

**Port of Portland
Portland International Airport (PDX) Citizen
Noise Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
February 10, 2005**

CNAC Members Present:

Gary Thornton	City of Vancouver
Fred Hostetler	Washington County
Bruce Lindoff	Clark County/Camas/Washougal
Vicki Thompson	City of Gresham
Maryhelen Kincaid	City of Portland
Erwin Bergman	City of Portland
Dave Smith	West Vancouver/At-Large
Jeanette Egger	Clackamas County
Mike Yee	Vancouver
Jim Trees	Troutdale/Fairview/Wood Village
Ken Heuvel	Hayden Island

TAG Member

Laura Schneider	FAA
-----------------	-----

CNAC Members Absent:

David King, chairman	Multnomah County
Gary Kunz	Portland At Large

Port Staff Present:

Mary Maxwell	Aviation Director
Peggy McNees	Noise Program Manager
Bob Turner	Noise Management Technician
Jerry Gerspach	Noise Management Technician
Debbie Bishop	Temporary Adco

Military Personnel Present:

Lt. Col. Dale Bennett	ORANG
Maj. Paul Fitzgerald	ORANG

1 **MEETING CALL TO ORDER**

2
3 Vicki Thompson, vice chair, called the meeting to order on behalf of chairman David
4 King, who was absent.

5
6 **INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

7
8 Lt. Col. Dale Bennett introduced Maj. Paul Fitzgerald who will be representing
9 ORANG (Oregon Air National Guard) at the CNAC meetings beginning in March. Lt.
10 Col. Bennett has been promoted which prompts the change.

11
12 Members of CNAC introduced themselves for all in attendance.

13
14 Jeanette Egger announced to everyone she is retiring from the committee effective
15 the end of the month, but this will be her last meeting. She said she has a
16 replacement in mind that she would like to recommend to the committee.

17
18 Jeanette then gave a brief history of both her professional background, as well as
19 her experiences while serving on CNAC. She complimented and thanked the
20 committee, and the Port, for all of their hard work and team work. She brought in
21 collected pertinent documents that she has received while serving on the committee
22 and offered them to members who might be interested in reading them. She stated
23 they contain valuable information that would be useful to, perhaps, the newer
24 members.

25
26 Peggy McNees then presented Jeannette with a thank you letter and gift, as well as
27 verbally expressing her gratitude for all of Jeannette's contributions to the CNAC.

28
29 **APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY, 2005 MEETING MINUTES**

30
31 Vice chair, Vicki Thompson, asked if there are revisions to the minutes of last
32 months (January 13, 2005) CNAC meeting. Before review of the minutes began,
33 Erwin Bergman asked the committee if they could peruse the agenda and see if
34 there are changes that may be appropriate in an effort to shorten the time spent on
35 some of the issues. Vicki replied that there has already been one change and that is
36 that Maryhelen Kincaid has given her questions regarding the North Runway
37 Maintenance & Improvement Project directly to Peggy McNees. By doing so, the
38 topic will be removed from the existing agenda which will save the committee five (5)
39 minutes. Erwin continued by recommending that the selection of a CNAC member
40 to attend the Aviation Noise and Air Quality Symposium be reduced to five (5)
41 minutes.

42
43 The following revisions to the January meeting minutes were identified:
44

45 **Line 151:** ...in "Answer": Bruce Lindoff noted this line reads 9,041 feet to be
46 added to the east end of the north runway. It should actually read 904 feet will
47 be added to the runway.
48

49 *Note: Per Fletcher Hunt on February 28, 2005, the*
50 *actual footage additions are:*

51
52 *941 on the east end*
53 *1,626 on the west end*
54 *10,567 total*
55

56 **Line 306:** Laura Schneider said the correct verbiage in her remarks should read
57 ...and because the "terrain" here...
58

59 **Line 17:** Jim Trees made the correction that he has served two (2) "years" on
60 the Troutdale City Council and not "terms" as previously stated. Also, it is not
61 "Troutdale" City Council, but rather Fairview City Council.
62

