



Chandler Municipal Airport FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Advisory Committee Meeting #3 – June 5, 2009

Consultant Staff

Pam Keidel-Adams, Wilbur Smith Associates
Steven Alverson, ESA Airports
Ron Seymour, ESA Airports
Dave Olney, Olney & Associates

The third Advisory Committee meeting was initiated at 1:00 p.m. in the Tumbleweed Recreation Center in Chandler. After brief introductory remarks by Dave Olney, consultant and facilitator for the City of Chandler, Pam Keidel-Adams, the consultant from Wilbur Smith Associates, started the meeting. She discussed the results of the June 4, 2009, Public Open House held at Chandler City Council Chambers. She noted that approximately 100 public were in attendance and that comments received focused on some pilots that are thought by the public to not follow the traffic pattern altitude, operators from the Airport who indicate their long-term presence at the Airport and changes made to make the Airport as safe and efficient as possible, and that the noise issues are mostly with helicopter training activity, itinerant helicopter activity, and fixed wing training activity.

Following the review of the Public Open House results, Steve Alverson of ESA made a presentation using a PowerPoint slide show on the Part 150 Study process and schedule, draft 2009 and 2014 Noise Exposure Maps, review of additional tasks requested by the Advisory Committee at the August meeting, review of the noise measurements conducted for the Study, and potential options related to the Noise Compatibility Program. At the conclusion of the presentation, the meeting was opened for additional input.

In discussing the draft 2009 and 2014 noise contours, Steve noted that the solid lines represent the 65 and higher DNL contours that are considered by the FAA. The dashed 60 and 55 DNL contours can be used by the City for land use planning purposes. During the review of the two contours, it was identified that while activity has changed due to the economic downturn, that the 2008 estimates prepared for the Study and the actual 2008 results are anticipated to be within the +/- 15 percent increase or decrease allowance provided by the FAA to remain representative contours of the current operating environment. As the Study progresses and the full draft NEM document is completed,

comparison of actual operational activity to data used to generate the noise contours will be provided to the FAA.

A draft 2028 noise contour with the runway extension and without the extension was presented, as requested during the August 2008 meeting of the AC. In addition, the request for an analysis of flight track altitudes was presented showing the various heights of a Cessna 172 and an R22 during touch and go procedures as modeled. The graphics showed that during takeoff and landing, aircraft are at lower altitudes than when the aircraft are at the traffic pattern altitude. For example, the Cessna 172 operates at approximately 900 feet above ground level (AGL) once it reaches traffic pattern altitude as compared to the R22 which operates at 500 feet AGL. Finally, a request had been made for a comparison of contours from the previous Part 150 Study to the draft contours for this Study. The contours for the current Study are generally the same length as those from the 1998 Study (2003 year contours), and they are wider for the most part than the previous contours. This is likely due to the use of more flight tracks and the higher levels of operations used to generate the current noise contours for 2009.

In terms of the noise measurements, slides were prepared to show the locations of where the 13 noise monitors were located. For each location, the single event noise level ranges as measured and as modeled using the INM were presented. For all but one site, the measured SEL were lower than the modeled SEL. It was again noted that data from the noise monitoring cannot be used to change the INM or for modeling purposes.

Finally, the presentation provided information on the upcoming various components of the Noise Compatibility Program. Discussion of various potential operational procedures (abatement), land use measures (mitigation), and administrative measures (policy) was initiated. Specific potential helicopter training activity options, itinerant helicopter operations options, and fixed wing training options were presented for discussion with the AC members in attendance.

Comments from the AC members included:

- Previous attempts have been made to comingle helicopter and fixed wing activity on both runways to see what the impact on the patterns would be. The operators at the Airport indicated they could discuss these attempts with the consultants if needed.
- A member commented that the intensity of the helicopter operations is the issue and is looking for pattern adjustments or traffic restrictions to address the intensity.
- A statement was made that the operational options presented were exactly what would have been expected given the types of operations that occur at the Airport and the noise concerns expressed by the local communities. It was noted that this member felt that there isn't anything that can be done operationally that would

be more effective and that the operators have been working on the issue since 1991. The member also noted frustration since many of the community residents who are complaining about noise signed real estate disclosure agreements indicating an understanding that they purchased a home near the airport.

- One member expressed that there is one potential option that could be modeled and that he would work with the consultant team in developing this option. No further details of the potential option were provided.
- It was expressed that the Study was putting “false hope” in people’s minds related to the potential for restrictions to activity. As part of this discussion, it was noted that while the slide show and discussion together accurately portrays that these are options, if someone downloads the presentation without the benefit of the discussion, there could be confusion that these are only options being examined. This is especially true related to the “restrictions”.
- Discussion that FAA requires that “restrictions” be included in the evaluation was also held. It was noted that FAA is revising Part 150 and since mandatory restrictions are not approved by the FAA as part of the recommendations, this requirement will be changed in the future but still exists as part of our Study due to timing.
- It was determined that changes would be made to the slide presentation for both the AC meeting and the Open House, as well as the boards, to clarify that the alternatives are only options being considered. These revised presentations and boards will be uploaded to the website on Monday, June 8, 2009.