

Audio recordings are made of this meeting





Item 1: Review and Approval of July 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes





Item 2: MSP FairSkies Presentation



Noise Oversight Committee: *MSP FairSkies Coalition Goals*

Steve Kittleson Kevin Terrell

September 20th 2017





What do we want?

Less noise

No surprises

What concerns us?

MSP noise is increasing



How do we know this?

MAC data we acquired show that across the MSP area, the population impacted by at least 55 dB DNL aircraft noise increased 30% in the last two years, to nearly 100,000





What concerns us?

MSP noise is increasing

FAA on noise impact is "arbitrary and capricious"



How do we know this?

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Argued March 17, 2017

Decided August 29, 2017

"The petitioners argue that the FAA's approval of the new flight routes was arbitrary and capricious... We agree."*

* City of Phoenix v. Huerta and FAA. The court decided <u>unanimously</u> on the merits of the case. The sole dissent addressed only the question of timeliness in filing the case

What we don't want

PHX

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

A result of FAA's NextGen implementation



STATE OF MARYLAND OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

GOVERNOR May 11, 2017

Michael P. Huerta, Administrator U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration 800 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, DC 20591

Re: NextGen Flight Path

NYC LGA

Population exposed to 55 dB DNL Noise*

370,000 2010

Pre NextGen

2016

774,000

Post NextGen

* Analysis of FAA data obtained through FOIA and Port Authority Part 150 We also are not asking for additional mitigation, further out than 60 dB DNL

MSP

Any of that to happen here

AKA outdated NEPA processes used against us



How to succeed?

- 1. Agree on the problem
- **2. Baseline** with meaningful and readily available data
- 3. Set improvement goals
- 4. Collaborate to reach goals



Anatomy of a problem

Annoyance is just one concern with airplane noise. Studies also show a negative association between 55 dB DNL noise, health and learning



Lower levels of reading comprehension for children

cardiovascular disease

Increased risk of stroke. cardiovascular and congestive heart disease

Environmental Protection Agency evaluation of noise, 1978

	Table VIII Yearly L _{dn} Values That Protect I and Welfare with a Margin o	
EFFECT	LEVEL	AREA
Hearing	$L_{eq(24)} \le 70 \text{ dB}$	All areas (at the ear)
Outdoor activity inter- ference and annoyance	$L_{dn} \leq 55 \; dB$	Outdoors in residential areas and farms and other outdoor areas where people spend widely varying amounts of time and other places in which quiet is a basis for use.
	$L_{eq\{24\}} \leq 55 \text{ dB}$	Outdoor areas where people spend limited amounts of time, such as school yards, playgrounds, etc.
Indoor activity inter- ference and annoyance	$L_{dn} \leq 45 \; dB$	Indoor residential areas
rerence and annuyance	$L_{eq(24)} \le 45 \text{ dB}$	Other indoor areas with human activities such as schools, etc.

Is this a problem?

Hiding noise with 55 dB DNL

A bad trend at MSP

Impact of 55 dB DNL increases 30% in two years



110% increase in people exposed to 55 dB DNL noise post NextGen flight path

What's past is prologue





Baseline: Today's view

"The Annual Noise Contour Report does not include population counts."

The FAA reporting standard would show only a couple thousand people impacted by **65 dB DNL**



Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport (MSP) 2016 Annual Noise Contour Report

Table 2.5 Summary of 2016 Actual DNL Noise Contour Unit Counts

				Dwell	ing Un	its With	in DNL (dB) Inte	rval				
City	Count		Sin	gle Fam	ily		Multi-Family						
-		60-64	65-69	70-74	75+	Total	60-64	65-69	70-74	75+	Tota		
Minneapolis	Completed	7045	1636	-	-	8681	447	507	-	-	954		
	Additional	1352	-	-	-	1352	237	-	-	-	237		
	Total	8387	1636	-	-	10023	684	507	-	-	1191		
Bloomington	Completed	16	1	-	-	17	513	-	-	-	513		
	Additional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	Total	16	1	-	-	17	513	-	-	-	513		
Richfield	Completed	689	22	-	-	711	66	-	-	-	66		
	Additional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	Total	689	22	•	-	711	66	-	-	-	66		
Eagan	Completed	319	15	-	-	334	38	-	-	-	38		
-	Additional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	Total	319	15	-	-	334	-	-	-	-	-		
Mendota	Completed	43	1	-	-	44	-	-	-	-	-		
Heights	Additional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
-	Total	43	1	-	-	44	-	-	-	-	-		
All Cities	Completed	8112	1675	-	-	9787	1064	507	-	-	1571		
	Additional	1352	-	-	-	1352	237	-	-	-	237		
	Total	9464	1675	-	-	11139	1301	507	-	-	1808		

Notes:

Block intersect methodology

Multi-Family = 4+ Units

Units that declined mitigation or were determined to be ineligible for participation in the current program are not included in the table. As a result of updated parcel information the MAC obtained from Metro GIS in January 2017, the unit counts in the tables above have slightly different values than previously published.

