



**Chandler Municipal Airport  
FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study  
Public Workshop #3  
December 8, 2009  
PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED**

For the third Public Workshop, speaker cards were used for those attendees who wanted to speak publicly. Similar to all previous workshops, all attendees were able to submit written comments at the meeting and were also directed to the study's website to submit comments. Initially, 12 speaker cards were submitted at the start of the meeting. During the meeting, several who completed speaker cards chose to pass and several more submitted speaker cards during the presentation. In all nine individuals provided oral input during the meeting.

Speaker #1 – Passed

Speaker #2 – Passed

Speaker #3 – Nelson Garrison – He noted that he is a pilot. He asked if the City was considered to be in “compliance” with the federal guidelines due to the fact that there are no noise sensitive land uses within 65 DNL contours.

Speaker #4 – Ken Tanner – He confirmed that the City is considered to be in “compliance” with the federal noise guidelines and that there are no regulatory issues. He noted that the City has received approximately 202 complaints according to the Part 150 report in a 57-month period but that with current processes it cannot be determined how many persons actually made all of those complaints (i.e., one person could make all complaints). He concluded that this was an insignificant number of complaints in relation to the number of operations for an airport as busy as Chandler. He asked if the study would not require any new procedures since there is no noise issue according to FAA criteria. He asked if City Council has final authority over what gets submitted to FAA for approval. He asked if the number of unknowns in the current noise complaint process is sufficient to conduct the study. He remarked on how much weight the complaints seemed to carry with the City Council and wondered why the City was spending funds on a noise compatibility study when there aren't any really significant noise issues. He also asked how much a noise monitoring or tracking system would cost. He indicated he would submit comments in a written form as well (he did via the web).

Speaker #5 – Passed

Speaker #6 – Passed

Speaker #7 – Passed

Speaker #8 – Passed

Speaker #9 – John Walkup – He complimented the study team on the analysis to date and the meeting. He indicated he wondered what some of the operational alternatives would mean (in terms of a noise impact) and the analysis shows that most don't have much of an impact. He agreed that aircraft could come in 300 feet higher until they are within 2 miles of the airport. He noted that the helicopter operators have also agreed that they could increase their altitude until they are within 2 miles of the airport. He indicated that both he and the helicopter operator are making efforts, trying to be good neighbors. He invited the public to call and ask questions, to come and get a tour of the airport and see their airplanes, and to discuss any issues. He noted that some of the procedures recommended in the study have already been implemented but that the operators are not being given credit for taking this initiative.

Speaker #10 – Dale Whiting – He asked how many people in the room were airport supporters. Approximately two-thirds of attendees raised their hands. Approximately 10 people raised their hands that they would like the noise condition in the community to improve. He has two sons who fly, but he does not. He has two comments that he will also submit in written form. First, he thinks there is a lack of a formal complaint management system. He indicated that the City admits that this is a low priority. He proposed to keep the noise complaint phone line and purchase noise monitoring system. He suggested development of an on-line noise complaint reporting system. The City could solicit and create a group of airport volunteers (those who support the airport and those that don't) to process and review the data collected and follow up with each and every complaint within three days. He suggested getting more detailed information and specifics on the noise complaint. He suggested developing a process to educate the complainant on what data to provide. He thought this would let the complainants know that someone cares. This could also allow for education of what noise abatement procedures are in place. He also suggested that a card could be developed for itinerant helicopter operators to let them know of the appropriate noise abatement procedures at the airport.

Speaker #11 – Lara Bruner – She expressed appreciation and complimented the consultant team. She thanked City Council for conducting the study. She indicated that there are roads and a school (Hailey Elementary) that are not shown on the maps. She noted that there are studies and data on the impact of noise on education. She feels that DNL is not an appropriate measure for schools since the weight penalty is on night operations and not on day operations that impact education. She is concerned about the potential of shifting fixed wing activity to the east. She feels more data is needed for northeast corridor of airport.

Speaker #12 – Chelle Daly – She reminded the audience that the meeting was being recorded and encouraged public input through comment sheets or the website. She also

assured the audience that all public comments would be included in the final report that will be submitted to the FAA. She asked if when the alternatives mention shifting traffic to the north, did the residents sign a “notification” in this area (answer from City was yes). She asked and wondered if the City asked more Chandler pilots to fly to other airports for activity, if this would create an issue with other non-Chandler pilots flying at the airport. She indicated she would prefer Chandler pilots use the airport.

Speaker #13 – Susan Parenti – She indicated that she is a Chandler resident and flight attendant. She indicated she has called the noise complaint line but she wants more detail than she has been provided. She would appreciate more information on the complaints as suggested earlier by another attendee. She hasn’t continued to call the complaint line since nothing gets done regarding the complaint. She feels there are more complaints than are recorded for this reason.

Speaker #14 – Craig Albright – He is a pilot. He agrees that the study was worthwhile. He feels that just because you conduct the study doesn’t mean you need to provide recommendations. He feels these are unfunded mandates – why should the City pay for a noise tracking system when the airport has limited number of issues. He felt they may want procedures implemented for training aircraft. He indicated that the alternative that examined climbing to pattern altitude doesn’t work from a pilot’s perspective.

Speaker #15 – Michael Tragarz – He indicated he is a local pilot, operates helicopters at Chandler Municipal, and flies for US Airways. He has been in the Valley for 35 years and has worked on noise studies. He doesn’t feel the City needs to get flight tracking system. The PDARS from the TRACON is public information. This would be free and Chandler could get data from this system and get another public software to look at the data. He feels it is false to say that the citizens get no public benefit from the location of the airport. He feels that businesses operate at the airport and add to the community. There is also search and rescue (he flies for the Sheriff’s Office). He indicated that aircraft fly the way they do because of physics and they have to perform certain ways for safety and operational/physical standards. He noted that Chandler has both training and itinerant (visiting) activity. He noted that the EPA established standards for noise and what is acceptable. He felt there was no need to differentiate the standards for schools. He felt that the study should stick to EPA guidelines that have been established.

Speaker #16 – Unknown – He asked where Hailey School was located. He asked if anyone asked the kids if they liked planes.