21	24	21	22
7	6	3	8	9	21	3	2	7	9
8	17	20	12	12	22	15	16	9	6
9	25	19	14	15	23	0	0	6	9
10	22	23	17	18	24	0	0	3	1
11	0	0	9	7	25	0	0	0	0
12	8	10	7	4	26	0	0	3	4
13	3	3	2	2	27	0	0	16	15
14	28	26	22	19					




Fig. 16. Comparison of  $L_{den}$  noise contours based on census data and on daily mobility data (solution 1).

1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006




Fig. 17. Comparison of  $L_{den}$  noise contours based on census data and on daily mobility data (solution 70).

## 6. Conclusions and future work

This paper introduces a new air traffic assignment model which is capable of taking the daily mobility of a city's population into account, in addition to having a **acceptable** trade-off between conflicting objectives (i.e., the NPA and fuel consumption). Furthermore, substantial efforts have been invested **to investigate the influence of the data used on the evaluation of aircraft noise effects**. Then, the optimal solutions of the air traffic assignment based on the mobility data are obtained and compared with that of the reference case and those based on the census data. The following conclusions can be drawn from this work:

- 1) The evaluation of aircraft noise impact is influenced by the daily population mobility data used. Specifically, **when the census data are used**, only people who live inside the noise contours get annoyed, whereas it has been found that people living outside the noise contours could be annoyed when the mobility data are used. Moreover, not all of the annoyed people suggested from the census data will actually be annoyed if their daily mobility is taken into account. Although the total NPA obtained by using either

2007  
2008  
2009 census data or mobility data is very similar, the NPA at each location is significantly  
2010  
2011 different.

- 2012  
2013  
2014 2) Compared to the reference case herein, the proposed methodology can generate  
2015 solutions that are much improved in terms of both the total NPA and fuel  
2016 consumption. Even with a small change in the total fuel consumption, the method can  
2017  
2018 still offer a solution which can reduce the total NPA up to 77%. Furthermore, the  
2019  
2020 proposed approach also provides a wide range of solutions with different benefits to  
2021  
2022 either noise or fuel burn, and these solutions can serve as a valuable input for  
2023  
2024 authorities and policymakers in their decision making.
- 2025  
2026  
2027  
2028 3) The optimal assignments obtained by both datasets are different since there is a  
2029  
2030 significant difference in the number of people at each location during the day. The  
2031  
2032 evaluation thereof also indicates that the difference in the optimal assignments is  
2033  
2034 rather dependent on the case study under consideration, and on whether the variation  
2035  
2036 of population at each location is significant or not, relative also to the population  
2037  
2038 distribution and airport layout.

2039  
2040 Some inherent limitations of the work which have not yet been considered in this study  
2041  
2042 are also worth mentioning. First, the mobility data are considered only for three distinct  
2043  
2044 groups of people, including students, employees and people staying at home. This assumption  
2045  
2046 may lead to variations in optimal assignments as a result of the change of population at each  
2047  
2048 location during the day if other types of mobility are also considered. Further research should  
2049  
2050 also investigate to a larger extent the assumption regarding the allocation of employees and  
2051  
2052 students to shifts. Second, for the air traffic assignment model, only the feasible options for  
2053  
2054 each operation are considered, while the runway and airspace capacity (e.g., aircraft  
2055  
2056 sequencing), which can lead to delay of flights, are not yet considered. This model could be  
2057  
2058 regarded as pre-tactical and intended to be used for planning purposes since it takes into  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065



2066  
2067  
2068 account forecasted data for the whole day and it is not resistant to any disruption in the pre-  
2069 defined timetable. In order to **render it** suitable for tactical use in real-time operations,  
2070 changes in runway in use, aircraft changes as well as delays should be included in the model.  
2071  
2072 Therefore, these issues will be dealt with in further work. Furthermore, by using the mobility  
2073 data, changes in population at sensitive regions such as schools and hospitals, can be  
2074 recognized. These more detailed mobility data can help develop more realistic, applied  
2075 solutions in terms of applying more complex fair weightings for each different category.  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083

