

# **Van Nuys Airport Part 150 Study**



City of Los Angeles  
LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS  
Noise Compatibility Program Report  
Prepared by: Environmental Management Division  
Project Manager: Dennis Quilliam

## **BACKGROUND APPENDICES**

**Volume Two of Three**

January 2003

**Background Appendices  
(Three separately bound volumes)**

**Volume 2 of 3**

Full Minutes of each Steering Committee Meeting and  
each Technical Committee Meeting

# **Steering Committee Minutes**

**FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Thursday, December 1, 1988

The first meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 3:00 p.m., December 1, 1988 at the Airtel Hotel. The meeting was opened by Mr. Maurice Z. Laham of the Los Angeles Department of Airports (DOA). Mr. Laham will serve as Project Administrator for DOA and will be responsible for the overall conduct of the project.

Mr. Laham introduced Mr. Michael R. McClintock of McClintock, Becker and Associates who would serve as Project Coordinator. Mr. McClintock's responsibilities will be to serve as staff person to the Steering Committee. He is to report to, and be directed by the Committee through its chairperson. He will also serve as the Committee's secretary.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Introductions of the Committee participants were made and Mr. Samuel Greenberg representing the Board of Airport Commissioners was selected as Committee Chairman. Mr. Greenberg accepted the chair with the caveat that, if after three months he found the position to be in conflict with his other commitments, he would have to relinquish it. The Committee next selected Ms. Renee Weitzer, of Councilman Wachs office, as Vice-Chairman.

### **STUDY PROCESS AND COMMITTEE ROLE**

Mr. Laham and Mr. McClintock jointly discussed the FAR Part 150 study process and the role of the Steering Committee as set forth in a handout provided to the Committee. In summary the Committee was advised that the purpose of the FAR Part 150 process was to come up with the most effective combination of Airport operational strategies and companion land use adjustments to reduce Airport-community incompatibility based on relative costs and benefits. The Steering Committee is to provide policy direction for the study program with an emphasis on seeking realistic implementation strategies and programs.

Mr. Laham and Mr. McClintock responded to questions from the Committee and advised that since this was just the initial meeting, the intent was to provide an overview of the process, and that additional detailed technical presentations would be forthcoming at future meetings.



## **NEXT MEETING**

The Committee selected Tuesday, February 7, 1989 as the date of the next meeting. The meeting will be held at the Airtel and commence at 5:00 p.m.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Two members of the audience expressed specific concerns over the proposed FAR PART 150 project. Dr. Gerald M. Silver provided the Committee with six points of concern and another gentleman stated his feelings about noise generated by aircraft utilizing Van Nuys Airport and the effects of such noise on his health and property.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:45 p.m.

Minutes

**FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, February 7, 1989

The second meeting of the Van Nuys-Airport (VNY) FAR PART 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 5:00 p.m., February 7, 1989 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. In the absence of Mr. Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, and at the request of Vice-Chair Weitzer, M. McClintock opened the meeting.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

The following committee members and staff were present:

Rene Weitzer, Member, Vice Chair  
Sandor Winger, Member  
Will Ross, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Joyce Emerson, Member

Kelly Jensen, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Larry Van Nuys, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Lisa Barrera, Member

Don Schultz, Member  
Robert Chick, Member  
Joseph McGuire, Member  
Maurice Z. Laham, Project Administrator  
Charles Zeman, Staff, Airport Manager

Paul Principe, Staff  
Bob Hayes, Staff  
Michael R. McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Samuel Greenberg, Chairman  
Clay Lacy  
Susan Loewenkamp

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the December 1, 1988 meeting were submitted to the committee for their approval. It was requested that in future minutes listings of committee members in attendance and absent be included as a part of the minutes. Motion was made and seconded for approval. Motion passed.

## **FAR PART 150 PROCESS - SUCCESSES AND FAILURES**

This agenda item was postponed to a future meeting.

## **IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

Mr. McClintock addressed the importance of identifying issues and concerns with respect to the FAR PART 150 process being a problem solving procedure. He requested that committee members begin to think about what they might hope to gain from the process and to define what they feel are the significant issues or areas of concern that should be dealt with. He requested that the committee write down any specific issues or concerns for detailed discussion at the next meeting.

As their initial effort the committee identified the issues and concerns set forth in Attachment 1, "Summary of Issues and Concerns". At the next meeting the committee will address these and other issues and begin to prioritize them.

## **AIRCRAFT NOISE DEMONSTRATION**

Dr. David Dubbink presented a real time demonstration of aircraft noise based on his "ISIS" noise demonstration program. The demonstration included recordings of various types of aircraft noise played back at different decibel levels to demonstrate the effects of aircraft type (e.g. FAR PART 36 Stage 2 vs. Stage 3) landing vs. takeoff, sideline location, and indoor vs. outdoor locations ( with and without noise insulation).

Dr. Dubbink responded to questions from the committee and audience, and gave demonstrations of specific types of aircraft and helicopter noises as requested. He also discussed basic acoustical concepts and gave audio demonstrations of some of these concepts. The committee was appreciative of Dr. Dubbink's presentation and expressed an interest in having him return to present more information on potential project specific noise mitigation measures.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The meeting was opened to comments from the public. Mr. Carl Davison of Van Nuys addressed the committee on matters of his personal concerns, including the curfew issue. Mr. McClintock advised that this matter would be addressed as an agenda item at the committee's next meeting.

