RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED PRIOR TO PUBLIC HEARING

SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT
14 CFR PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY
Responses to Comments Received
Prior to Public Comment Period

Public comments were accepted throughout the development of the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program. There were multiple opportunities for interested parties to submit comments. There were comment sheets available at the Public Information Workshops. These comment sheets could be filled out on the evening of the event or sent to the consultant at the commenter's convenience. An Internet-based forum was also established for the purpose of soliciting comments from the public.

In addition to these two formal means of submitting comments, e-mails and letters addressed to airport staff or the consultant were reviewed and responses were prepared. Following are the comments received prior to the public hearing, coupled with responses to the comments. Copies of the comments received can be found in this document under the section titled, ***"Written Comments Received Prior to Public Hearing."***

List of People Commenting	
Person Commenting	**Comment Number**
Phil Vickers	1, 2, 3, 4
Joseph Dean	5, 6, 7, 8
Diana Nayer	9
Scott Calev	10, 33
Michael McCarthy	11, 53
Mark ---	12
James and Carol Slaker	16, 17, 18
Larry Burgo	19, 20, 21, 27, 28
Steve Williams	22, 23
Charles Delvin	24, 25, 35
John Lekas	26, 77
Shoshana Epstein	29, 30
Debra Fritze	31, 32
Mary Ritter	34
Bill Hudson	36, 37
Christine Schild	38
Kathleen Feurstein	39
James Kingery	40
Charles Smith	41
G. Meyers	42, 43, 44
Kathy Watson-Johnson	45, 46, 47
Catherine Hopkins	48, 49, 68, 69
D. Landreville	50, 51, 52
J. Marty Gordon	54
Bob Giammarco	55, 56, 57
Rich Garigen	58
Pat Murphy	59, 60, 61
Pascal de Sarthe	62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67
Herb Schwartz	70, 71, 72, 78
Genevieve ---	73, 74, 75
Mark Kucera	76
J. Walter	79
Stacy Howard	80, 81, 82
William Gillies	83

Comments Received at Public Information Workshops or Submitted by Mail or E-mail

Phil Vickers – August 3, 2004

Comment 1 – I suggest that night and early morning operations should be limited to emergency operations between 7 p.m. and 7 a.m. due to the impact on residents and the non-economic merits of keeping the airport open.

> Response – Various operating restrictions were evaluated in the noise abatement alternatives portion of the study. Among those alternatives evaluated were capacity restrictions, curfews, and operating restrictions. It was determined that these restrictions would have adverse effects on general aviation and the region's economy. Additionally, implementing restrictions based on noise levels can be costly, problematic, and require the completion and subsequent FAA approval of a Part 161 Study. For a Part 161 Study to be approved, it must be demonstrated that the benefits of the restriction (the reduction of noise-sensitive impacts within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour) are greater than the costs of implementing the restriction. FAA disapproval of an operating restriction is likely because there are no impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour.

Comment 2 – All Stage 2 aircraft should be immediately banned. If Jackson Hole can ban Stage 2 aircraft, then Scottsdale should be able to do so. An alternative would be to ban Stage 2 aircraft that have not been retrofitted with noise reduction devices.

> Response - Jackson Hole Airport is located within a national park. Congress passed legislation exclusive to airports like Jackson Hole to ban Stage 2 business jets. Implementing a Stage 2 ban at Scottsdale Airport would require an approved Part 161 Study. For a Part 161 Study to be approved, it must be demonstrated that the benefits of the restriction (the reduction of noise-sensitive impacts within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour) are greater than the costs of implementing the restriction. FAA disapproval of an operating restriction is likely because there are no impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour.

Comment 3 – The FAA should allow airports to make their own rules about aircraft noise in their community.