## 2084 **Acknowledgments**

2085  
2086

2087 This research is supported by the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of the  
2088 Republic of Serbia and represents a part of the project named “A support to sustainable  
2089 development of the Republic of Serbia's air transport system” (TR36033). The authors would  
2090 like to express their gratitude to the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia for providing  
2091 the data regarding daily mobility. **The authors would also like to thank the editor and**  
2092 **anonymous reviewers for their constructive, helpful and valuable comments and suggestions.**  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100

## 2101 **References**

2102  
2103

- 2104 Abouei, M., Taghi, M., 2018. Multi-objective optimization of reliability – redundancy allocation problem with  
2105 cold-standby strategy using NSGA-II. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety* 172, 225–238.  
2106 doi:10.1016/j.ress.2017.12.019
- 2107 Alikar, N., Mohsen, S., Ari, R., Ghazilla, R., Tavana, M., 2017. Application of the NSGA-II algorithm to a  
2108 multi-period inventory- redundancy allocation problem in a series-parallel system 160, 1–10.
- 2109 AzB-08, 2008. Anleitung zur Berechnung von Lärmschutzbereichen nach dem Gesetz zum Schutz gegen  
2110 Fluglärm vom 19. November 2008 in: 1. Verordnung zur Durchführung des Gesetzes zum Schutz gegen  
2111 Fluglärm (1. FlugLSV) vom 27.12.2008, BGBl. I S.2980.
- 2112 **Coelho, J.L.B., Vogiatzis, K., Licitra, G., 2011. The CNOSSOS-EU initiative: A framework for road, railway,  
2113 aircraft and industrial noise modelling for strategic noise mapping in EU Member States, in: 18th  
2114 International Congress on Sound and Vibration 2011, ICSV 2011. pp. 789–795.**
- 2115 Deb, K., Pratap, A., Agarwal, S., Meyarivan, T., 2002. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm:  
2116 NSGA-II. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 6, 182–197. doi:10.1109/4235.996017
- 2117 EC, 2002. Directive 2002/49/EC of the European parliament and the Council of 25 June 2002 relating to the  
2118 assessment and management of environmental noise. *Official Journal of the European Communities*.
- 2119 ECAC, 2016. ECAC.CEAC Doc 29 4th Edition Report on Standard Method of Computing Noise Contours  
2120 around Civil Airports Volume 1: Applications Guide 1.
- 2121 **European Commission, 2016. Evaluation of Directive 2002/49/EC relating to the assessment and management of  
2122 environmental noise. Executive Summary. Brussels, Belgium. doi:10.1007/s10875-005-4080-8**
- 2123 European Environment Agency (EEA), 2010. Good practice guide on noise exposure and potential health  
2124

