MINUTES

SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP
JANUARY 1998

The meeting began with introductions and a review of the purpose of the Community Working Group (CWG) meetings. General comments were solicited prior to proceeding with the agenda.

A. citizen asked if there is a specific reason why the flight tracks are laid out to the west of Scottsdale Airport Runway (RW3, RW21). Kevin Shirer replied there are a lot of reasons, terrain concerns to the north, controller visibility, air traffic interface issues with Sky Harbor traffic patterns., etc. The tower manager Mr. John Brett briefed on the interference with jet departures between Scottsdale and Phoenix.

Another citizen questioned if loud Type 2 jets are always supposed to take off on RW3 to the north, and how do you handle that if the wind is in the opposite direction. Kevin Shirer advised the noise abatement procedure states, "weather and traffic permitting." He also advised that some pilots will request a RW21 departure with a tail wind, and some can. J. Brett said it depends on the aircraft. Citizen questioned can't you regulate more the takeoffs for both runways more equally. Kevin advised all traffic direction is weather and traffic permitting; there are times when a RW3 departure opposite the traffic flow can be granted. Although, pilots usually use the runway direction that allows a maximum take off for his aircraft, even though he won't be using the calm wind, noise abatement runway.

A Citizen mentioned he observed the windsock and noticed that even in a calm wind, aircraft were taking off on RW21. Kevin Shirer commented that as part of his job as noise abatement officer, and he will ask air traffic control (ATC) why the runway flow hasn't changed during a calm wind. Sometimes ATC has not made the change yet, but will, and other times the wind is varying and not yet established in a new direction for use of RW3.

Kevin Shirer asked Mr. Brett what happens when aircraft are in the traffic pattern and the direction of flow is turned around. J. Brett stated the majority of the time, if RW 3 is on in a.m. then the wind picks up and they decide to go to RW21, if there are aircraft in the pattern, they either extend their upwind and turn to make a left traffic back to RW3 and then cross back to RW21 to buy some time. Usually when a runway change is made, there are anywhere from 2 to 3 aircraft in the pattern, and they can follow each other.

Kevin advised that a notice was sent out to the flight schools with the last quarter's noise reports advising of the complaints from the Stonebrook neighborhood and describing its location. In response to a question why pilots avoid the neighborhoods below them, Kevin replied the pilot's in a traffic pattern don't normally use ground based references, bur follow the standard pattern governed by the performance characteristics of the airplane. Short approaches are encouraged to avoid neighborhoods. Kevin stated that the standard pattern usually takes propeller aircraft just south of Stonebrook. Kevin asked those in attendance who live in Stonebrook to keep him informed and added that he'd be glad to pay a visit to their house some busy morning.

George stated that the Scottsdale airport runway was only 4800 feet long until the extension was added on, and at that time there were a lot of small planes (pilot training). In

response to a question on why the touch-and-go pattern is as it is, Kevin advised that he would check the part 150 study to see what the study says about the pattern.

Question: How many flights are considered training flights? A local count is kept and it includes the aircraft touch and go pattern. Kevin advised it depends upon each day and time of day.

In response to a question, Kevin explained the Tower was specifically put on the east side of the runway many years ago because of visibility problems. With the Tower being on the east side of the traffic pattern, the most of the aircraft traffic and the runway is visible to the controllers.

Citizen comment: The curious factor is safety – traffic safety. From common sense when you do training flights here, if you look at those patterns from a safety standpoint you've got an awful light of different tracks skewed in one particular area. How can safety be a concern? Safety to me would be you give an option on both sides of the airport. Unless there's a terrain consideration, and I'm assuming there is. From a safety standpoint, I'm looking at aircraft crisscrossing over my household.

Kevin advised we don't have left and right hand traffic to the same runway as general option, and some of the reasons for the traffic pattern layout are: controller visibility, concern for operational safety, potential for head to head traffic coming in on the base leg, closeness to terrain on the crosswind leg, etc..

In response to the earlier question of what percent is training flights, JB responded it's probably anywhere from 40% to 60%. Sabena and Fight Dimensions generate a lot of the touch and go traffic patterns.

Comment: On the RW3 arrival. They are coming in and landing to the north. I have a problem with the pilots heading south and landing on RWY21. Those are the ones that traverse Grayhawk. What I'm seeing is constantly all weekend long they are coming right across Grayhawk.