> Response – Part 150 was developed to provide communities an avenue to develop rules on aircraft noise issues. However, any rule that is considered discriminatory, creates an undue burden on interstate commerce, prevents the efficient use of navigable airspace, conflicts with existing federal regulations, or creates an undue burden on the national aviation system is

subject to further study under the Part 161 Study process. For a Part 161 Study to be approved, it must be demonstrated that the benefits of the restriction (the reduction of noise-sensitive impacts within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour) are greater than the costs of implementing the restriction. FAA disapproval of an operating restriction is likely because there are no impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour.

Comment 4 – Helicopter flight rules should be revised to require higher minimum operating altitudes to reduce noise.

Response – The helicopter pilot guide, as well as the voluntary Letter of Agreement between the based helicopter operators and the Tower, defines a recommended altitude of 500 feet above ground level for aircraft performing the established arrival and departure procedures. The traffic pattern altitude for propeller aircraft is 1,000 feet above ground level. Separation is required between the two groups of aircraft. Additionally, airspace at Scottsdale Airport is constrained by the Class B Airspace associated with Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport. This limits the overall height of the pattern altitudes for jets, propeller aircraft, and helicopters.

Joseph Dean – August 3, 2004

Comment 5 – Having the airport so near my home is an asset and increases my property value. The noise is absolutely no problem.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 6 – I am a strong supporter of Scottsdale Airport. The only noise that bothers me is the noise generated by those people who knowingly purchased property in this area and now want changes made to accommodate their wishes.

Response – Comment noted.

David Barnett – August 5, 2004

Comment 7 – Signs indicating the proximity of the airport to a particular location are suitable for commercial and industrial areas, but not for residential areas. Buyers should do more of their own research regarding airport noise.

Response – Airport warning signage was evaluated during the study process. It was determined that warning signs would not be an effective means of alerting residents to the presence of the airport (see pages 7-2 and 7-3 of the Noise Compatibility Program document). The current state fair disclosure law, local real estate agent education program, city website, and airport

directional signage program provide adequate information regarding the presence of the airport and its operations.

Comment 8 – Building heights should be investigated as a means of reducing noise impacts. Sixty-foot buildings would help.

Response – While increased building heights would create a barrier to attenuate noise, the availability of land and lack of funding to construct such buildings prohibit this recommendation from being a feasible alternative. The FAA has standards regarding the height of structures in relation to their proximity to the runway that could restrict the height of these buildings. Additionally, City of Scottsdale ordinances stipulate that all building heights shall not exceed 36 feet.

Diana Nayer – August 5, 2004

Comment 9 – There needs to be a flight tracking system to formally track residents' noise complaints and pilots' compliance with the airport procedures.

Response – A noise and flight track monitoring system is included in the Noise Compatibility Program and Program Management Element #4. This system will allow airport staff to better respond to aircraft overflights. While the flight track and monitoring system cannot be used to enforce a particular procedure, it can be used to better understand how pilots operate in the vicinity of the airport. It can also be used to educate pilots on how to operate as quietly as possible in the Scottsdale area. Additionally, it can provide prospective home buyers an historical account of flight patterns.

Scott Calev – August 5, 2004

Comment 10 – The arrival routes could be shifted over Highway 101 to reduce noise over residential areas.

Response – An arrival route following Highway 101 was evaluated as part of the study. It was determined that this is not a viable alternative because it shifts the 65 DNL noise contour over residential areas not previously impacted by noise. Additionally, due to the proximity of the runway end to the highway, would require a very tight turn that high-performance aircraft such as business jets cannot safely complete. Additionally, the noise abatement procedures published in the helicopter pilot guide, as well as the voluntary Letter of Agreement between the based helicopter operators and the Tower, recommend departing aircraft follow Highway 101 when departing Runway 21 and then flying south.

Michael McCarthy – August 5, 2004

Comment 11 – Noise has absolutely no impact.

Response – Comment noted.

Mark (Unable to discern last name written on comment sheet.) – August 5, 2004

Comment 12 – Warning signs indicating the presence of "loud, low-flying aircraft" are unnecessary.

Response – See response to Comment 7.