Source: HNTB provided AEDT contours, MAC analysis, 2017



Baseline: A better view

International standards (55 dB DNL) show the impact of noise is far larger & is growing dramatically





Baseline: A new view

Nx (N70) single event map



United States Court of Appeals FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT Argued March 17, 2017 Decided August 29, 2017

"The FAA's proposal would increase by 300% the number of aircraft flying over twenty-five historic neighborhoods...The idea that a change with these effects would not be highly controversial is "so implausible" that it could not reflect reasoned decisionmaking."

"In short, the FAA had several reasons to anticipate that the new flight routes would be *highly controversial: The agency was changing* routes that had been in place for a long time...The air traffic in some areas would increase by 300%"



A baseline to prepare us

- 1. A 55 dB DNL contour
- 2. A 55 dB DNL NEM
- 3. An N65 contour
- 4. An N65 NEM
- NOC/MAC staff suggestions?
- Data-driven decisions based on citizen expectations



3. Set goals

Target Amsterdam:

Reduce the population impacted by 55 dB DNL noise from MSP by 50% by 2025 AND ensure it's fairly distributed



NOC suggestion:



4. Collaborate

Voice of Citizen

- 1. Noise <u>Oversight</u>?
- 2. City reps on NOC have many stakeholders, not just residents
- Industry-City / 6-6 split on NOC: Few citizens we talk to deem this to be fair, reasonable or as providing citizens a true voice in the process
- These concerns undermine the legitimacy and effectiveness of the NOC in the eyes of concerned citizens
- Citizens need a "seat at the table" in order to effectively collaborate

Alternatives

1. Noise <u>Reduction</u>

- Directly integrate a Voice of Citizen "listening post" onto the NRC. Several possible models exist:
 - School Board "student" rep who applies and is selected
 - Appointed Ombudsman
 - Elected/seconded by citizen groups (e.g. LAX Roundtable)
 - Other?
- Use that direct VOC to better understand community standards and enhance NRC's legitimacy



Will you...

Wa	ays to help improve our community	Decis	ion	If not, why not?
1.	Produce a 55 dB DNL contour?	Yes	No	
2.	Publish a 55 dB DNL NEM?	Yes	No	
3.	Produce an N65 contour?	Yes	No	
4.	Publish an N65 NEM?	Yes	No	
5.	Establish a goal to <u>reduce</u> noise?	Yes	No	
6.	Enhance the NOC with greater stakeholder (citizen) representation?	Yes	No	





1. NOC to review this proposal

2. Integrate into the work plan

3. Collaborate to reduce noise







Item 3: Review of Monthly Operations Reports: July and August 2017



MSP OPERATIONS

					J	UĽ	Υź	201	17												AUGUST 2017																								
		37,6	65									2	,34	46											38	3,5	11						2,213												
		Opera	tions					Nighttime Operations (10:30 PM – 6:00 AM)									Ope	erati	ions	5					Nighttime Operations (10:30 PM – 6:00 AM)																				
50.000														-0.																						10.0									
50,000																																													
40,000		_			_		Г												Г)r													7												
30,000 20,000	35,167 36.734	33,758 34 270	33,048 30 772	36,227	33,827	34,377	35,659	37,306	36,689	33,085	34,595	31,256	32,013	31,371	29,038	35,119	32,686	33,409	35,542	37,132	36,885	32,887	33,969	31,896	32,356	31,597	30,020	34,966	00,290 04 004	26,331	37 880	37,887	34,052	34,906	32,102	33,103	31,868	29.825	36.235	33 971	35.407	36.292	37.665		38,511
10,000																																													
0	SEP-13	NOV-13	JAN-14	MAR-14		MAY-14	1	JUL-14		SEP-14		NOV-14		JAN-15		MAR-15	1	MAY-15		JUL-15	1	SEP-15	1	NOV-15		JAN-16	1	MAR-16			- 111 - 16) -]))	SEP-16	,	NOV-16		JAN-17		MAR-17		MAY-17	-	JUL-17) ; ;	