- effects, n.d. , in: EEA Technical Report.
- Federal Aviation Administration, 2007. INM v7.0 User's Guide.
- Frair, L., 1984. Airport noise modelling and aircraft scheduling so as to minimize community annoyance. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 8, 271–281. doi:10.1016/0307-904X(84)90162-8
- Ganić, E., Babić, O., Čangalović, M., Stanojević, M., 2018. Air traffic assignment to reduce population noise exposure using activity-based approach. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 63, 58–71. doi:10.1016/j.trd.2018.04.012
- Ganić, E., Radojević, M., Babić, O., 2016. Influence of aircraft noise on quiet areas, in: 25th International Conference Noise and Vibration Proceeding of Papers. University of Niš, Faculty of Occupational Safety, Tara, Serbia, pp. 47–53.
- Glekas, I., Vogiatzis, K., Antoniadis, C., 2016. Strategic noise mapping & action plans for the international airports of Larnaca & Pafos in Cyprus, in: The 23rd International Congress on Sound and Vibration. Athens, Greece.
- Hartjes, S., Visser, H., 2016. Efficient trajectory parameterization for environmental optimization of departure flight paths using a genetic algorithm. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part G: Journal of Aerospace Engineering* 0, 1–9. doi:10.1177/0954410016648980
- Hatzopoulou, M., Miller, E.J., 2010. Linking an activity-based travel demand model with traffic emission and dispersion models: Transport's contribution to air pollution in Toronto. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 15, 315–325. doi:10.1016/j.trd.2010.03.007
- Heblij, S.J., Hanenburg, V., Wijnen, R.A.A., Visser, H.G., 2007. Development of a Noise Allocation Planning Tool, in: 45th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit. American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Reno, Nevada, pp. 1–7. doi:10.2514/6.2007-1335
- Ho-Huu, Vinh, Hartjes, S., Geijselaers, L.H., Visser, H.G., Curran, R., 2018. Optimization of noise abatement aircraft terminal routes using a multi-objective evolutionary algorithm based on decomposition. *Transportation Research Procedia* 29, 157–168. doi:10.1016/j.trpro.2018.02.014
- Ho-Huu, V., Hartjes, S., Visser, H., Curran, R., 2017. An Efficient Application of the MOEA/D Algorithm for Designing Noise Abatement Departure Trajectories. *Aerospace* 4, 54. doi:10.3390/aerospace4040054
- Ho-Huu, V., Hartjes, S., Visser, H.G., Curran, R., 2018. Integrated design and allocation of optimal aircraft departure routes. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 63, 689–705. doi:10.1016/j.trd.2018.07.006
- Isermann, U., Vogelsang, B., 2010. AzB and ECAC Doc.29—Two best-practice European aircraft noise prediction models. *Noise Control Engineering Journal* 58, 455–461. doi:10.3397/1.3455442
- Jiang, S., Ferreira, J., Gonzalez, M.C., 2017. Activity-Based Human Mobility Patterns Inferred from Mobile Phone Data: A Case Study of Singapore. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* 3, 208–219. doi:10.1109/TBDATA.2016.2631141
- Kaddoura, I., Kröger, L., Nagel, K., 2017. An activity-based and dynamic approach to calculate road traffic noise damages. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 54, 335–347. doi:10.1016/j.trd.2017.06.005
- Kaddoura, I., Kröger, L., Nagel, K., 2016. User-specific and Dynamic Internalization of Road Traffic Noise Exposures. *Networks and Spatial Economics*. doi:10.1007/s11067-016-9321-2
- Kephalopoulos, S., Paviotti, M., Anfosso-lédée, F., Maercke, D. Van, Shilton, S., Jones, N., 2014. Science of the Total Environment Advances in the development of common noise assessment methods in Europe : The CNOSSOS-EU framework for strategic environmental noise mapping. *Science of the Total Environment*, The 482–483, 400–410. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.02.031
- Kuiper, B.R., Visser, H.G., Heblij, S.J., 2013. Efficient use of an allotted airport annual noise budget through minimax optimization of runway allocations. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part G: Journal of Aerospace Engineering* 227, 1021–1035. doi:10.1177/0954410012447767
- Marais, K.B., Reynolds, T.G., Uday, P., Muller, D., Lovegren, J., Dumont, J.-M., Hansman, R.J., 2013. Evaluation of potential near-term operational changes to mitigate environmental impacts of aviation. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part G: Journal of Aerospace Engineering* 227, 1277–1299. doi:10.1177/0954410012454095
- Martínez-Puras, A., Pacheco, J., 2016. MOAMP-Tabu search and NSGA-II for a real Bi-objective scheduling-routing problem. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 112, 92–104. doi:10.1016/j.knosys.2016.09.001
- Netjasov, F., 2008. A Model of Air Traffic Assignment as a Measure for Mitigating Noise at Airports: The Zurich Airport Case. *Transportation Planning and Technology* 31, 487–508. doi:10.1080/03081060802364448
- Nibourg, J.M., Hesselink, H.H., Vijver, Y.A.J.R. van de, 2012. Environment-Aware Runway Allocation Advice System (No. NLR-TP-2008-506). Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Novák, J., Sýkora, L., 2007. A City in Motion: Time-Space Activity and Mobility Patterns of Suburban Inhabitants and the Structuration of the Spatial Organization of the Prague Metropolitan Area. *Geografiska*