James and Carol Slaker – August 3, 2004

Comment 16 – We live north of Jomax Road and the airport will not accept our noise complaints. This policy needs to be altered, as we feel disenfranchised.

Response – Aircraft noise complaints logged via the Scottsdale Airport 24-hour noise complaint hotline are limited to callers within the Scottsdale Airport influence area. The Scottsdale Airport influence area encompasses approximately 120 square miles, which extends beyond the Scottsdale Airport "Class D" airspace boundaries. The influence area boundaries are approximately 40th Street to the west, 112th Street to the east, Jomax Road to the north and Mockingbird Lane to the south. Aircraft noise complaints from areas outside the Scottsdale Airport influence area called in to the noise hotline will not become part of the official record of the City. These noise complaints can, however, still become part of our official record if logged via the Scottsdale Airport web-server complaint reporting system. Furthermore, to effectively utilize staff resources, requests for return calls will only occur for complaints within the airport influence area.

Comment 17 – The flight path should be revised to prevent arriving aircraft from flying over residential areas to the north of the airport. Arriving aircraft should be routed over Tonto National Forest, south near Granite Mountain and Fraesfield Mountain, the McDowell Mountains, and then south and west to the Airpark. This would eliminate many of the complaints from Carefree, Cave Creek, and Far North Scottsdale.

Response – The Noise Compatibility Program includes a recommendation to identify Cave Creek and Carefree as urban areas on the Phoenix Sectional Aeronautical Chart. Flight path changes in the Cave Creek and Carefree area are beyond the scope of Scottsdale Airport Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study as they are outside the study area and would not result in a noise impact reduction within the 65 DNL noise contour. Additionally,

coordination with the National Parks Service would be required to ensure that the suggested overflights would not impact the national park lands. Modifications to flight routes are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration. Additionally, many flights in the Scottsdale area are not operating at Scottsdale Airport; instead, they are transitioning through the airspace en route to other locations.

Comment 18 – The hours of aircraft operations should be changed. No Stage 2 or un-muffled propeller-driven aircraft should be allowed to operate between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.

Response – See response to Comments 1 and 2.

Larry Burgo – August 5, 2004

Comment 19 – The airport needs a radar tracking system.

Response – See response to Comment 9.

Comment 20 – Aircraft fly in too low and loud when arriving at Scottsdale Airport.

Response –The glide slope for both runways at Scottsdale Airport are set at four degrees, the steepest approach slope allowed under federal regulations. The Study also recommends the continuation of a policy discouraging descents below 2,500 feet MSL for practice instrument approaches.

Comment 21 – The proposed noise reduction efforts will not make a noticeable difference.

Response – Comment noted.

Steve Williams – August 5, 2004

Comment 22 – I live outside the noise study area, but we have had a great deal of small aircraft noise during the last 18 months.

Response – The commenter lives southeast of the airport, approximately six miles from the Airport. The number of operations at Scottsdale Airport has fluctuated over the past 15 years. The number has ranged between 171,000 and 260,000 operations during that time. Over the last three years, the number of operations has increased at Scottsdale Airport from approximately 189,000 to 196,000. Although there has been an increase over this period, there have also been years during which the number of operations was substantially greater than the existing conditions. Also see response to Comment 17.

Comment 23 – We feel like no one is listening to our complaints about aircraft noise.

Response – See response to Comment 16.

Charles Delvin – October 15, 2004

Comment 24 – I have been to several meetings and feel that they are a waste of my time. In several years dealing with the airport, I feel that they do not care about my opinion.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 25 – Aircraft noise is disruptive to our lives. We are awakened in the middle of the night by aircraft and our children suffer from a lack of sleep.

Response – Comment noted.

John Lekas – October 25, 2004

Comment 26 – Is the new area of DC Ranch being included in the noise study? Thousands of new residents will be living in this area and it appears that aircraft are frequently flying over this area.