Group discussion followed on what they believe is wrong and how they think it should be fixed. They asked if Kevin could come prepared to talk to the group as to what the process would be to make a recommendation to change the flight pattern.

Kevin recapped the issues for later follow up: the process to recommend change to the flight patterns; the possibility of eliminating touch-and-go traffic; having early turnouts on RWY 21 departures, and tour of the Scottsdale Tower prior to next meeting.

MEETING MINUTES

SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP
April 8, 1998

The meeting began with introductions and a review of the purpose of the Community Working Group (CWG) meetings. General comments were solicited prior to proceeding with the agenda. Several attendees expressed that the introductions be limited to just name and noise issue only. Several minutes of voicing complaints by each person eats up time and gets the group nowhere.

Areas of individual concern are: Susan Nerheim - Jet noise; Mike DiLeone - Helicopters altitudes and routes, propeller aircraft flight tracks; Gary Lewin - Homeowner disclosure; Ed Helmick - pilot/resident education and communication; Frank Martinson - Aircraft noise; Bernie Cassidy - Traffic pattern; April Dahl - safety, flight tracks, noise, flights at night; Laura Brownfield - traffic increases, flights at night; Marlene Baker - Helicopter altitude, prohibiting larger aircraft, flights at night; George Tissen - Pilot accountability, community dialog; Belle Crooker - flights at night/early morning, jet aircraft departure altitudes; Ralph Ganarelli - safety and community relations. Kevin recapped that (as is evident by the comments), noise complaints and aircraft traffic varies and airport noise abatement must be a balanced solution.

The monthly noise abatement reports for January and February were reviewed.

The FAA tower and airport management have agreed to change the location of "Point Pima" in response to noise concerns in the Patterson Ranch area. The new reporting point location should encourage traffic to the north and east of Patterson Ranch. A revised map and letter of agreement will be forthcoming.

Helicopter operations were discussed in detail. Of the several helicopter pilots invited, Ralph Ganarelli of Aero Luso helicopters was present and was very helpful in answering questions regarding helicopter operations. The group decided to invite the Scottsdale based helicopter pilots to attend the next meeting to further discuss helicopter noise abatement. It was suggested that since there currently is no official helicopter reporting point to the west, the airport should investigate a "Point Greenway" which could possibly lessen the perceived noise impact over the residences to the west. Kevin advised he will look into it and relayed that operators have stated they vary the flight tracks to the west (when unable to follow the Bell Road route), to avoid concentrating all overflights over one area.

The group discussed what regulatory authority the airport has to control aircraft in flight and institute noise abatement regulations. The regulation of airspace and air traffic flight is under Federal jurisdiction. While the airport does have some regulatory authority on airport operations, Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 161, makes the enacting of new noise abatement regulations unlikely for Scottsdale.

Because of the impact of FAR Part 161, the group wanted to explore methods to better educate visiting pilots about how best to operate at Scottsdale. Kevin discussed the new pilot guide, and a pilot in attendance suggested placing an advertisement in the National Business Aircraft Association (NBAA) national magazine and annual exposition program. The ad could advertise the noise abatement procedures and request flights be conducted during

non-noise sensitive hours. Kevin advised he would look into the idea. It was also suggested that the airport link up with large events that attract airport traffic, and publicize preferred hours of operation to minimize noise complaints.

Some attendees wanted letters on noise abatement to be sent to every aircraft operating between the noise sensitive hours of 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. Kevin advised the FAA would possibly view this practice as discrimination and a violation of airport grant assurances since the airport is a 24 hour facility. However, he encouraged residents to call in to the noise line for all operations during the noise sensitive hours they find objectionable, and if at all possible he would follow up with a letter to the pilot.

Mike DiLeone presented his views on why the traffic pattern should allow propeller aircraft departing from runway 21 heading east, to turn east at the end of the runway instead of turning west and making a climbing turn. He suggested this new procedure be allowed in the airport traffic pattern to share the noise with the neighbors east of Scottsdale Road. Kevin advised that left hand turns when departing runway 21 were thoroughly examined in the Noise Compatibility Study. However, the outcome of this change would expand the incompatible land use within the critical noise contour (65 DNL) and therefore it was not pursued.

Ed Helmick related that many noise complaints come from older model jet aircraft, and perhaps some data could be researched on how many old, noisy aircraft there are left in the operating fleet.

April Dahl advised she had heard a recent talk radio discussion on the Scottsdale Airport noise issues, however, she didn't have any information on the station or any dates.

