



---

---

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED  
DURING PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

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

---

The Public Hearing for the Scottsdale Airport Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 14, Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) was held on January 27, 2005.

The public comments were heard before a certified court reporter at the Public Hearing. Participants choosing to speak were given three minutes to express their comments. Additionally, comment sheets were available for members of the public to submit written comments.

The comments and questions received during the hearing and corresponding comment period that ended February 4, 2005 are responded to in this section. A list of people making comments follows.

<b>List of People Commenting</b>	
<b>Person Commenting</b>	<b>Comment Number</b>
Chris Kolanko	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Tommy Walker	7, 8
Betty Jacobs	9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14
Sandra Vendt	15, 16
Bob Carter	17, 18
Stacy Howard	19, 20, 21
Joyce Clark	22, 23, 24, 25
Mike Schnell	26, 27
Cathy Regan	28, 29
Mary Ann Lund	30, 31
Larry Burgo	32, 33, 34
David Raiff	35
Willan and Sandra Vendt	36, 37
Ruth Warnas	38
Dan Ables	39, 40, 41, 42, 43
John Altman	44
Margaret Paterson	45, 46, 47
John Brett	48, 49, 50

## **Verbal Comments Received At the Public Hearing**

Chris Kolanko

Comment 1 – I have lived in Scottsdale for fourteen years and there was no noise problem when we moved here. In the past three years, the noise has increased tremendously. The air traffic this year has been horrendous.

Response – The commenter lives approximately two and one-half miles west of the Airport. A comparison of flight track information from the Part 150 Study prepared in 1997 and the existing radar flight track information indicated aircraft overflights occurred in this area historically. The number of operations at Scottsdale Airport, however, 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.

Comment 2 – I checked to see if the flight patterns have changed to see if that was the cause of the increased noise. It was not.

Response – Comment noted. Also see response to Comment 1.

Comment 3 – I think airplanes need to have mufflers on them to quiet the engines. The older airplanes are the louder ones.

Response – Restrictions on Stage 2 business jets under 75,000 pounds or Stage 3 aircraft which are prominent users of 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 is available for Stage 2 aircraft, but is not required by federal regulations.

Comment 4 – Aircraft circling while waiting to land are a concern for safety. When there are more planes circling, it increases the likelihood that there will be an accident.

Response – During situations when there are multiple aircraft approaching the airport at the same time, the control tower directs aircraft to enter the traffic pattern. The traffic pattern is an oval-shaped route that pilots fly

until they can safely land. While safety is a concern to all involved with aviation, the sole purpose of the Part 150 Study is to address noise impacts within the 65 DNL noise contour.

Comment 5 – We need to do something to limit the environmental problems from the noise perspective.

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 could be viewed as discriminatory and, therefore, subject to litigation. These restrictions can also have adverse effects on general aviation and the region's economy. Additionally, implementing restrictions based on noise 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 6 –The airplanes should go to another airport because Scottsdale Airport is too congested. They should go back to south Phoenix where they have all of that room.

Response – Restricting access to the Scottsdale Airport or forcing aircraft to operate at another airport would require a FAA 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.

Tommy Walker

Comment 7 – I am the General Manager of the Scottsdale Air Center. We are extremely happy with the airport and the city, and the study that is being prepared. I think it has been done in a fair manner.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 8 – I want to assure the public that we do everything possible at the Scottsdale Air Center to be safe and noise-friendly when operating at the airport.

Response – Comment noted.

Betty Jacobs

Comment 9 – I have written several times to complain about the noise, but have not been pleased with the response from the city. The noise has frustrated me so much that I have recorded the number of overflights occurring at my residence.

Response – The Noise Compatibility Program includes measures intended to improve the complaint tracking system. The current complaint tracking system is recommended to be integrated into a noise and flight track monitoring system. This system will allow airport staff to correlate noise events with specific aircraft. The system will also be useful in monitoring the effectiveness of noise abatement procedures.

Comment 10 – I have lived in Scottsdale for eleven years and we have never had a noise problem like we have now.

Response – See response to Comment 1.

Comment 11 – The planes fly so low over our house that I can almost wave to the pilot.

Response - The Noise Compatibility Program includes a recommendation for the city to acquire a noise and flight track monitoring system. 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.

Comment 12 – The noise has not been a problem until the last year.

Response – See response to Comment 1.