Response – Land Use Management Measure #4 includes a recommended overlay zone for the area surrounding Scottsdale Airport. The overlay zone includes DC Ranch and has provisions for project review guidelines and zoning stipulations intended to provide adequate fair disclosure and to obtain avigation easements on properties. In addition, the State of Arizona adopted legislation that provides for the disclosure of aviation activities to prospective buyers of real estate in 1997. In 1999, the Arizona State Legislature adopted additional aviation-related legislation requiring the state real estate department to prepare and maintain a series of maps depicting the traffic pattern airspace of each public airport in the state. A disclosure notice describing the proximity of the airport was included as part of the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for properties within the DC Ranch development. This disclosure notice will also be included as part of the title report. Upon sale of the property, the prospective buyer will have to sign the disclosure notice to signify acceptance of its terms.

Larry Burgo – October 26, 2004

Comment 27 – Until there is a standard height guide for aircraft operating at Scottsdale Airport, noise problems will continue. Every day there are aircraft that

fly over our houses at altitudes ranging between 1,000 and 2,000 feet above the ground.

Response – See response to Comments 4 and 20.

Comment 28 – Stage 2 aircraft are the noisiest aircraft operating at the airport.

Response – See response to Comments 1 and 2.

Shoshana Epstein – October 26, 2004

Comment 29 – The blue shading on the pilot guide indicating noise-sensitive areas should be added to the maps published online. This would give the public a better understanding of the location of noise-sensitive areas.

Response – The pilot guide will be updated as part of this study. This suggestion will be taken under advisement when the pilot guide is updated.

Comment 30 – Homes in noise-sensitive areas should have a map indicating the noise-sensitive areas recorded in the chain of title. This information would be linked to the property and available to owners.

Response – See response to Comment 26.

Debra Fritze – October 26, 2004

Comment 31 – We purchased our home in Scottsdale 12 years ago and there was no noise problem. Everything has changed now and we are constantly bombarded by helicopter noise. We have a serious noise pollution problem.

Response - A helicopter pilot guide has been developed to provide pilots with information regarding where to fly to reduce noise impacts. Program Management Measure #6 recommends continuation and periodic updates of pilot information materials such as the helicopter pilot guide. Also see response to Comment 4.

Comment 32 – The corporate jets at Scottsdale are too large to be operating at such a small airport.

Response – Scottsdale Airport meets all safety regulations for the aircraft currently operating at the airport.

Scott Calev – October 26, 2004

Comment 33 – I was told that there were approximately 169,000 operations at Scottsdale Airport during 2003. I think this is too much noise and this problem is out of control.

> Response – The number of operations at Scottsdale Airport has fluctuated over the past 15 years. The number has ranged between 171,000 and 260,000 operations during that time. Over the last three years, the number of operations has increased at Scottsdale Airport from approximately 189,000 to 196,000. Although there has been an increase over this period, there have also been years during which the number of operations was substantially greater than the existing conditions. Historic operations are outlined in Table 2K and Table 2Q found in the *Noise Exposure Maps* document. Also see response to Comment 1.

Mary Ritter – October 26, 2004

Comment 34 – I have been disappointed in the increase in helicopter noise. They fly at altitudes over my house starting early in the morning and continue until late at night. I suggest helicopters fly along the CAP canal or Highway 101 to reduce the number of residences disturbed by noise.

> Response – The helicopter pilot guide for Scottsdale Airport defines several arrival/departure routes that follow Highway 101, and other major roadways to avoid overflights of residential areas. See response to Comment 4.

Charles Delvin – January 8, 2005

Comment 35 – The only thing that will satisfy me is a total restriction of jets operating at Scottsdale Airport.

> Response – See response to Comments 1 and 2.

Bill Hudson – January 9, 2005

Comment 36 – Helicopters should fly from Deer Valley Airport and not Scottsdale.

> Response – Implementing a restriction for helicopters would require the completion and subsequent FAA approval of a Part 161 Study. For a Part 161 Study to be approved, it must be demonstrated that the benefits of the restriction (the reduction of noise-sensitive impacts within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour) are greater than the costs of implementing the restriction. FAA disapproval of an operating restriction is likely because there are no impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour.