63 **Line 216:** Gary Thornton said the sentence should read "However, he
64 continued, the Port's explanation of the proposal is accurate in that it will save
65 money. However, it will increase capacity." **Line 325:** ...analysis to see if this is
66 "increasing". Not "decreasing". **Line 258:** Gary stated that regarding the
67 comments of Linda Nielsen: it isn't "navigation" easement, but should be
68 "avigation". Also, the implication was she was so upset about it that she wasn't
69 going to complain (about the runway extension) that night (of the meeting) about
70 it. Vicki mentioned that she thought Linda said she wasn't upset. Gary said it
71 reads like she wasn't upset, but he believed she was.
72

73 **Note:** *please see Linda Nielsen's revisions below*
74

75 **Line 221:** correction is "avigation" easements – not navigation.
76

77 Other revisions to the minutes had previously been submitted **via email by Linda**
78 **Nielsen** who attended and spoke at last month's meeting. Ms. Nielsen's emailed
79 revisions are:
80

81 **Line 258:** She passed around some flight tracks and photographs, as anecdotal
82 evidence, that tracks are not accurate as can be clearly seen by photos taken
83 from her home at West 29th Street, in Vancouver. Jets flying by her home are
84 over Washington geography, and she does not live on the river. She is not as
85 upset now at avigation easements or noise disclosures notices which are being
86 forced on her with this newest proposal to extend the north runway. She
87 frequently calls PDX with noise complaints because her home has become
88 virtually unbearable with the northward encroachment of noise over west
89 Vancouver in the past four or five years. Her concern now, with this news, is that
90 she will be subjected to more noise if extending the north runway is allowed,

91 which will put jet engines of massive carriers closer to her home which, she
92 states, clearly would not be a good thing for her.

93
94 PDX generated noise not experienced before at her home, has moved over west
95 Vancouver after installation of the north runway ILS. She suggests putting ILS on
96 south side of the river, in & outbound flights need to travel over Portland
97 Industrial strip, not over dozens of west Vancouver neighborhoods. She does not
98 live at the end of PDX's runways but recently very low altitude aircraft make it
99 seem so.

100
101 **In line 284:** Which recommendations directly address & mitigate noise in west
102 Vancouver neighborhoods? Regarding the Port preferred recommendations
103 moving forward; what remedy has been set forth to address the ever increasing
104 noise burden in Vancouver? (Regarding continuation & bringing more of the
105 noise assault on Vancouver, twice that of Portland.)

106
107 **Line # 288 & 289:** She is opposed to the north runway extension because she
108 says there are no recommendations outlined in the current noise study to
109 address the noise burden that they are suffering today.

110
111 Vicki Thompson then asked for a motion to approve the January, 2005 minutes as
112 corrected. The motion was made, seconded and then passed by the CNAC
113 committee.

114 **AVIATION NOISE AND AIR QUALITY SYMPOSIUM**

115
116
117 Vicki asked members of the committee if anyone would like to attend the upcoming
118 Symposium. She stated she heard Erwin Bergman expressed an interest in going
119 again this year. CNAC members discussed reasons why they are not available to
120 attend. Jeanette mentioned that Erwin attended last year and brought back some
121 wonderful information to the committee. Erwin added that Gary attended as well and
122 he, too, brought back some very useful information.

123
124 Peggy McNees stated the Port encourages rotation of who attends the noise
125 symposium among the CNAC members and hopes the opportunity to attend is
126 shared among all members. She said she knows there has been concern
127 expressed regarding taking a newer CNAC member – but this is only because the
128 amount of information can be overwhelming. However, please keep in mind that this
129 is a great opportunity.

130
131 Vicki Thompson was asked if she is interested in attending and she indicated she is,
132 if no one else wants to go. Gary said if she would like to attend, he believes that she
133 should.