Frank Martinson recapped some of the positive outcomes from the working group's efforts to date: more active pilot education and follow up on complaints by the airport, better educated residents on what is a "violation", and better airport community dialog to develop non-regulatory noise abatement education for pilots.

April Dahl was under the impression that a pilot is contacted or a letter is sent out for every noise complaint received. Kevin advised this is usually the case for complaints received during noise sensitive hours, or in the case of unusual or rare circumstances when noise abatement wasn't even attempted. However, for complaints on noisy aircraft during normal business hours when there was a clear attempt to comply with the noise abatement procedures, a letter to the pilot is not usually issued.

A concern was raised about the next quarterly meeting occurring around the July 4th holiday which could be an attendance problem. It was suggested that the meeting be held in early June to provide more timely feedback on the issues raised this evening, and possibly not interfere with summer vacation plans.

The next Community Working Group Meeting has therefore been scheduled for Wednesday, June 10, 1998, from 7:00 - 9:00 p.m., at the airport terminal building, 15000 N. Airport Drive.

Please contact Kevin Shirer at 994-7609, it you wish to have an item placed on the meeting agenda, or an item to be included with the reminder mailing.

MEETING MINUTES

SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP
June 10, 1998

The meeting began with introductions and a review of the purpose of the Community Working Group (CWG) meetings. In response to concerns raised at the last meeting, this meeting is being held in June instead of July, and the next meeting will be held in September after the summer holiday period is over.

Attendees are: Frank Martinson, pilot and interested neighbor; Bob Shields, neighbor north of the airport; Bernie Cassidy, pilot and neighbor to the southwest; Belle Crooker; NEVCO representative; Bill and Carol Mulvaney, Kierland residents; Geroge Tissen, Kierland resident; Jerry and Scott Clifton, helicopter pilots; and Beverly Crockett, pilot and neighbor west of the airport.

AUTHOR'S NOTE: These Meeting Minutes are longer than usual to convey the detailed discussion on helicopter procedures and operations.

Helicopter activity was brought up at previous meetings and therefore based helicopter pilots were invited to attend and share their knowledge. Ralph Ganarelli, a helicopter pilot for Aero Luso, attended the last meeting. His concerns were for safety, separation from fixed wing traffic above him, and making sure that he wasn't conflicting with the arrival and departure routes of fixed wing aircraft.

Jerry Clifton gave a detailed briefing on helicopter operations and advised safety is primary. The FAA mandates when operating in an airport environment, helicopters are to avoid the flow of fixed wing traffic. As fixed wing traffic coming in and out of Scottsdale is basically at 2500 feet mean sea level (MSL), helicopter traffic is generally assigned at 2000 MSL feet. That gives helicopters 500 feet above the ground and also gives a 500 foot separation from fixed wing traffic above them Airport elevation is 1509 MSL. Normally helicopter arrivals and departures (east/west) will be perpendicular to the fixed wing aircraft arriving and departing the runway (north and south).

He discussed the "Pecos" Helicopter Letter of Agreement and cautioned that the routes on the agreement are not mandates. The letter is a means of facilitating the Tower and helicopter operators' communications, minimizing radio traffic, and establishing standard procedures for arriving and departing. It is available to anyone that wants to be a signatory, but transient helicopters are not going to operate under this letter of agreement, nor are they required to by the FAA.

For the most part there are less helicopter noise complaints on the east side of the airport, and the pilots try as much as possible to use this area as it keeps the helicopters over an industrial area longer. As far as traffic to the west, with all the new development, there really is no good way in and out, as they are coming from downtown and only have two options; fly around to Pima, or come across Bell Road and then those people complain. If they take Greenway, then that area complains, if they go over Sumitomo, the neighbors there complain so there isn't any way to get around without affecting some area.

News helicopters sometimes start out very early in the morning, but there are actually only two of them that go out at that time on a regular basis. He stated there are two schools of thought as to what would be better for the residents. Some believe alternating departure and arrival routes is the solution, others firmly believe that you only come in and go via the routes. On behalf of the media helicopter pilots, he said he's more than willing to work with the public and do what they prefer. They will try to fly in whatever manner they safely can to help noise abatement.

