WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC HEARING AND COMMENT PERIOD

14 CFR PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY UPDATE

PUBLIC HEARING
MEETING COMMENT FORM

Name: CATHY REGAN

Date: Jan. 27, 2005 Time: 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Place: Best Western Scottsdale Airpark Suites
High Flight Room

Please print neatly

1) Scotts. airport was built long before most homes in this area. Therefore, the people who bought near the airport really shouldn't be complaining about anything. Growth happens!

2) The skies were too quiet after 9/11. When I hear an ~~air~~ airplane or helicopter, I am thankful they're still able to fly — and not grounded.

Mail to:
COFFMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
237 N.W. Blue Parkway, Suite 100
Lee's Summit, MO 64063 FAX: (816) 524-2575
www.coffmanassociates.com

14 CFR PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY UPDATE

PUBLIC HEARING
MEETING COMMENT FORM

Name: Mary Ann Lund

Date: Jan. 27, 2005 Time: 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Place: Best Western Scottsdale Airpark Suites
High Flight Room

Please print neatly

We paid how much for this study to decide status quo?

My complaint is that there are no regulations on size of plane, how noisy the plane is and what time they can fly in.

We are woken ~~by air planes~~ at 2:00 3:00 4:00 am. by jets flying in. But I understand that initates another study.

Mail to:
COFFMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
237 N.W. Blue Parkway, Suite 100
Lee's Summit, MO 64063 FAX: (816) 524-2575
www.coffmanassociates.com

14 CFR PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY UPDATE

PUBLIC HEARING
MEETING COMMENT FORM

Name: LARRY BURGO
16622 N. 108th St. 85255

Date: Jan. 27, 2005 Time: 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Place: Best Western Scottsdale Airpark Suites
High Flight Room

Please print neatly

SINCE MOST of the SMALLER PLANES have been LEAVING S.D. AIRPORT, ITS ALMOST 98 or 99% CORP. JETS. (over the past 7 YRS.)

We REALLY NOTICE the difference (my NEIGHBORS AND my FAMILY) IN the LAST 3 YEARS OR SO

They are ONLY 6 OR 700 FT. OVER OUR houses, MANY COME IN WAY TOO FAST which CREATS EVEN MORE NOISE AND TOO LOW.

OUR daughter LIVES a MILE west of US at BELL + T. Peak, which is EVEN CLOSER TO the AIRPORT. They are EVEN LOWER there + LOUDER.

IT TICKS ME OFF WHEN COUNCILMAN BOB LITTLEFIELD SAYS WELL you KNEW there was AN AIRPORT there IN 1995-96. Yeah when it was 80% SMALL PLANES you HARDLY HEARD! AND OTHERS

NOW when they COME 3 or 4 RIGHT AFTER the other FROM 4 to 6 P.M. ITS ANNOYING as HELL!

PRETTY SOON IT WILL be 100% CORP JETS — they LOOK LIKE there GETTING EVEN LARGER TOO.

Mail to:
COFFMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
237 N.W. Blue Parkway, Suite 100
Lee's Summit, MO 64063 FAX: (816) 524-2575 12-3
www.coffmanassociates.com

14 CFR PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY UPDATE

PUBLIC HEARING
MEETING COMMENT FORM

Name: Donald L. Raff

Date: Jan. 27, 2005 Time: 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Place: Best Western Scottsdale Airpark Suites
High Flight Room

Please print neatly

I want to strongly support the recomendation #4 under Program Management Element: Acquire and implement ... monitoring system.

A significant part of a good public policy and satisfied citizens is based on accurate data; so the rogue pilot that is too low can be identified!