134
135 Erwin stated that since he has attended twice, he is happy to “step back” so
136 someone else may go this year. A new motion was made to send Vicki Thompson

137 to the 2005 Noise Symposium. The motion was seconded and passed – Vicki will
138 attend the Noise Symposium as a representative of CNAC.

139

140 Gary asked “who sponsors this Symposium?” Peggy replied it is U.C. Berkeley and
141 it is *the* Noise Symposium in the country. Berkeley has been putting on this
142 symposium since the 1980s. It has been moved this year to Palm Springs from its
143 original location of San Diego. Jeannette Egger told everyone that the Symposium
144 is well attended by people from various parts of the globe and is extremely
145 interesting and educational.

146

147 **REVIEW AND COMMENTS ON DRAFT FAA AIRPORTS ENVIRONMENTAL**
148 **HANDBOOK (Drafted by Erwin Bergman)**

149

150 Vice chair Vicki Thompson turned the floor over to Erwin Bergman so that he could
151 discuss the draft letter he authored to the FAA.

152

153 Erwin indicated that he’d first addressed the subject of the FAA report at the last
154 CNAC meeting. He said he had read about the report in the ANR (Airport Noise
155 Report) which stated the FAA is creating an airport handbook that will include a
156 number of changes. There is one change of concern, that being the contour of 64-65
157 DNL and, the mention that a noise increase of up to 3 dB. (This would have no
158 significance for environmental purposes – in his opinion.) Erwin continued by saying
159 that what this means is that if approved, it would be a categorical exclusion, meaning
160 that they would define that as either a single or group of actions in this category that
161 do not have significant impact. It means there’d be no environmental analysis. He
162 said that at the last meeting he volunteered to investigate and write a response for
163 CNAC.

164

165 During his review of the report, he spoke to an associate of his in California, Mr.
166 Beckman, who, Erwin reported, is an attorney specializing in aviation law and has a
167 website that is – in Erwin’s opinion - “second to none in this country”. Mr. Beckman
168 sent Erwin a two page document identifying a number of issues in the FAA draft that
169 are problematic. Erwin reviewed the chapters identified by Mr. Beckman and found
170 “some real problems” that should “bother anyone” who is in the environmental area,
171 but should also bother anyone who lives near an airport. The environmental reviews
172 would be short circuited, have the FAA behaving like a real autocratic agency, and
173 stated some of the provisions lack consistency with NEPA.

174

175 Erwin said he drafted a response to chapters 4, 9, 10, 14 & 15 following extensive
176 review of the FAA report. Many of the comments have implications relating to
177 NEPA. He also obtained a great deal of his information from varied issues of the
178 ANR.

179

180 He said that his review, as well as information obtained from the ANR is used as an
181 attempt to “shoot down” the categorical exclusion for the 3 dB increase as having no
182 significance. He said he feels the FAA did not present valid arguments, that they

183 ignored health implications, and that they have very little expertise in the area of
184 noise. He continued that he feels the EPA had all the expertise until they dropped
185 out of the picture. As a result, his document took a great deal more work than
186 originally anticipated.

187
188 Erwin stated he asked Mr. Beckman the question “how strong should one respond to
189 the FAA?” Mr. Beckman’s answer was to respond in the “strongest way possible
190 because that is the only way they (the FAA) will listen to you” and that the FAA, by
191 law, must respond to raised meaningful comments.

192
193 Erwin stated he is open to editing, criticism or other types of corrections concerning
194 his draft letter. However, he said that unless you have the background he has, he
195 would be concerned about any offered criticisms. He continued that his document is
196 a product of much work and stated firmly “if it ain’t broken, don’t fix it.”

197
198 Vicki Thompson said she did not know if CNAC members had been reading the
199 emails between David King and Gary Kunz, but David had asked Gary to try and
200 reword the response and shorten it as five (5) pages seems a bit lengthy. David has
201 volunteered to meet with Erwin over the upcoming weekend to make revisions to the
202 document. However, Erwin said he is unavailable over the weekend, and added that
203 the deadline for the submission of this document to the FAA is February 16th.