- Annaler, Series B: Human Geography 89, 147–168. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0467.2007.00245.x
- Ott, W.R., 1982. Concepts of human exposure to air pollution. *Environment International* 7, 179–196. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-4120(82)90104-0
- Prats, X., Puig, V., Quevedo, J., 2011. A multi-objective optimization strategy for designing aircraft noise abatement procedures. Case study at Girona airport. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 16, 31–41. doi:10.1016/j.trd.2010.07.007
- Srinivas, N., Deb, K., 1994. Multiobjective Optimization Using Nondominated Sorting in Genetic Algorithms. *Evol. Comput.* 2, 221–248. doi:10.1162/evco.1994.2.3.221
- Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2013. 2011 Census of Population, Households and Dwellings in the Republic of Serbia. Daily Migrants (data by municipalities/cities). Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, Serbia.
- Thang, L.-D., Ho-Huu, V., Hung, N.-Q., 2018. Multi-objective optimal design of magnetorheological brakes for motorcycling application considering thermal effect in working process. *Smart Materials and Structures* 27, 75060.
- Torres, R., Chaptal, J., Bès, C., Hiriart-Urruty, J.-B., 2011. Optimal , Environmentally Friendly Departure Procedures for Civil Aircraft. *Journal of Aircraft* 48, 11–23. doi:10.2514/1.C031012
- Visser, H.G., 2005. Generic and site-specific criteria in the optimization of noise abatement trajectories. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 10, 405–419. doi:10.1016/j.trd.2005.05.001
- Visser, H.G., Wijnen, R.A.A., 2001. Optimization of Noise Abatement Departure Trajectories. *Journal of Aircraft* 38, 620–627. doi:10.2514/2.2838
- Vo-Duy, T., Duong-Gia, D., Ho-Huu, V., Vu-Do, H.C., Nguyen-Thoi, T., 2017. Multi-objective optimization of laminated composite beam structures using NSGA-II algorithm. *Composite Structures* 168, 498–509. doi:10.1016/j.compstruct.2017.02.038
- Vogiatzis, K., 2014. Assessment of environmental noise due to aircraft operation at the Athens International Airport according to the 2002/49/EC Directive and the new Greek national legislation. *Applied Acoustics* 84, 37–46. doi:10.1016/j.apacoust.2014.02.019
- Vogiatzis, K., 2012. Airport environmental noise mapping and land use management as an environmental protection action policy tool. The case of the Larnaka International Airport (Cyprus). *The Science of the total environment* 424, 162–73. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.02.036
- Vogiatzis, K., Remy, N., 2014. **Strategic Noise Mapping of Herakleion: The Aircraft Noise Impact as a factor of the Int. Airport relocation. *Noise Mapping* 1, 15–31. doi:10.2478/noise-2014-0003**
- Wang, H., Fu, Y., Huang, M., Huang, G.Q., Wang, J., 2017. Computers & Industrial Engineering A NSGA-II based memetic algorithm for multiobjective parallel flowshop scheduling problem. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 113, 185–194. doi:10.1016/j.cie.2017.09.009
- WHO, 2009. Night Noise Guidelines for Europe.
- Winther, M., Rypdal, K., Sørensen, L., Kalivoda, M., Bukovnik, M., Kilde, N., Lauretis, R. De, Falk, R., Romano, D., Deransy, R., Box, L., Carbo, L., Meana, N.T., Whiteley, M., 2017. EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2016 – Update July 2017 - 1.A.3.a, 1.A.5.b Aviation. European Environment Agency.
- Zachary, D.S., Gervais, J., Leopold, U., 2010. Multi-impact optimization to reduce aviation noise and emissions. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 15, 82–93. doi:10.1016/j.trd.2009.09.005
- Zachary, D.S., Gervais, J., Leopold, U., Schutz, G., Huck, V.S.T., Braun, C., 2011. Strategic Planning of Aircraft Movements with a Three-Cost Objective. *Journal of Aircraft* 48, 256–264. doi:10.2514/1.C031090
- Zhang, M., Filippone, A., Bojdo, N., 2018. Multi-objective optimisation of aircraft departure trajectories. *Aerospace Science and Technology* 79, 37–47. doi:10.1016/j.ast.2018.05.032