Comment 37 – Operations at Scottsdale Airport should be restricted to the time between 6:30 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.

Response – See response to Comment 1.

Responses to Comments Posted on Scottsdale Part 150 Internet-Based Forum

Christine Schild – July 23, 2004

Comment 38 – I have been a resident of Scottsdale for over 11 years. I rarely hear the airplanes flying in and out of Scottsdale Airport. The level of noise does not affect our quality of life in any way.

Response – Comment noted.

Kathleen Feuerstein – July 23, 2004

Comment 39 – I think that people who are complaining about airport noise do not have reason to complain. They should have been aware of the airport's location before they purchased their house.

Response – Comment noted.

James Kingery – July 26, 2004

Comment 40 – I think that occasionally aircraft noise is excessive at Scottsdale Airport. The only planes that draw my attention are the Lear aircraft and one Gulfstream GIII.

Response – Comment noted. See response to Comment 2.

Charles Smith – July 26, 2004

Comment 41 – Over the last three and one-half years, we have experienced an increasing number of low-flying aircraft, primarily corporate jets and helicopters. This noise is something we did not anticipate when we purchased our house.

Response – The operational fleet mix (see Table 3B of the *Noise Exposure Maps* document) for Scottsdale Airport indicate that 18% of the operations at the airport are performed by business jets and helicopters. The number of corporate jets has increased over the last ten years. According to the previous Part 150 Study, 7% of the operations at the airport were performed by business jets and helicopters. Also see responses to Comments 22 and 31.

G. Meyers – July 27, 2004

Comment 42 – Pilot controls should be addressed. Pilots do not have to fly into the A-1 zones unless they feel like it.

Response – There are arrival and departure procedures, depicted on Exhibits 3E and 3F, which require pilots flying under visual flight rules to fly over the designated A-1 overlay zones. The overlay zones are defined as part of the Land Use Management Element. The current overlay zones are illustrated on Exhibit 6B and the proposed overlay zones are depicted on Exhibit 7E.

Comment 43 – Alternative measures need to be considered since it is not possible to move the existing houses.

Response – A variety of noise abatement alternatives and land use alternatives were evaluated as part of this Noise Compatibility Study Update. However, over the years noise-sensitive development has encroached on Scottsdale Airport and left very few options for routing aircraft. The study recommends the continuation of using the only compatible corridor left north/northwest of the airport - Noise Abatement Measure #1 recommends the use of Runway 3 to direct departures to the north, Noise Abatement Measure #2 encourages louder Stage 2 aircraft to arrive from the north on Runway 21 and depart to the north on Runway 3, and Noise Abatement Measure #3 discourages right departure turns from Runway 3 prior to reaching the airport boundary.

Comment 44 – The study only references the existing conditions; it needs to focus on things that can be changed.

Response – The Scottsdale Airport Part 150 Study Update prepared noise exposure contours for two forecast years: 2009 and 2025. In addition, a review of future general plans for both Scottsdale and Phoenix was done and recommendations for maintaining compatible land uses in high aircraft noise areas were made. These include maintaining compatible land uses within the 65 DNL noise exposure contours, maintaining compatibly-zoned areas within the project study area, enacting project review guidelines, adopting overlay zoning and subdivision regulations, adopting building code amendments for sound insulation standards, incorporating the 2009 noise exposure contours in the general plan for fair disclosure, and rezoning areas north of the CAP canal zoned for residential areas but planned for industrial/commercial development.

Kathy Watson-Johnson – July 28, 2004

Comment 45 – I am concerned about the increase in jet operations, which are much louder than the smaller propeller aircraft. I think these operations should be limited.

Response –See response to Comments 1 and 2.

Comment 46 – Aircraft seem to operate much lower than 1,000 feet.

Response – The traffic pattern altitude for propeller aircraft is 1,000 feet above ground level. For helicopters, it is 500 feet above ground level. Traffic pattern altitude doesn't apply to aircraft on an established descent. See response to Comments 4 and 20.