A question was asked what is the truth about helicopter noise footprints, the higher the helicopter, the bigger the footprint? The answer was that generally if we follow a freeway corridor about 500 feet above, the noise the helicopter is virtually unrecognizable from the freeway traffic. We try to stay over major arteries to have less of a noise footprint through the subdivisions, because it will be masked by some of the vehicular traffic on the major streets. So flying lower tends to be quieter than flying higher because of the smaller footprint? The response was absolutely that is true if flying over a major street.

Higher altitudes tend to spread the noise over a larger area, i.e., like the National Guard helicopters at 3000 feet, you can hear them for about 5 minutes before you can actually see them.

Jerry advised when departing they try to gain as much altitude as they can, and try to get to 500 feet as fast as they can, not only to satisfy noise complaints but the sooner they get to 500 feet altitude the safer it is. Mr. Shirer asked what is the location where they normally reach 500 feet going to the west. The reply was if they go out over the golf course, they are at 500 feet before they get over the houses on the other side of the golf course. And even if they go north, they reach 500 feet before they come to the residential areas, which is well within a mile. Mr. Shirer asked if the aircraft makes more noise in a climb versus decelerating and descending for landing. Jerry responded there is no appreciable difference.

What about the helicopters – are the older ones nosier than the newer ones? The noise issue on helicopters is being addressed on many fronts. The new helicopters produced by McDonnell-Douglas, Hughes, or Bell, the NOTAR, are without tail rotors and are significantly quieter than aircraft with tail rotors. At the Grand Canyon they are taking conventional helicopters and they are testing four bladed tail rudders as opposed to two on an offset design and they are having some success with that. Some of the newer Aero-Spatial helicopters have shrouded tail rotor blades and they are somewhat quieter. So, yes, there is technology that's helping. It was noted that any changes cannot be done overnight. You cannot force some who is driving a particular type of motor vehicle today to buy and drive another one tomorrow; the same is true for aircraft. How fast the technology gets into the aircraft fleet is another question. But you are going to see more four-blade rotors. The manufacturers are very much aware of the problem and would like to provide as low a noise level as possible. The media all fly Aero-Spatials. Their choice of helicopter they use is based on their mission requirements, weights, capacity, etc.

What happens when Loop 101 is completed? Will helicopters be using that as a corridor? Response - probably. Would residents be notified in advance so they'd have an opportunity to complain? Scottsdale-Stonebrook is going to be about 1200 feet from the freeway. Response was helicopters will use major roadways to avoid fixed wing aircraft.

Can FAA regulations, enforcement, FSDO, etc., be discussed and what can the public be told as to what helicopters can and cannot do? FAA altitude requirements in unpopulated areas is 500 feet above ground level (AGL). Over a populated area, it is 1000 feet AGL, but helicopters are allowed to go lower. So, there are no minimum altitude limitations for a helicopter. The only thing the FAA relies upon for altitude enforcement for helicopters is careless, or reckless endangerment. That's the only thing that mandates helicopters be operated at an altitude to enable a safe emergency landing. Under Part 135 which is a charter operator, helicopters are required to operate an altitude of 300 feet above the ground or higher. At Scottsdale we are requested to be 500 feet above the ground and I think everybody does their best to abide by that.

Isn't auto rotation a way to safely land a helicopter when an engine isn't functioning? In auto rotation, the engine quits, and the aircraft is designed so the drive train disengages from engine and the wind through the rotor blades keep the rotor blades windmilling. The kinetic energy in the blades help keep the helicopter stable to land safely. So from a safety standpoint, the chances of a helicopter falling out of the sky are pretty slim.

Mr. Shirer inquired if there were any recommended changes to the helicopter letter of agreement. Jerry responded to ask the community to decide what everyone has sat around and debated, whether or not dispersed flight paths or concentrating the noise is what they want. Because none of the operators can figure it out. Whatever they do they generate complaints. If there was something they could do to eliminate that, they would be happy to accommodate. Mr. Shirer stated that from the calls he receives, most callers prefer helicopters not be over their area at all, meaning fly over someone else.

George Tissen advised in Kierland they told residents beforehand about the airport. Home owner associations can participate and be knowledgeable about living near the airport. Disclosure was discussed and that a lack of understanding often causes more dissatisfaction with aircraft noise. He suggested that some of the operators put a few lines in the newsletter. This notifies residents that the operators are willing to work with the residents.

Why can't everyone be made to sign the letter of agreement, and why can't SDL regulate how helicopters fly? It was stated that SDL has no authority over airspace or aircraft in flight, they can only advise and request. The FAA has sole authority over airspace and aircraft in flight.