Comment 13 – When we bought our house, we were not in the path of airplanes.

Response – The commenter's residence is located southeast of the airport. A comparison of the flight paths of the 1997 Noise Compatibility Study to the present condition indicates that flight paths have remained in the same general location. Noise Abatement Measure #4 in the Noise Compatibility Plan is designed to reduce noise impacts in the area southeast of the airport. The measure is intended to encourage right turns as soon as practical and discourage straight-out and left turns when departing from Runway 21.

Comment 14 – I would appreciate anything that can be done by the City of Scottsdale to improve the noise conditions at my residence.

Response – The Part 150 Study Update recommends the continuation of several noise abatement procedures to reduce overflights southwest of the airport. The recommendations include: continue to encourage Stage 2 aircraft to use Runway 21 for landings and Runway 3 for takeoffs, continue to discourage right departure turns from Runway 3 prior to reaching the airport boundary, continue to discourage long straight-in, right base entry and left downwind approaches to Runway 21.

Sandra Vendt

Comment 15 – My complaint is about the noise. It seems like our problems started around June 1<sup>st</sup>. The maps indicate that the flight paths go directly over our house. Because we are not located directly at the end of the runway, it must be the planes that takeoff and turn causing the noise at our residence.

Response – The commenter’s residence is located north of the airport. Aircraft taking off from Runway 3 fly north of the airport as depicted in Exhibit 3E of the *Noise Exposure Maps* (NEM) document. Aircraft on approach to the airport also fly over the area near the commenter’s residence. The aircraft flight tracks north of the airport are similar to those published in the 1995 NEM document. Also see response to Comment 1.

Comment 16 – I was told that there is a better way for aircraft to depart by not accelerating to full throttle, but this uses more fuel. Pilots do not want to do this.

Response – The Noise Compatibility Program includes a recommendation to encourage the use of National Business Aviation Association or aircraft manufacturer’s noise abatement procedures when safe and prudent. Efforts to encourage the use of reduced thrust takeoffs would greatly reduce safety margins and are unlikely to be used by pilots. Business jet aircraft operating at Scottsdale must have the discretion to choose the level of thrust due to the runway length and hot temperatures experienced between spring and early fall.

Bob Carter

Comment 17 – I want to make a comment about the aircraft traffic over our house. I have no complaints with any noise issues. Unless you are looking for them, you really can’t hear them in our neighborhood.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 18 – I think that there is more noise at my house from Highway 101 than from the airport.

Response – Comment noted.

Stacy Howard

Comment 19 – I am the regional representative from the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association and would like to say that this is a very thorough study and it gives adequate consideration to all of the alternatives for noise abatement.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 20 – The most critical element of the study are the land use regulations. It is essential that the city begin implementing the planning and zoning recommendations that were carried over from the previous study. Land Use Measures #8 and 9 should be implemented as soon as possible.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 21 – I would like to see the FAA take into consideration the airport sponsor's demonstrated performance in implementing these recommendations when considering future grant applications for Scottsdale Airport.

Response – Comment noted.

Joyce Clark

Comment 22 – I work about two buildings away from the airport. Most of the problems I have are with the noise levels in the early morning. I would like to see some sort of curfew that would provide a few hours of quiet.

Response – See response to Comment 5.

Comment 23 – I see aircraft landing from the southwest at all heights and directions. They come in so low that they just clear the intersection lights.

Response – See response to Comment 11.

Comment 24 – The planes come in over my house all the time and are very noisy. I know they do an averaging of sound levels, but sometimes it is so loud I cannot hear my television.

Response – The noise contours used in the Part 150 Study indicate the day-night sound level (DNL) for the areas surrounding the airport. DNL is a cumulative noise metric that considers all aircraft noise events for “one day” with a 10 dB penalty assessed for each event that occurs at night.

Comment 25 – They need to control the number of aircraft operating at the airport.

Response – See response to Comment 5.

Mike Schell

Comment 26 – I live two and one-half miles southwest of the runway. I am primarily concerned with approaches to Runway 3. I want the City Council to purchase a flight tracking system so we can have an idea of what the altitudes of aircraft are on approach.

Response – Comment noted. The Noise Compatibility Program includes a recommendation for the city to acquire a noise and flight track monitoring system.

Comment 27 – I think in the future there should be a precision approach to Runway 3 so we can limit the impact of the approach more than is presently possible.