Comment 47 – Aircraft operations should not be allowed in the middle of the night.

Response – See response to Comment 1.

Catherine Hopkins – August 1, 2004

Comment 48 – I have recently noticed that jet operations have increased at Scottsdale Airport. These aircraft disturb the peace in Scottsdale.

Response - See response to Comments 41.

Comment 49 – Users of corporate jets should operate from Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport.

Response – See response to Comments 1 and 2.

D. Landreville – August 5, 2004

Comment 50 – The basis for the FAA DNL noise measurement is flawed. Noise measurements should be based on the total number of occurrences above an acceptable level over a specific time period, the degree above the acceptable level, and the duration of the noise.

Response – The DNL noise metric is required by the FAA when preparing a Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study. It should be noted that there is no other officially accepted criteria for assessing how human annoyance is correlated with single-event aircraft noise. The use of noise metrics such as DNL in this type of study is based on years of research demonstrating that average community response to noise is best predicted when based on cumulative noise exposure. (See Directorate of Operational Research and Analysis (*Aircraft Noise and Sleep Disturbance: Final Report* (DORA) 1980; Fidell et

al. *Updating a Dosage-Effect Relationship for the Prevalence of Annoyance Due to General Transportation Noise*, 1989; Finegold et al. "Applied Acoustical Report: Criteria for Assessment of Noise Impacts on People." *Submitted to the Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*; Great Britain Committee on the Problem of Noise. *Noise, Final Report*, 1963; Kryter. *The Effects of Noise on Man*, 1970; Richards and Ollerhead. "Noise Burden Factor – "A New Way of Rating Noise", *Sound and Vibration*, 1973; Schultz. "Synthesis of Social Surveys on Noise Annoyance," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 1978; U.S. EPA. Information on Levels of *Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*, 1974.) These studies have produced similar results, finding that annoyance is most directly related to cumulative noise exposure like DNL, rather than single-event exposure.

Comment 51 – The departure from Runway 21 should not be to 300 degrees as soon as possible, but rather south along Scottsdale Road until an acceptable altitude is reached, then along Cactus Road.

Response – The published instrument flight rule (IFR) departure procedures require that aircraft follow a heading of 300 degrees until reaching a predetermined location. This IFR departure procedure was developed by the FAA to direct aircraft to a common point (called the Banyo Intersection) northwest of Scottsdale Airport where radar coverage is available. A procedure described by the commenter may be possible in the future when radar coverage to the ground is available in the Scottsdale Airport area.

Comment 52 – All departures should climb immediately to a minimum height that will minimize noise during takeoff.

Response – Establishing a maximum climb procedure would create more noise close-in over noise-sensitive land uses immediately south of Scottsdale Airport. The Noise Compatibility Program Noise Abatement Measure #7 recommends that pilots use National Business Aviation Association standard or manufacturers' noise abatement procedures. These procedures outline how pilots can reduce the amount of noise their aircraft produce on takeoff. These procedures are to be flown at the pilot's discretion and consistent with safety procedures.

Michael McCarthy – August 6, 2004

Comment 53 – The noise problem at Scottsdale Airport cannot be fixed by this study because the measures that need to be taken will result in a loss of funding for the airport.

Response – Comment noted. See response to Comments 1 and 2.

J. Marty Gordon – August 6, 2004

Comment 54 – I have noticed significant aircraft noise reduction over the last several months. I appreciate the efforts by the helicopter pilots to reduce power and thereby noise. Hopefully these efforts will continue.

Response – Comment noted.

Bob Giammarco – August 7, 2004

Comment 55 – The solution to the noise problem is to ban Stage 2 aircraft at Scottsdale Airport.

Response – See response to Comments 1 and 2.

Comment 56 – The next best solution would be to enact a mandatory curfew between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. The voluntary curfew is not effective.

Response – See response to Comment 1.

Comment 57 – Jets and helicopters are the source of the noise problem. Over the last two years, the number of jet operations has increased dramatically.