Mr. Shirer went over the helicopter information package with the attendees. A survey of helicopter arrivals and departures was distributed, a graph with noise complaints by aircraft type. Data varies from month to month, but helicopter complaints have not significantly increased.

One citizen commented on some items; the need to get those who don't follow rules, a lot have been from out of town, some older jets that are loud, etc. Mr. Shirer advised some pilots have returned his calls and some have thanked him for advising them of the noise abatement procedures. Some have agreed to make changes based on his letters and calls. There were concerns regarding nighttime noise. Someone inquired if sending a second letter was ever required; Mr. Shirer responded, no.

There was a lengthy discussion of airport traffic patterns, and of the limited authority by the airport for legal restrictions.

Mr. Shirer advised that the City's zoning department keeps airport staff informed on proposed new development via agendas and meeting notices. A question was raised if they have disclosure at DC Ranch, and Mr. Shirer responded, yes.

Someone commented it's all relative depending on where you came from and what you are used to as far as noise levels go. A real estate agent advised Mr. Shirer that someone may buy a house right next to a busy road if they are coming from out of town because their perception is different, but said resale is a little harder for properties right next to a major road.

Mr. Shirer thanked the helicopter pilots and the working group participants for coming to the meeting.

The next Community Working Group Meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday September 30th from 7:00-9:00 p.m., at the Airport Terminal Building, 15000 N. Airport Drive.

Please contact Kevin Shirer at 994-7609, it you wish to have an item placed on the meeting agenda, or an item to be included with the reminder mailing.

MEETING MINUTES
(revised)

SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP
October 7, 1998

The meeting began with introductions and a review of the purpose of the Community Working Group (CWG) meetings. Attendees and concerns are: Kevin Shirer - airport noise abatement, Frank Martinson - Pilot and interested neighbor, Bernie Cassidy - neighbor to the southwest and pilot, Laura Brownfield – neighbor to the southwest, Marlene Baker – neighbor to the west, Jim Findlay – Civil Air Patrol, April Dahl – neighbor to the southwest.

The noise reports for the previous months were reviewed. Complaints have been less during the hot late summer months.

Bernie Cassidy discussed the helicopter routes and the presentation by Channel 5 pilots Jerry and Scott Clifton at the previous meeting.

In response to questions, Kevin provided a briefing on what airport development plans were included in the airport master plan. The projects will slightly increase parking areas for smaller aircraft and facilitate aircraft movement on the ground, however they will not increase the size of the aircraft or the amount of traffic which can be accommodated with the current facility.

The upcoming Air Fair was discussed briefly and residents appreciated that a notice about the upcoming Air Fair was mailed out to many of the residents who have voiced concern about airport noise in the past.

The next Community Working Group Meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 10, 1999 from 7:00 - 9:00 p.m., at the airport terminal building, 2nd floor, 15000 N. Airport Drive.

Please contact Kevin Shirer at 312-7609, it you wish to have an item placed on the meeting agenda.

COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP
MEETING MINUTES
2/10/99, 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Attendees: Belle Crooker, Marlene Baker, April Dahl, Tammy Thomann, Susan Nerheim, Frank Martinson, George Tissen, Kevin Shirer - Noise Abatement Specialist, Gary Mascaro - Airport Operations.

The meeting began with a quick overview of the purpose of the CWG and an opportunity to review of the noise reports for October - December

Marlene Baker expressed concern about continued helicopter overflights of Patterson ranch. Kevin discussed the progress on the proposed noise ATIS (Automated Information System) radio broadcast frequency using the airport's present UNICOM frequency. The airport is pursuing permission of the FCC and is polling local operators. The group discussed aircraft safety and the November mid-air collision.

Kevin discussed the current efforts to raise the pilot awareness of the Stonebrook subdivision so they can make adjustments to their flight track when departing runway 03: presentation at the Scottsdale Pilots and Aviation Association (SPAA), 8 new noise display boards prominently displayed in the flight schools, progress towards putting additional display boards in flight schools at other airports in the valley.

The status of the Noise Compatibility Program was raised. Mr. Shirer has been reviewing proposed developments using the criteria recommended in the study and staff is planning the implementation process with the Community Development staff. Mr. Shirer briefed the group on two current bills in the State house regarding airport influence areas. Ms. Crooker inquired about what happens to housing values if declared inside of an airport influence area? Some residents expressed concern if being inside an influence area would be the precursor toward re-zoning residential development to commercial.