Mail to:
COFFMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
237 N.W. Blue Parkway, Suite 100
Lee's Summit, MO 64063 FAX: (816) 524-2575
www.coffmanassociates.com

14 CFR PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY UPDATE

PUBLIC HEARING
MEETING COMMENT FORM

Name: Wm & Sandra Vendt Date: Jan. 27, 2005 Time: 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

8176 E Beardsley Place: Best Western Scottsdale Airpark Suites

Please print neatly High Flight Room

I am very unhappy with the "jet" aircrafts departing from Scottsdale Airport. After leaving the runway To the north There route Turns west, going right over our home in GRAYHAWK If we our out on the patio all conversation must stop until they have passed. If in our home all the doors and windows must be closed to hear the TV. I feel a flight route staying north and following Pima Road until they gain there elevation would be less of a problem for everyone living in this area. less thrust in there takeoffs would also help the noise impact of us home owners. Another way to help us would be to fly away from from the airport without making a turn in our direction

Thank you

Mail to:
COFFMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
237 N.W. Blue Parkway, Suite 100
Lee's Summit, MO 64063 FAX: (816) 524-2575
www.coffmanassociates.com

David W. Fitz

From: Lewis, Jennifer [JMLewis@ScottsdaleAz.Gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2005 9:40 AM
To: Jim Harris; David W. Fitz
Subject: FW: Testimony for 1/27/05 "AIRPORT NOISE & LAND USE ..." Public Hearing

-----Original Message-----
From: Badda56@aol.com [mailto:Badda56@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2005 10:34 PM
To: JMLewis@Scottsdaleaz.gov
Cc: Badda56@aol.com; Apex96@yahoo.com
Subject: Testimony for 1/27/05 "AIRPORT NOISE & LAND USE ..." Public Hearing

I wish to provide the following written statement to be considered at the Jan. 27, 2005 public hearing; I do not plan to personally appear at that time:

As a 20-year resident of the "Scottsdale Airport Influence Area," living approximately 1 mile directly south of the control tower, I wish to state that airplane noise has *NEVER* been a problem for my family. On the rare occasions when we are consciously aware of aircraft noise, it is patently obvious that either inclement weather or a scheduled "air show" is responsible, and we dismiss the minor intrusion as inconsequential. Scottsdale Airport is vitally important to Scottsdale's economy, and should continue and expand its operation into the future.

Mrs. Ruth Warnas
12511 N. 76 Pl.
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
480 (556-6484)

Dan

From: "daniel ables" <dables61@cox.net>
To: <jmharris@coffmanassociates.com>
Sent: Friday, February 04, 2005 7:14 AM
Attach: Scottsdale Airport Part 150 Study.doc
Subject: Scottsdale Airport Part 150 Study

Please see my attachment re subject matter. I will also Fax this to your (816) 524-2575 number. Should you need to contact me my e-mail address is dables61@cox.net and my cell number is (602) 376-6076. I will be out of town today thru Monday.

Thank You

Dan Ables

February 3, 2005

To: COFFMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.

From: Dan Ables, Scottsdale, Arizona Resident

Subject: Scottsdale Airport Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study

Gentlemen:

My name is Dan Ables. I have resided in the same house at 14023 N. 83rd Street, Patterson Ranch in Scottsdale, Arizona since late 1977.

As you know from your current study with the Scottsdale Airport, that Airport was basically a touch and go small landing strip for private prop planes with no helicopter usage after World War II.

After being advised by City of Scottsdale officials 28 years ago that there were no plans for airport expansion, I purchased my land and built my house. I have since been both amazed and disappointed at the growth of not only the Airpark but also the increase in size, scope and utilization of the Airport itself. We now have many different types and sizes of jet traffic, both private and commercial, larger and nosier prop planes along with the constant buzzing and intrusion of helicopters. The Scottsdale Airport and Airpark has certainly expanded over the last 28 years until it's right up to my property line. This is not what I was promised by City of Scottsdale officials 28 years ago! During this same time frame, my property and house has NOT expanded toward the Airport/Airpark. I think you get my drift on this point!

That said my main focus and problem at this time is all the helicopters that now utilize the Scottsdale Airport/Airpark, which were not originally located there. As you know, some are based at the Airport, others may be based at the Airpark and some are based elsewhere but all use the Airport/Airpark just the same. They ALL fly over my house when flying west into the Airport/Airpark from the east or leaving the Airport/Airpark going to the east. They are ALL extremely noisy, fly very low and many seem to like to hover, thereby making more noise.