Response – See response to Comment 41.

Rich Garigen – August 18, 2004

Comment 58 – I do not think there is a problem with jet noise. I think that some motorcycles are louder than the jets.

Response – Comment noted.

Pat Murphy – September 4, 2004

Comment 59 – I do not think that jets are the source of the noise problem; I think it is the smaller aircraft that operate between 6:00 and 7:30 a.m.

Response – Comment noted. See response to Comment 1.

Comment 60 – I think that the flight path for smaller aircraft should follow the Highway 101 loop to reduce noise.

Response – The pilot guide published by the Airport suggests that aircraft departing Runway 3 and heading south follow Highway 101 to avoid overflight of noise-sensitive areas. Aircraft approaching Runway 21 may

have difficulty turning for approach because of the proximity of the runway end to the highway. Using the Highway 101 route would not be effective for aircraft approaching or departing on Runway 3. Also see response to Comment 10.

Comment 61 – I think that aircraft frequently fly too low over residential areas.

Response – See response to Comments 4 and 20.

Pascal de Sarthe – September 10, 2004

Comment 62 – Frequently aircraft fly over our home at less than 1,000 feet.

Response – See response to Comments 4 and 20.

Comment 63 – Aircraft operate at all hours of the day including very early morning. This is very annoying.

Response – See response to Comment 1.

Comment 64 – We are also concerned about the safety issues related to the nearby elementary school.

Response - While safety is a concern to all involved with aviation, it is not the purview of the Part 150. However, safety is one of the criterion when assessing noise abatement alternatives. A noise abatement procedure will not be recommended if it is not considered safe.

Comment 65 – I think that the proper authorities should control the flight paths so that they are not routed over residential areas.

Response – Flight paths at Scottsdale Airport are overseen by the FAA.

Comment 66 – I think that it is absolutely abnormal for the airport to not have the authority to restrict the hours of operation.

Response – See response to Comment 1.

Comment 67 – The airport should have the means to monitor flight paths.

Response – See response to Comment 9.

Catherine Hopkins – October 20, 2004

Comment 68 – Aircraft taking off before 7:00 a.m. is not acceptable for a residential area.

Response – See response to Comment 1.

Comment 69 – The number of operations at the airport has doubled over the last four years. Let's go back to the pre-2000 levels.

Response – The number of operations at Scottsdale Airport was greater prior to 2000 compared to the 2003 operations. In 1999, the number of operations was approximately 230,000, while the 2003 operation count was approximately 196,000. Historic operations are outlined in Table 2K and Table 2Q found in the *Noise Exposure Maps* document. See response to Comment 22.

Herb Schwartz – October 23, 2004

Comment 70 – In the past two years, the aircraft noise has increased to the point where it is constant. The aircraft are flying at low altitudes very slowly which increases the noise.

Response – See responses to Comments 4, 20, and 22.

Comment 71 – Private jets operating at the airport are very loud and frequently fly over my house.

Response – The commenter resides southwest of the airport, under the arrival and departure tracks as illustrated on Exhibits 3E and 3F. See response to Comments 1 and 2.

Comment 72 – I have called and emailed the airport regarding loud and frequent overflights of my house and have been dissatisfied with their response.

Response – Scottsdale Airport tracks aircraft noise complaints to assist in ongoing noise abatement efforts. This information is used to identify emerging concerns, assist in land use planning efforts, develop pilot education materials, and to document changes in noise-related concerns. This information does not directly influence aircraft flight paths and does not result in the issuance of warnings or violations to specific pilots. Scottsdale Airport has established noise abatement procedures, however, low-flying aircraft complaints should be directed to the Federal Aviation Administration as the airport does not have legal authority over aircraft in flight. Also see response to Comment 16.

Genevieve – October 24, 2004

Comment 73 – Since moving to Scottsdale a few years ago, there has been an exponential increase in takeoff noise at the airport.

Response – See response to Comment 22.