Marlene Baked brought up the possible height of the proposed development along the future 101 corridor. George Tissen briefed the group on what he recently learned about the local street transportation issues. Marlene Baker inquired about the proposed 140 airpark tower and Kevin Shirer provided a brief update of the public discussion and some of the reasons why the owner is proposing locating the tower in the airpark.

Marlene and April requested that they be informed on the CWG agenda when the airport advisory commission is to meet. Kevin suggested they mark their calendars for the third Wednesday of every month.

Kevin gave October's Air Fair noise abatement "report card" and distributed copies of the Air Fair noise abatement plan developed as a result of lessons learned at this year's event (see attached). He advised some residents noted that Air Fair was less disturbing than the regular airport traffic. April and others thanked the airport for providing advance notice of the event and 2 tickets to CWG members present at the October CWG meeting.

It was suggested that the airport add a noise complaint submittal form on the airport web site. In response to a question from Mr. Martinson, Kevin advised that the flight track monitoring system is a few years off due to the prerequisites for obtaining federal funding. This type of system was not an approved measure in the 1997 Noise Compatibility Plan and requires an amendment to the plan.

A brief update on the airport capital improvements was provided in response to a question on what is happening with the airport runway widening. Kevin briefed the group on the recently passed new Chapter 5 and upcoming public process to review the Industrial Park zoning and approved aeronautical uses.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 12th.

COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP
MEETING SUMMARY
June 2, 1999, 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Attendees and Concerns:

Jeannie Ryan – Concerned neighbor, 65th Place and Sweetwater. Homeowner since 1964. Noise is getting worse, can't something be done? New to working group.

Gail Martelle – Concerned neighbor, 65th Place and Sweetwater. Thinks noise is getting worse, can't something be done? New to working group.

[During the second half of the meeting, Kevin Shirer, Noise Abatement Specialist, explained in detail for Jeannie & Gail the rich history of noise abatement at Scottsdale, the airport's past efforts to prevent increased noise, and the issues involved in the latest noise compatibility study conducted in 1997.]

Frank Martinson – Concerned neighbor and pilot. He now flies higher for noise abatement after becoming more aware of residents' concerns. Also, as a hobby he analyzes and monitors noise complaint data for trends.

Les Waggoner – Concerned neighbor southwest of airport. His observation is that traffic density is now higher than a few years ago and wants defined acceptable noise levels. Excess noise is inverse condemnation and some single-event noise is excessive. Traffic is now a little better than it was in January and February. **Q:** Why does it get so busy? **A:** Seasonal "snowbird" traffic in the spring and a good economy encourages aviation activity. [Kevin also explained the federally mandated noise standards that track the cumulative effect of noise rather than single-event noise.]

Belle Crooker – NEVCO president. Resides at 64th & Acoma. She has noticed more helicopters recently flying around 6:00 a.m. and briefed the group about a new book discussing misunderstandings in radio communications. She is also concerned about property values. [Kevin advised that May is a "sweeps" month when ratings are determined. The TV news station helicopters fly during almost every newscast during the month.]

Laura Brownfield – Resident at 70th & Sweetwater. Traffic is better now than in the past and she notices less early-morning traffic. Thought the mass mailing last year to nearby residents providing prior notice of the upcoming Air Fair was helpful. Laura repeated her suggestion that the airport send postcards to nearby residents urging use of the noise complaint line, since airport administration responds to noise calls. **Q:** Where do we publish the noise complaint hotline number "26-NOISE?"
A: Government "blue" pages, web site and airport main telephone number in yellow pages. **Q:** What is status of scheduled service? **A:** Nothing on the immediate horizon. However, aircraft in scheduled service will still be required to meet existing airport runway weight limitations.

Joe Stallone – Kierland area resident. He perceives a constant traffic flow because of too many pilots, especially on the weekends. Can't we stop or limit the flow? [Kevin explained about how delay during busy times tends to limit operations but the airport is prevented from enacting operating restrictions by Federal Law. Think of the airport like a highway – only traffic and delay limits the number of vehicles getting on and off.]

Jim Kanellos – Wants the airport to purchase a monitoring system to better know who is using the airport during off-hours. [Kevin briefed about the funds budgeted for a flight track monitoring system in the five year capital budget.]

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for September/October.