Response – A precision approach to Runway 3 would require a long, straight-in approach. The location of Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport and terrain southwest of the airport (Camelback Mountain) prevent a precision approach to Runway 3 from being a possibility.

### **Written Comments Received During the Public Comment Period**

Cathy Regan

Comment 28 – Scottsdale Airport was built long before most homes in this area. Therefore, the people who bought houses near the airport really shouldn't be complaining about anything.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 29 – The skies were too quiet after September 11, 2001. When I hear an aircraft or helicopter, I am thankful they are still able to fly.

Response – Comment noted.

Many Ann Lund

Comment 30 – A lot of money was spent on the Part 150 Study and it appears that nothing is going to change.



Response – Scottsdale Airport has a long history of managing noise impacts. The Airport will continue to generate noise as long as it is in operation. The Noise Compatibility Program contains measures that are intended to manage noise impacts and prevent additional impacts in the future. Substantial effort was made to evaluate various solutions to protect Scottsdale from future noise impacts.

Comment 31 – My complaint is that there are no regulations included in the study to restrict the size of plane, how noisy the planes are, or what time of day they can operate at the airport. We are awakened early in the morning by jets flying in and out of Scottsdale Airport. To restrict this, I understand that another study is needed.

Response – Restrictions at Scottsdale Airport were evaluated as part of this study. The primary determinant in the amount of noise an aircraft generates is its age, rather than size. The study found that Scottsdale did not meet one of the basic criteria for establishing a restriction, a significant number of noise-sensitive impacts within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour. Also see responses to Comments 3, 5, and 6.

Larry Burgo

Comment 32 – Over the past seven years, the smaller planes operating at Scottsdale Airport have been replaced with corporate jets. Now it appears that 98-99% of the aircraft operating at the airport are corporate jets.

Response – The operational fleet mix (see Table 3B of the *Noise Exposure Maps* document) for Scottsdale Airport indicates that 13% of the operations at the airport are performed by business jets. This is an increase from the base year of the 1995 *Noise Exposure Maps* document when approximately five percent of the operations at Scottsdale Airport were from business jets in 1994.

Comment 33 – In the last three years, there has been a noticeable difference in aircraft operations at Scottsdale Airport.

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.

Comment 34 – The planes fly 600 or 700 feet over our house. When aircraft come in to land, they are moving too fast and flying too low.

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 mean sea level (MSL) for practice instrument approaches.

David Raiff

Comment 35 – I strongly support Program Management Measure #4 which proposes acquiring a noise and flight track monitoring system.

Response – Comment noted.

William and Sandra Vendt

Comment 36 – I am very unhappy with the jet aircraft departing from Scottsdale Airport. Departures to the north frequently turn west over our house. It is disruptive to our lives. Aircraft should depart the airport without turning towards our neighborhood.

Response – Jet aircraft departing to the north turn to the west for two reasons. The first reason is for terrain avoidance. The second reason is that these aircraft typically fly under instrument flight rules (IFR). Jets must fly the IFR departure procedure that requires the aircraft to follow a heading of 300 degrees until reaching a predetermined location called the Banyo Intersection. The purpose of directing aircraft to the Banyo Intersection northwest of Scottsdale Airport is to get aircraft to a location and altitude where radar coverage is available.

Comment 37 – Pilots should use less thrust during takeoff to reduce noise over our homes.

Response – See response to Comment 16.

Ruth Warnas

Comment 38 – I have lived within the Scottsdale Airport Influence Area for 20 years and airplane noise has never been a problem for my family. Scottsdale Airport is important to Scottsdale's economy and should continue to expand its operation into the future.

Response – Comment noted.

Dan Ables

Comment 39 – Helicopters fly over my house when flying west to the airport or when leaving the airport headed east. They are extremely noisy, fly very low, and many seem to hover, making more noise.

Response – The airport has developed a helicopter pilot guide. This effort was coordinated with the FAA and mirrors the revised 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.

Comment 40 – I submitted approximately 350 complaints during a six-month period through the Airport's website regarding low-flying, noisy airplanes and helicopters. I received only one response from the Airport.

Response – When a comment is submitted through the complaint tracking system, the complainant is required to indicate whether or not they wish to be contacted by airport staff regarding their comment. Upon reviewing the commenter's file, it was found that only one request was made for airport staff contact between 1999 and the present. This complaint was addressed the day following submittal. Airport policy states that requests for return telephone calls to residents within the airport influence area occur as soon as practical.