204
205 Vicki then asked if everyone received an email today (February 10th) from Gary Kunz
206 regarding the document. In that email, Gary stated:

207
208 “I’ve done some word-smithing of Erwin’s letter, and I believe it needs more.
209 Please consider this a start. I recommend that CNAC support this letter
210 going out on our letterhead after David and Erwin have a chance to refine it
211 over the weekend. I will not be at the meeting tonight but offer full support
212 to the work Erwin has done on our behalf. As I tried to review the FAA
213 document, I quickly realized it was a daunting task. I ran out of steam
214 before reviewing the chapter 15 portion of this letter or the FAA document.”

215
216 Peggy McNees said that Jerry Gerspach is (at that time) distributing a copy of
217 “Version 2” of this response letter. Vicki said this is the revision that Gary has
218 submitted. However, he (Gary) is still not satisfied with his own revision and is
219 hopeful that David can work with Erwin over the weekend. Erwin again stated he is
220 unavailable over the weekend.

221
222 Fred Hostetler said that he’d like to make the comment that when he tried to read
223 Erwin’s letter, and then listened to Erwin’s position regarding responding to the FAA,
224 what comes to his mind is “confrontation”. He is hopeful that David will get involved
225 with rewriting the document so that when the FAA reads down to the end of the
226 second page they don’t respond negatively. Fred also noted that when you “chop
227 something up”, or “say something is bad”, you need to offset it with something
228 positive. We (meaning the committee) need to come up with a suggestion or

229 alternative solution to their proposals. Fred continued by saying that the work,
230 overall, however, is excellent. A reader of the argument against the FAA
231 understands that “they are putting themselves out on a limb and people like us are
232 going to have to wade into the middle of this thing.”
233

234 Vicki explained to the new members that typically, David King, chairman of CNAC,
235 authors all correspondence on behalf of the committee. There have been times, in
236 the past, when the committee has told David that a letter needs to go out regarding a
237 specific topic and they have asked David to just write it, with no review by the
238 committee prior to mailing. The committee’s faith in David’s writing ability is that
239 complete. Erwin said he admits that his letter is “pretty strong”, however the “FAA
240 *has* to respond to every comment in that letter that is meaningful and is a good
241 argument.” Confrontation has absolutely no bearing on it, from his point of view.
242

243 Erwin continued discussion with regarding the 3 dB, that basically the entire
244 argument is based on poor science, or no science, and false assumption.
245 Regarding the DNL, those comments are the poorest methodology, and are based
246 on ambient environments in cities where all noise sources pretty well disappear into
247 the background. However, with aircraft noise, there are tremendous peaks that
248 stand out and those are totally ignored by the DNL. Australia, Canada and Europe
249 are getting away from the DNL system of measurement and more towards single
250 event and number of event elimination. They are doing this because “that *clearly*
251 identifies how severe the impacts are.” DNL does not wake you up. It is cumulative
252 noise events that wake you. This is why he (Erwin) stated in his letter that the FAA
253 has a poor metric and should, therefore, not come out with the 3 dB argument.
254

255 Additionally, sometime ago the FAA stated that aircraft over 3,000 feet above ground
256 have insignificant noise contribution and denied any other impact from noise. Erwin
257 continued that there is a German study that identifies that noise impact causes
258 awakening at 33 dB. The FAA has not conducted any study on what prevents sleep.
259 Erwin stated that if you hear noise while sleeping, it is because you are much more
260 alert to noise when sleeping.
261

262 Jeannette Egger asked if “Version 2” that was distributed was the version edited by
263 Gary Kunz, and Vicki replied that yes, it is. Jeanette then asked Erwin if he used
264 citations regarding the aforementioned German studies and Erwin said no, he did
265 not, but perhaps he should have considered doing that. Jeanette said “citing” your
266 information demonstrates authenticity of a study. Erwin said he had obtained much
267 of his information from the ANR.
268

269 Vicki Thompson then asked Erwin who would be determining what is “meaningful” in
270 regards to his letter? She continued if the FAA looks at it and decides it is not
271 meaningful and chooses not to respond, who is going to make that determination?
272 Erwin responded by asking “how can they (the FAA) say it is not meaningful - if you
273 say they are wrong, or their comments are not consistent with NEPA, then how can
274 they say our letter is not meaningful?”