In this regard, in 2003 I submitted approximately 350 complaints over about a 6 month period on the noise hot line web site on both airplanes and helicopters that were flying low and noisy directly over my house. During that year I personally witnessed a near mid-air collision between two prop planes over my house that only their evasive reaction at the last minute prevented a disaster. From all these complaints I received only one response from Airport personnel and that was related to my report of the near mid-air collision. The reaction form the Airport was that they did not have a report filed by the pilots of such an incident and, therefore, I was being assured that everything was under control at the

time. If the planes were "under control" then why did both planes commence evasive maneuvers to avoid one another and why did the pilots not report it? Without any means for the Airport to track those two planes it was left up to the pilots discretion and their "honor" code of ethics to report the incident . . . . .which they did not do! Therefore, there is no factual record of the incident other than my observation. It's a hell of a way to run an Airport!

In 2004, I concentrated my efforts in working with Jennifer Lewis, Aviation Planner for the Scottsdale Airport on just the helicopter problem. Jennifer came to my house and as we set outside she could hear and see some of the helicopters that are causing my problem. She informed me that she was working with the Airport based helicopters to get their "voluntary" signature on documents that lay-out a "suggested" flight pattern for the helicopters going into and out of the Airport/Airpark and that this "suggested" flight pattern would be included in a Pilot Guide Book that the Airport was going to publish and distribute to all pilots, both fixed wing and helicopter. It is my understanding that the Pilot Guide Book has been published and is currently in distribution.

Jennifer asked me to call her when I observed a helicopter flying out of the "suggested" flight path so she could try and get there "voluntary" signature of commitment to adhere to the "suggested" flight plan. Through 2004, Jennifer and I had many, many conversations regarding helicopters NOT following the "suggested" flight patterns in and out of the Airport/Airpark as it related to the eastern side only. I would report date; time, direction and color to her for her follow up with the helicopter companies. Some progress has been made by Jennifer's efforts. A large number of those that I reported to Jennifer she could not identify, especially the ones at night because of no visual tracking ability nor could she identify the ones flying into and out of the Airport/Airpark late at night or early morning (10PM to 2AM) when the Airport is "voluntarily" closed. This included two helicopters that were on a collision coarse over my house until the pilots took evasive action to avoid one another. Again, no pilot notification or report of this incident was filed. Like I have stated, this "voluntary/on your honor" program DOES NOT WORK!

After extreme frustration and numerous conversations with Jennifer and attending all of your open house meetings, I have come to the conclusion and totally support you and the Airports desire to have a Flight Tracking System recommended to the Scottsdale City Council and included in your Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study. The City will fight you on this because of cost. As I understand it, however, the Federal Government is picking up 80% of the Part 150 cost. If that's correct then cost should not be an issue for something so desperately needed to make the Airport/Airpark more "good neighbor friendly." With a Flight Tracking System, Jennifer tells me, she and her staff would know exactly which aircraft did what and when. She then would have the ability to contact them and encourage them to be "good neighbor pilots" and sign up for the "voluntary" program. It at least makes the pilots accountable for their actions, to some degree, and sends the message that their actions are being watched. If you make the assumption that pilots do care and are consentience then reduced traffic and noise over residential neighborhoods would be the result.

Yes, there are some pilots that will not initially respond favorably to the Flight Tracking System and the follow up contact Jennifer will make should the Pilot Guide Book not be followed. However, she and I believe that her continued contact with them and appropriate nudging will eventually bring them into the fold of a "good neighbor pilot!" It's a win-win for everybody.

There are many good uses and logical justification for installing a Flight Tracking System. Safety and good neighbor relations between all pilots of all aircraft and surrounding residential and commercial neighbors would be at the top of my list. With the Federal Government paying 80% of the cost the question is . . . . . why would you not install it?

In conclusion, I fully understand that there is no penalty mechanism that can be put into place to effectively penalize a pilot who does something wrong. Unfortunately for the surrounding citizens true, full and complete pilot accountability is not allowed. This is the number one detriment to the operation of the Scottsdale Airport. I, for one, am glad we automobile drivers do not have the same rules and latitude the pilots have!