MSP OPERATIONS

JULY	2017	AUGUST 2017						
37,665	2,346	38,511	2,213					
Operations	Nighttime Operations (10:30 PM – 6:00 AM)	Operations	Nighttime Operations (10:30 PM – 6:00 AM)					



RUNWAY USE



—▲—M —■—N —●—S



CARRIER JET FLEET MIX

JULY 2017

AUGUST 2017



	JULY 201	7		AUGUST 2017								
COMPLAINTS		LOCATIONS		COMPLAINTS		LOCATIONS						
16,293		557		16,727								
Operations per Complaint	New Locations	s Average Median		Operations per Complaint	New Locations	Average	Median					
2.3	145	29	3	2.3	157	27	3					



	JULY 201	7		AUGUST 2017							
COMPLAINTS		LOCATIONS		COMPLAINTS	LOCATIONS						
16,293		557		16,727							
Operations per Complaint	New Locations	Average	Median	Operations per Complaint	New Locations	Average	Median				
2.3	145	29	3	2.3	157	27	3				



	JULY 201	7		AUGUST 2017							
COMPLAINTS		LOCATIONS		COMPLAINTS	LOCATIONS						
16,293		557		16,727							
Operations per Complaint	New Locations	ns Average Median		Operations per Complaint	New Locations	Average	Median				
2.3	145	29	3	2.3	157	27	3				



	JULY 201	7		AUGUST 2017							
COMPLAINTS		LOCATIONS		COMPLAINTS		LOCATIONS					
16,293		557		16,727							
Operations per Complaint	New Locations	Average	Median	Operations per Complaint	New Locations	Average	Median				
2.3	145	29	3	2.3	157	27	3				





JULY – AUGUST COMPLAINT DATA

TOP 10 LOCATIONS FILED **52%** OF ALL COMPLAINTS

TOP 50 LOCATIONS FILED **80%** OF ALL COMPLAINTS

TOP 100 LOCATIONS FILED **88%** OF ALL COMPLAINTS

632 (75%) LOCATIONS FILED 10 OR LESS COMPLAINTS

	JULY 2017		AUGUST 2017							
Time Above	43 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	454_h 29_m TA ⁶⁵	Time Above	47 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	506_h 47_m TA ⁶⁵					
Count Above	2.51 N ⁶⁵ per operation	94,434 N ⁶⁵	Count Above	2.57 N ⁶⁵ per operation	98,847 N ⁶⁵					

	JULY 2017		AUGUST 2017							
Time Above	43 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	454_h 29_m TA ⁶⁵	Time Above	47 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	506_h 47_m TA ⁶⁵					
Count Above	2.51 N ⁶⁵ per operation	94,434 N ⁶⁵	Count Above	2.57 N ⁶⁵ per operation	98,847 N ⁶⁵					



JULY 2017			AUGUST 2017		
Time Above	43 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	454_h 29_m TA ⁶⁵	Time Above	47 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	506_h 47_m TA ⁶⁵
Count Above	2.51 N ⁶⁵ per operation	94,434 N ⁶⁵	Count Above	2.57 N ⁶⁵ per operation	98,847 N ⁶⁵



JULY 2017			AUGUST 2017		
Time Above	43 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	454_h 29_m TA ⁶⁵	Time Above	47 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	506_h 47_m TA ⁶⁵
Count Above	2.51 N ⁶⁵ per operation	94,434 N ⁶⁵	Count Above	2.57 N ⁶⁵ per operation	98,847 N ⁶⁵


SOUND MONITORING

	JULY 2017		AUGUST 2017				
Time Above	43 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	454_h 29_m TA ⁶⁵	Time Above	47 s TA ⁶⁵ per operation	506_h 47_m TA ⁶⁵		
Count Above	2.51 N ⁶⁵ per operation	94,434 N ⁶⁵	Count Above	2.57 N ⁶⁵ per operation	98,847 N ⁶⁵		



JULY 2017								AUGUST 2017						
Runway 17		99.8%					Runway 17 Corridor		99.8% 94.3%					
	Corridor			94.7%										
Cros			ay Nigh . 5% 37.3 9					Cros	sing	Da 36. 9		Nię 35.		
RUS		Verall Arrival 52.1% 42%				rtures 2%	I RUS I		Overall 55.4%		Arrivals 58%		-	rtures 3%