275 Gary Thornton said he recalls a prior study that demonstrated there is an effect on
276 learning ability due to noise. Perhaps that would lend credibility to the argument
277 against FAA proposed actions. Regarding Erwin's letter, Gary said it is well written,
278 however, he does not see an immediate benefit to the letter. He did say that it is
279 "worth a try" to submit it to the FAA and see if they respond. Erwin Bergman
280 responded to that by asking what liability would CNAC incur in getting this (letter) to
281 the FAA? "What is the worse thing that can happen?" He further stated that back in
282 November he brought up the fact that CNAC should write a letter to a number of
283 congressional members in Oregon and Washington asking them to co-sponsor a
284 letter addressing the issue of enforcement of a noise curfew. "Nothing ever
285 happened and the idea was dropped. That can happen with this issue as well, but
286 then why is there a CNAC at all?"
287

288 Gary continued his comments by stating that when there was a categorical exclusion
289 of the 3 dB, CNAC wrote a letter. He said he feels that this issue deserves at *least* a
290 letter from the committee for the purpose of going on record. Jeanette (Egger)
291 asked if Gary was referring to the time the FAA assigned different decibels to
292 different parts of the plane? She said CNAC objected to that as well, but never got
293 an answer from them (the FAA). Gary said the point is, that he accepts Erwin's
294 opinion and if we (CNAC) don't do anything about the issues, then we are wasting
295 our time as a committee.
296

297 Bruce Lindoff commented that he would probably agree to what Gary is saying. He
298 (Bruce) attends many planning commission meetings where upset people are
299 speaking out. However, if you put those comments into letter form, like the one
300 written by Erwin, and cite other studies, such as the one in Germany, then that is a
301 strong argument. They (the FAA) would *have* to address our comments. He said he
302 is all in favor of sending a letter to them.
303

304 Maryhelen Kincaid applauds Erwin's efforts in using his expertise to write this letter
305 and fully agrees we need to speak out. If we don't speak to the issues, then we may
306 as well not be here at all. Her question is, however, how much effort does one put
307 into something like this when the only person the FAA is ultimately responsible to is
308 the President of the United States, so they (the FAA) can do pretty much whatever
309 they want. But, at least they will know we are addressing our concerns. Erwin
310 added he would like to have his letter sent to our congressional delegation because
311 if you follow what the FAA is doing, they are acting like a "renegade agency".
312

313 Vicki Thompson asked for a motion regarding submitting the letter to the FAA. A
314 question was raised whether or not we (the committee members) will be rewriting
315 the document for submission. Jeanette explained that David King is the committee's
316 official corresponding secretary who typically authors documents on behalf of the
317 committee and that he would be working on this document over the weekend. Vicki
318 said that David is in transit from California but will be working on a rewrite upon his
319 return.
320

321 Jeanette Egger made the motion to adopt Erwin Bergman's document for transmittal
322 to the FAA, regarding FAA Order 5050.4B, which is due (to the FAA) on February
323 16, 2005 and that it be submitted through the committee's correspondence secretary
324 and chairman, David King, following minor editing. She continued that David should
325 take into consideration the work done by Gary Kunz and include that in the final
326 document as well. The motion was seconded and repeated prior to final vote. The
327 motion passed with verbal abstinence of vote voiced by Erwin Bergman.

328

329 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

330

331 Eric Meyer spoke to the committee. He is a citizen from the Roseway Neighborhood
332 and is part of the Part 150 study advisory committee. His committee has discussed
333 the Part 150 and knows that not everyone is going to be happy at the result of this
334 study. However, he is here to ask CNAC a few questions and make a few
335 comments.