Kory A. Lewis

From: David W. Fitz
Sent: Sunday, February 06, 2005 1:50 PM
To: Kory A. Lewis
Subject: FW: Scottsdale Airport Noise Compatibility Study Public Hearing - City of Scottsdale

-----Original Message-----
From: Mascaro, Gary [mailto:gmascaro@Scottsdaleaz.Gov]
Sent: Fri 2/4/2005 9:13 AM
To: 'JON C. ALTMANN'
Cc: Bob Littlefield; Gray, Scott
Subject: RE: Scottsdale Airport Noise Compatibility Study Public Hearing - City of Scottsdale

Dear Mr. Altmann,

Thank you for your comments. I will forward them on to Dave Fitz (Coffman Associates) to ensure that they are included in the official submittal to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). If you have any additional questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Gary P. Mascaro, C.M., C.A.E.
Assistant Aviation Director
(480) 312-7612
FAX: (480) 312-8480
gmascaro@ScottsdaleAz.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: JON C. ALTMANN [mailto:jcaltmann@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2005 11:52 PM
To: Mascaro, Gary
Cc: Bob Littlefield
Subject: Re: Scottsdale Airport Noise Compatibility Study Public Hearing - City of Scottsdale

Gary,

I am a Phoenix resident in the 5300 block of East Sweetwater AV - and one that, according to the FAA charts, my home is about directly under the turning point on the approach to/from Scottsdale Airpark.

I am also active in Phoenix as a member of the Paradise Valley Village Planning Committee.

About two years ago, I would say that the jet noise and the overflights of my home were bothersome. I have followed the studies and outreach that you all have made since then. I would say that either I have grown immune from the noise, or it is just simply less.

One noise I never mind are those of the military jets in and out of the Airpark as part of the refueling contract. You will hear only a defense of those from me - but I am also a Senior Chief Intelligence Specialist in the U.S. Naval Reserve, also.

I appreciate the work you all have done in Scottsdale. As a former Scottsdale resident and someone who used to sit on a Scottsdale city committee, I know the city works hard for citizen involvement. With all that said, I thought it would be appropriate to send

you all a note of thanks on the efforts towards making the airport a good neighbor.

Best regards,

Jon

JON C. ALTMANN

5305 E. Sweetwater AV
Scottsdale, AZ 85254-4243
602-765-4588
Email: jcaltmann@earthlink.net

Gary Mascaro
Assistant Aviation Director Scottsdale Airport

January 25, 2005

Re: Coffman Scottsdale Airport Noise Study and Recommendations

Dear Sir:
I have read a printed copy of the Coffman Noise Update at the Arabian Library and wish to make some written remarks for the upcoming Hearing.

Page 7-2
I agree. Additional warning signage is NOT likely to reduce noise complaints. I live in Ironwood Village and the seller failed to disclose the airport 10 years ago, but I knew it was there from standing in the yard. The sound was tolerable at that time and the realtor told me there was no room to expand the airport. But that wasn't true either. So knowing and forecasting are two different situations. I wasn't a whiner initially, now I am.

Page 7-21
I appreciate suggestion number 3 to plot noise complaints more specifically. While it seemed pretty specific to me at the last hearing I attended, the more specific, the more likely to be able to analyze it objectively and, perhaps, to track it back to "offenders".

Page 7-22
Suggestion 4 would be even more objective than 3. It would also let us know whether Holidays or special events-likely to include more unfamiliar pilots using the aiport-are really more noisy or not. I love the idea that "glide" could be monitored to maximize abatement. Sounds like what was going on could really be evaluated/changed.

Suggestion number 4, while expensive, would be 95% paid for by the FAA. Cities' costs would be far less than the $500,000 Scottsdale proposed for car dealers on McDowell Road whose existence (or not) don't bother me at all.

Page 7-25
Suggestion 6-Pilot and Community Outreach, yes, but. People in the community who are outraged will probably never be assuaged by information, except perhaps being able to view-hear a video that shows pilots the noise when they take off one way vs. another. But that'll only last as long as something occurs to which makes these pilots change certain behaviors.

I'd also suggest that a bit of the written and video materials deal with the "feelings" of homeowners who were informed but who have/will live through changes in flight patterns and increased number/size/power of planes. I've been to the airport several times in the past couple years and some bumper stickers/signage indicate that pilots/staff (who are probably not the ones making the big noises) don't quite "get it". The average (vs. the rabidly offended) homeowner doesn't want to see the airport go away but would

like consideration from pilots who aren't considerate. Perhaps we need to hear what that pilot is thinking too (homeowners tend to assume that the noisy pilot is a hot-rodder, thinks he is too important or too busy to be considerate when in reality I am sure sometimes it is partly weather condition and ignorance. Although the latter is a scary thought).