JULY 2017								AUGUST 2017						
Runway 17			99.8%					Runway 17		99.8%				
	Corridor			94.7%					Corr	idor	94.	.3%		
Cros			ay Night 5% 37.3%					Cros	sing	Da 36. 9		Niç 35.		
RUS Over 52. 1			Arrivals 42%			rtures 2%	RUS		Overall 55.4%		Arrivals 58%			rtures 3%



		JULY	2017			AUGUST 2017						
	Runwa	ay 17	99.8%				Runw	Runway 17		.8%		
	Corridor 94.7%						Cor	ridor	94	.3%		
		Da 36. 5				Cro	ssing				ght . 1%	
RUS Overal			Arrivals 42%		Departures 62%	RUS	Overall 55.4%		Arrivals 58%			artures 3%

-DAY USAGE -- NIGHT USAGE







Item 4: Update on Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport PBN Ruling



Item 4: Update on Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport PBN Ruling



PHX v. Huerta, Procedural Issues

- 49 U.S.C. 46110 60-day clock starts at time of route publication
- PHX reasonably waited to file
 - Narrow exception
 - But, FAA promised to address concerns
- FAA failed to adequately consult with City under:
 - NEPA
 - National Historic Preservation Act
 - Section 4(f)

PHX v. Huerta, Holdings

- FAA unreasonably concluded a categorical exclusion was appropriate
 - 5 dB increase in 45-60 dB contours
 - Community concern
- FAA inappropriately applied DNL 65 standards under NHPA and Section 4(f)
 - Assumed Historic Districts and parks were "urban"
 - Required to consult with city

NOC RNAV Resolution

- Establishes "Extraordinary Circumstances" at MSP
- Provides strong message with all stakeholders aligned around a set of local expectation
- A foundational element for industry position on airport and community role
- Speaks to role/extent of community engagement and nature of analyses





Item 5: Evaluate and Enhance the Reporting of the Runway Use System (RUS)

The 2017 NOC Work Plan includes an evaluation of enhancements to the Runway Use System (RUS) reporting to evaluate different options for reporting airport configurations, rather than individual runways.

















Item 6: Investigate Noise-Reducing Landscaping Options



Item 6: Investigate Noise-Reducing Landscaping Options

Amsterdam's Schiphol Airport

- Ridges created off one end of their newest runway to dampen low-frequency ground noise
- The airport sits on over 6,800 acres of land 80 acres were converted to ridges
- Reduced ground noise by 2-3 dB



Source: worksthatwork.com/2/silent-airport

MSP Airport

- The airport sits on 3,400 acres of land
- Does not offer a feasible location for such landscaping techniques on airport property
- Land surrounding MSP is controlled and developed by municipalities
- Landscaping options do not reduce overflight noise; therefore, they must be located close to the airport to be effective





Item 7: Status of FAA Center of Excellence/ASCENT, TRB and FICAN Research Initiatives

A summary of the research projects that were completed, active, initiated, or anticipated in 2017 or 2018 conducted by

- Transportation Research Board TRB (20 projects)
 - Airports Cooperative Research Program
- FAA's Centers of Excellence/ASCENT (21 projects)
- Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise FICAN
 - No published new findings or reports in 2016; however the reports and findings from 1997-2010 can be found here: <u>https://fican.org/findings/</u>
- Recent studies concerning health-related effects of aircraft noise – conducted by various independent researchers – and published in 2017 were also included in the staff report





Item 8: Review of July 26, 2017 Listening Session

9 residents attended the Summer Listening Session at the Apple Valley Municipal Center

Presentation slides from the meeting are available at <u>www.macnoise.com/our-neighbors/msp-quarterly-listening-sessions</u>

All questions were answered at the meeting, therefore staff will not be preparing written responses

Comments/questions from the residents focused on:

- Runway 17 departures and Runway 35 arrivals
- MSP nighttime operations
- Noise monitoring locations and data
- Runway Use System (RUS) prioritization
- Components of the Federal Environmental Impact Statement completed for the construction of Runway 17/35
- Converging Runway Operations and the effect on runway use

The next listening session will be **October 25, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.** at the MAC General Offices.





Item 9: Public Comment Period





Item 10: Announcements

Next NOC meeting November 15, 2017 @ 1:30 PM MAC General Offices 6040 28th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55450 Fall Listening Session October 25, 2017 @ 7:00 PM MAC General Offices 6040 28th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55450