336

337 There apparently has been some "tweaking" of the Part 150 since the last meeting.
338 Will that be happening again? He said that Chris Corich came to a neighborhood
339 meeting a couple of weeks ago and discussed approved recommendations and
340 identified items that had been changed or removed.

341 He further stated that at the last two SAC sessions there were items added at the
342 last minute and people did not have enough time to review for complete
343 understanding. Some of those referenced land use while other items involved flight
344 tracks.

345

346 Land use will potentially affect many people in many different neighborhoods.
347 The verbiage originally was to include existing homes that are sold. This verbiage
348 was to have a starting date that stated homes sold since "XXXX" (implies fictional
349 date) will be identified as being in the 55-65 DNL. It didn't seem fair because,
350 according to Mr. Meyer, you put up with the noise for so long, and then you
351 experience a decrease in your property value because of the noise. He stated
352 realtors of new home construction have documentation that states they are ethically
353 bound to inform potential buyers that the home being purchased is located in the
354 noise zone.

355

356 • Item #25, in the Part 150 study, is bothersome. Not well defined. It states
357 there is a brochure that is being developed that informs people what areas of
358 the city are affected by noise. Will this information be provided only to
359 realtors or who? This has nothing to do with the 55-65 DNL. These are just
360 locations in the city where noise is located. The way you get a map for these
361 noise locations is from basic noise complaints. Coupled with that, "what kind
362 of viable noise office is going to penalize people for complaining? What does
363 that say about the noise office? What it kind of does is, it gets the complaints
364 off the "Port's plate" because the noise office can just say "we are already
365 aware of that noise" issue.

366

367 The last 150 study – prior to this current study - didn't prevent the noise that is
368 happening now. A good percentage of the noise complaints are caused as a result
369 of box haulers and box haulers are not in the 55 DNL. They take off over Concordia
370 and take early turns. There are things that are supposed to help with this such as
371 the Fly Quiet that you'll hear about. If those worked, then the issues about noise
372 could change.

373

374 "I just object to the fact that at this point in time the Port is saying "okay, now we are
375 going to be honest about noise" because when I started complaining about noise, I
376 was told there isn't any noise going over my house. "People, retirees for example,
377 who are depending on the money from the sale of their homes are being told by the
378 FAA that the noise won't affect property values. Any time you affect the desirability
379 of a location, you are affecting property values. If he goes to neighborhood
380 associations and talks about property values affected by noise, "you watch what
381 happens. It will open a can of worms."

382

383 He said he didn't really have time to prepare for this meeting, but he wanted to say it
384 is a "double indemnity." You find out what the Port will or won't do regarding
385 remedies for the noise issue (i.e., insulate your home, buy your property, won't
386 reimburse you for the loss of property value, etc.) and yet you will be penalized for
387 the noise one way or the other because the property values go down. Whether you
388 agree or not, it needs to be talked about. And it needs to be talked about with the
389 City. He believes CNAC should ask the Port to postpone going to Commission until
390 after City Hall meets with citizens and reviews all the recommendations. As they
391 stand, the recommendations are not valid.

392

393 Vicki Thompson thanked Mr. Meyer for his comments. She went on to explain that
394 the schedule for the upcoming Part 150 meetings can be found on the Port website.
395 It lists upcoming open house meetings, as well as the formal public hearings, that
396 will be held in the very near future.

397

398 **PART 150 PRESENTATION BY PEGGY MCNEES OF THE PORT OF PORTLAND**

399

400 Peggy gave a Power Point presentation of the Part 150 study that is being given to
401 local jurisdictions and others. The presentation goes through the Part 150 study
402 recommendations, and shows the noise exposure maps. In addition, Peggy spoke
403 briefly to key pieces of federal legislation that defines the DNL noise metric, and
404 prevent airport operational restrictions such as curfews. She also briefly highlighted
405 a Part 161 study. Future CNAC briefings will discuss this legislation in greater detail.
406 She again gave the dates of the Commission hearing and the upcoming open house
407 meetings to be held in Oregon and Washington that result from requests by the
408 community.