F-2 Building Requirements for Noise Reduction
Are there things that the average noise-annoyed homeowner could do which are significant enough in their sound reduction capability to offset the cost (kind of like when power companies compute whether adding storm doors and insulation would offset your power costs)? Maybe advertising these should be part of Community Outreach above. I see in the paper that Sky Harbor/City actually paid for some changes for some homeowners in that area. Maybe that or a tax credit should be considered for older homes.

Other
Perhaps Audubon Society members would do counts of pilots' compliance to "informal", "encouraged" and 'discouraged" practices as listed on pages 7-4 to 7-9. Then you could advertise the results at the airport or do something even more serious. And I'm only half kidding.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Margaret Paterson

Margaret Paterson
9124 E Maple LN
Scottsdale

2 Pages fax
Dave Fitz

SCOTTSDALE NOISE ABATEMENT
2/4/05

SAFETY ALWAYS COMES FIRST

The primary purpose of the ATC system at Scottsdale ATCT is to prevent a collision between aircraft operating in the system and to organize and expedite the flow of traffic. In addition to its primary function the ATC system has the capability to provide (with certain limitations) additional services. Additional services are required when the work situations permit. Noise abatement falls into additional services along with many other items when duty priorities permit.

To assist the City of Scottsdale in encouraging the use of the noise abatement procedures Scottsdale ATCT will continue advertising on our ATIS:

"Scottsdale noise abatement procedures are in effect"

As we do today when necessary we will advise pilots of the noise abatement procedures.

Example:

"For noise abatement left turns off of Runway 21 are discouraged."

"For noise abatement formation flights are prohibited"

Compliance is at pilot's discretion however if a pilot fails to comply with a control instruction, not a noise abatement procedure, Scottsdale ATCT will take the appropriate action.

During pilot briefings conducted by Scottsdale ATCT we will continue to handout the Scottsdale Airport Pilot Guide and encourage the use of the noise abatement procedures.

Scottsdale ATCT personnel are aware of the noise abatement procedures and will provide this and other additional services to our users as duty priorities permit.

Additionally the City of Scottsdale needs to understand that the Noise Abatement Program is voluntary and that the safety of aircraft using Scottsdale Airport will always come first and foremost at Scottsdale ATCT.

Existing Noise Abatement measures to be retained from the 1997 NCP.

#3 – Due to the traffic flow into Scottsdale discouraging right traffic to Runway 3 has not been an issue. However my concern is the wording of long straight in and its intended meaning.
Even thought Phoenix Tracon is working on rerouting some aircraft from the south and west, aircraft transitioning from the Biltmore Transition are given straight in approaches to Runway 3. This allows us a more efficient arrival flow to the airport.

New Noise Abatement Measures not included in the 1997 NCP.

#11—Left downwinds to Runway 21 provide Scottsdale Tower a safe and efficient flow to the airport. Phoenix Tracon is working on rerouting some aircraft from the south so they join the arrival stream from the north. While this procedure will reduce traffic east of the airport some arrivals will still need to be on left downwind for safety and efficiency. Additionally left downwinds to Scottsdale are used to adjust our traffic mix during peak times as well as allowing practice approaches to remain east of the airport after missed approach if landing at Scottsdale.
Again I have concern in the wording of long straight in and its intended meaning. Even thought a majority of our arrival traffic is west of Carefree when inbound on occasion there is a need for aircraft to make a straight in approach.

#13 – Even though a helicopter pilot may have this guide there is no requirement that they fly these routes.

Even though I understand the reasoning behind the recommended procedures and we will use them whenever feasible it needs to be understood that these are not mandatory procedures. Weather and traffic permitting use of the procedures are subject to the discretion of the pilot in command and/or the air traffic controller, with safety of flight operations as the primary factor.

John E. Brett
Air Traffic Manager
Scottsdale ATCT