Comment 41 – I think that the pilot pledge program does not work to reduce the amount of helicopters deviating from the suggested flight path.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 42 – I support the recommendation for the Airport to acquire a noise and flight track monitoring system. I am concerned that the city might not support this because of the cost, despite FAA paying for 80% of the cost.

Response – Comment noted. It should be clarified that the FAA's Airport Improvement Program has a noise set-aside fund that provides money for noise-related projects and programs. For FAA approved projects, the FAA will pay up to 95% of the cost. Additionally, the Arizona Department of Transportation will pay up to 2.5% of the cost of approved projects. The city is responsible for the remaining 2.5%.

Comment 43 – The flight track monitoring system will make pilots accountable for their actions and sends the message that they are being watched.

Response -- 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.

Jon Altman

Comment 44 – I think that the overflights and noise problems have decreased over the last two years. I appreciate what the City of Scottsdale has done in terms of airport noise abatement and community involvement.

Response – Comment noted.

Margaret Paterson

Comment 45 – Program Management Measure #3 will be useful specifically for locating complaints and to objectively analyze the problems and correlate those with the offenders.

Response – Comment noted.

Comment 46 – Are there things the average annoyed homeowner could do which are significant enough in their sound attenuation capability to offset the cost? Including such strategies in community outreach materials could be useful to residents.

Response – Home sound attenuation by the homeowner can be difficult and costly. Typically, sound insulating a home entails installing special windows and doors, attic insulation, and heating and cooling systems. Even with the addition of these attenuation features to a home, they are not effective if the windows are open during nice weather or if the occupant is out in the yard. Program Management Element 6, Pilot and Community Outreach Program, recommends the development of materials and other outreach methods to educate the pilots and public on aircraft noise issues.

Comment 47 – I read in the paper that Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport and the City of Phoenix paid for sound insulating improvements at houses near the airport. A similar program or tax credit should be considered for Scottsdale.

Response – Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport does have a sound insulation program for residential units located within the 65 DNL noise exposure contour. Scottsdale Airport does not have any residential units within the 65 DNL noise exposure contours and FAA will not fund the sound insulation of residential units below 65 DNL.

John Brett

Comment 48 – The inclusion of “long straight-in” as part of Noise Abatement Measure #3 is of concern. The Phoenix TRACON is working on rerouting some aircraft from the south and west, and aircraft transitioning from the Biltmore Transition are given straight-in approaches to Runway 3. This allows for a more efficient arrival flow to the airport.

Response – This is an advisory procedure developed to prevent low overflights of the residential areas east and southwest of the Scottsdale Airport. This measure was included in the 1997 Noise Compatibility Program and is published in the current Scottsdale Airport Pilot Guide. Safety continues to be the prevailing factor in assigning approaches to aircraft arriving at Scottsdale Airport. However, efforts should be made to assign approaches that are safe and that reduce noise impacts whenever possible.

Comment 49 – This comment refers to Noise Abatement Measure #11. Left downwind approaches to Runway 21 provide Scottsdale Airport Traffic Control Tower a safe and efficient flow to the airport. While this procedure will reduce traffic east of the airport, some arrivals will still need to be left downwind for safety and efficiency. Additionally, left downwind approaches are used to adjust the traffic mix during peak times. On occasion, there is a need for aircraft to make straight-in approaches.

Response – This is an advisory procedure developed to prevent low overflights of the residential areas east and southwest of the Scottsdale Airport. Safety continues to be the prevailing factor in assigning approaches to aircraft arriving to Runway 21. However, efforts should be made to assign approaches that are safe and that reduce noise impacts whenever possible.

Comment 50 – Although the helicopter pilot guide is available, there is no requirement that they fly these routes.

Response – The helicopter pilot guide is meant to educate pilots about noise sensitive areas and to define routes that can be used to avoid them. These are recommended procedures and compliance with the helicopter noise abatement procedures is at the pilot’s discretion.



**KANSAS CITY**  
**(816) 524-3500**

237 N.W. Blue Parkway  
Suite 100  
Lee's Summit, MO 64063

**PHOENIX**  
**(602) 993-6999**

4835 E. Cactus Road  
Suite 235  
Scottsdale, AZ 85254