409

410 Inserted comment from Gary Thornton: "Noise will be
411 concentrated over homes even though they were specifically
412 told it wouldn't."

413

414 During the presentation, Erwin Bergman said he is concerned the Port is planning
415 congressional meetings regarding the Part 150 recommendations. He thinks such a
416 meeting is premature and it gives the impression everything is finalized before it has
417 been reviewed by Port commissioners and the public. He doesn't understand why
418 they are being involved at this point.

419

420 Vicki Thompson offered another perspective as a former elected official. She said
421 that briefings are very helpful to understand the issues and respond to calls from
422 citizens who elected you.

423

424 Peggy McNeas stated the Port often receives calls and requests on a variety of
425 issues, including briefings on the Part 150 study. She told CNAC "we are working
426 with a new staff and doing the best we can to stay on top of an ever changing
427 schedule for Part 150 meetings." She assured the committee that her office will
428 continue to work to keep everyone informed about pending meetings.

429

430 Peggy went on to explain that there will be a public hearing before the Port
431 Commission which will give the Commission an opportunity to hear comments
432 directly from the public. At the end of two months, another meeting will be held with
433 the Commission to request formal action. The Commission will be updated on
434 responses to public comments heard at the public hearing or received through the
435 30-day comment period. The goal is to prepare and submit final recommendations to
436 the FAA by June, 2005. The FAA then has 180 days to review and make their
437 decision. By 2006, we should have approval and then we'll be able to move forward
438 on any other environmental actions that need to be addressed prior to
439 implementation.

440

441 Vicki asked if it would be possible to get a copy of the Power Point presentation that
442 Peggy presented to the committee members and Peggy replied yes. Some
443 members requested an electronic copy while others requested a paper copy. Mike
444 Yee suggested the presentation be linked to the Port web site and perhaps CNAC
445 members be provided with a password that would give them access to the
446 presentation. Peggy responded positively to this suggestion and said we would
447 consider that in the future as we work to update our web site.

448

449 **NOISE OFFICE REPORT**

450

451 Vicki invited Peggy to speak to the Noise Office Report. Peggy reported that an
452 orientation for new CNAC members is still in the works.

453

454 **AIRPORT NOISE REPORT**

455

456 Laura Schneider, of the FAA, reported that as a result of the study advisory
457 committee's work, that between now and when the final Part 150 recommendations
458 are due to the FAA, they will be looking at the operational impacts of the proposed

459 alternatives, specifically the operational alternatives that can be flown without
460 additional technology. Items the FAA is reviewing include:

461

- 462 • FAA has already done some modeling in their simulator to test the operational
463 feasibility of the proposed alternatives.
- 464 • Jets flying inbound toward the airport (downwind entry) at higher altitudes;
465 this will include some large turboprops having to level off at an interim altitude
466 to cross under the higher arrivals - *(need to fly it to see the actual frequency*
467 *of this to judge the impacts)*.
- 468 • Trying some alternative headings for small aircraft on departure, as outlined
469 in the Part 150 proposals.
- 470 • FAA will be doing real time work on these ideas over the next 3 - 6 months so
471 that we can ensure that our final comments to the Part 150 reflect real
472 operational feasibility.

473

474 Vicki asked if what this all means is that the committee can do all this work on the
475 Part 150 and then the FAA can just turn down all recommendations? Laura
476 responded that Air Traffic had been commenting on operational impacts all along,
477 but that to provide the final formal input, more operational input was needed. All
478 along we had made clear that final implementation may involve some modifications,
479 and this will help us figure out what that might look like, so that it can be included in
480 the whole process.

481

482 **ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA**

483

484 Peggy requested CNAC members copy her on requests and communications with
485 the Noise Office staff. This will help ensure prompt response.

486

487 **ADJOURNMENT**

488

489 At 8:25 p.m., Vicki asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was
490 made, seconded and passed. Meeting adjourned.