Comment 74 – Measures need to be recommended such as retrofitting older jets to return the quality of life to Scottsdale to what it once was.

Response – Restrictions on Stage 2 business jets under 75,000 pounds or Stage 3 aircraft, which are the primary customers for Scottsdale Airport, require the completion and subsequent FAA approval of a Part 161 Study. For a Part 161 Study to be approved, it must be demonstrated that the benefits of the restriction (the reduction of noise-sensitive impacts within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour) are greater than the costs of implementing the restriction. FAA disapproval of an operating restriction is likely because there are no impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour. Noise reduction technology for Stage 2 aircraft is available, but is not required by federal regulations.

Comment 75 – Signs should not be posted to notify potential buyers of the airport; this will decrease our property values.

Response – See response to Comment 7.

Mark Kucera – October 24, 2004

Comment 76 – Helicopter noise is a problem at my house. The flight paths need to be changed to avoid overflight of residential areas.

Response - The airport has developed a helicopter pilot guide. This effort was coordinated with the FAA and was based on the voluntary Letter of Agreement between the based helicopter operators and the Tower. The guide is to be distributed to all helicopter pilots to familiarize them with the area and flight routes, and provide a reference on how to avoid noise-sensitive land uses in the area. The Noise Compatibility Program includes a measure that urges the Airport to continue to develop and update the helicopter pilot guide in coordination with the FAA and Airport Traffic Control Tower.

John Lekas – October 25, 2004

Comment 77 – I would like to know if anything is being done about noise reduction over the new portion of DC Ranch.

Response – See response to Comment 26.

Herb Schwartz – November 5, 2004

Comment 78 – The low-flying aircraft doing touch-and-go procedures over my house need to stop.

Response – Touch-and-go operations are currently prohibited between 9:30 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. Additional restrictions on touch-and-go operations would require an approved Part 161 Study. For a Part 161 Study to be approved, it must be demonstrated that the benefits of the restriction (the reduction of noise-sensitive impacts within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour) are greater than the costs of implementing the restriction. FAA disapproval of an operating restriction is likely because there are no impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour.

J. Walter – November 10, 2004

Comment 79 – We have noticed an increase in the amount of airplane and helicopter noise in our neighborhood recently. We would appreciate it if the flight paths be altered to route helicopters over the CAP canal or the freeway to reduce the overflight of residential areas.

Response – The orientation of the CAP canal to the runway does not make it a suitable flight corridor for fixed-wing aircraft for noise abatement purposes. The turn radius required is too tight to allow aircraft to safely turn when approaching the airport. Helicopters follow the arrival and departure procedures outlined in the helicopter pilot guide. When departing to the south, helicopters follow Highway 101. Departures to the north and west follow a path just south of the CAP canal. These flight paths were developed in coordination with the FAA and are intended to provide safe and efficient routes for helicopters operating at Scottsdale Airport.

Comments Received From TAT Members

Stacy Howard – August 13, 2004

Comment 80 – Page 5-2 should be amended to state that prospective residents should perform due diligence to determine which areas are impacted by aircraft overflights and/or noise, become aware of the effect that aircraft operations may have on their quality of life, and make their locational decisions with that in mind.

Response – This change was made in the text.

Comment 81 – References to increased cost, wear and tear on equipment, or inconvenience to aircraft operators as a consideration for not implementing operational changes and restrictions should be deleted from the final draft. It could lead the public to believe that aircraft owners and operators are unwilling to make financial concessions for the sake of noise reduction.

Response – The specified references were removed from the text.

Comment 82 – With reference to charted visual approaches, we believe that any charted approach to the airport should be available and useful to all classifications of aircraft. There should never be a debate whether or not a charted approach is flyable.

Response – Comment noted.

William Gillies – October 15, 2004

Comment 83 – I see no mention of military aircraft. The military operates at Scottsdale Airport and would like to retain that ability.

Response – Military aircraft operations are included in the operational fleet mix used to calculate the noise contours. Military operations are expected to continue at Scottsdale Airport.