Mr. Al Gorsky of Sepulveda, representing the Rubio Avenue Homeowners/Walnut Avenue Homeowners Associations expressed a number of concerns with respect to the FAR PART 150 Process. He was particularly concerned over a perceived lack of publicity and notification of homeowners organizations and priorities for noise mitigation. He requested that more money be spent on advance publicity for meetings and that the committee investigate "right angle turns" into the airport over Rubio and Gothic Avenues by low-flying light aircraft. He provided the committee with an illustration of his concern (see attachment 2), and suggested a number of possible regulatory measures.

Mr. Areg Gharabegian advised the committee that he had a presentation to make that would likely exceed the time remaining. He distributed copies of a technical report he had prepared. The committee determined that in light of time constraints a maximum of two minutes per person would be allowed for public comment at this meeting. Mr. Gharabegian was asked to return at the next meeting to make his presentation.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

The committee set 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 14, 1989 as the time and date of its next meeting. Specific agenda items are to include a discussion of the curfew issue and meeting format with respect to public input. Vice Chair Weitzer requested that additional public notice be provided.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Attachment 1

**FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
Van Nuys Airport**

**SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

February 7, 1989

The following is a summary of initial issues and concerns raised by the Van Nuys Airport FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Project Steering Committee at their February 7, 1989 meeting.

**RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY**

- o Noise impacts on residential community.
- o Where is VNY going in future (i.e., number and types of operations)?
- o What can be done to mitigate existing problems?
- o Desire to see improvements in present situation.
- o Need for direction in airport growth (i.e., current growth not planned).
- o Need for airport master plan to assess what will be happening 5-10-20 years into future.
- o Airport growth and expansion (i.e., too much, too fast).
- o Community and airport must learn to live together.
- o Airport growth and community growth can only lead to more controversy ( How much growth is enough? Who gets priority--airport or community?).
- o Aircraft make right angle turns into the airport and are off established flight tracks.

## AIRPORT USERS

- o Need for national airport policy with respect to noise limits and restrictions (lack of direction and purpose by Federal Government leads to confusion and frustration).
- o Possibility for interference with interstate commerce if noise abatement options not properly evaluated.
- o Today's concerns may be offset with new technology (e.g., quiet engines, quiet rotors, MLS, etc.).
- o Phase-out of old technology (noisy) aircraft will help reduce problems
- o Recent down-turns in GA activity and aircraft production are being reversed. Operations may increase and more aircraft sold. Need for additional facilities (e.g., hangars, tie-downs). More flight training possible.
- o Do not overlook general aviation and business aviation as part of national transportation system. Corporate and charter aircraft are important components of this system. VNY can be model for rest of country, depending on how issues are dealt with.

## ELECTED OFFICIALS

- o Need to know nature and extent of impacts.
- o How local and Federal funds are to be used in dealing with problems.
- o Want airport to be good neighbor.
- o How to resolve conflicts between an airport in urban area and the community it impacts/serves.
- o Need for openness, (i.e., no surprises, proper notification, better communication).
- o Airport is important economic base, but it must serve the community, not vice-versa.
- o FAR PART 150 represents the first real opportunity to deal with raw, unbiased data concerning airport and community
- o Polarization will not result in meaningful results.
- o Creativity and honesty required to achieve positive results.

## GENERAL

- o Need to maintain balance between needs of airport users and community needs.
- o Need to keep open minds.
- o Need for accurate information in order to make informed decisions.
- o Need for better communication between various interests, and even among different City departments (e.g., DOA and City Planning).
- o Need to revise/update General Plan for airport area.

## Minutes

### FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, March 14, 1989

The third meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:05 p.m., March 14, 1989 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. In the absence of Mr. Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, and at the request of Vice-Chair Weitzer, M. McClintock opened the meeting.

#### INTRODUCTIONS

The following committee members and staff were present:

Renee Weitzer, Member, Vice Chair  
Don Schultz, Member  
Will Ross, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Clay Lacy, Member

Kelly Jensen, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Larry Van Nuys, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Robert Chick, Member

Joseph McGuire, Member  
Charles Zeman, Staff, Airport Manager  
Paul Principe, Staff  
Bob Hayes, Staff  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Samuel Greenberg, Chairman  
Susan Loewenkamp  
Sandor Winger  
Joyce Emerson  
Lisa Barrena  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator



## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the February 7, 1988 meeting were submitted to the committee for their approval. Motion was made and seconded for approval. Motion passed.

## MEETING FORMAT/PUBLIC INPUT

McClintock opened the discussion by summarizing three points that needed to be resolved. These were (1) the length of the Steering Committee meetings, (2) the amount of time to be set aside for public input, and (3) the need for certain meetings to be set aside for public information and comment. Discussion followed which resulted in consensus on the following points:

- o Meetings to last 1-1/2 to 2 hours.
- o 20 to 30 minutes to be set aside for public comment.
- o Speakers generally to be limited to 2 to 3 minutes.
- o Longer presentations should be agendized in advance.
  
- o Priorities to go to new speakers and agenda items.
- o Allow public to provide input prior to major decisions.
- o Encourage written comments.
- o Discourage repetitiveness.

The Committee also determined that every fourth meeting should be devoted to public participation and information if appropriate information were available, or if a specific need identified. Speaker's information cards should also be prepared and used. Other format issues raised included the seating arrangement--the Committee would like a U-shaped arrangement so that all could face the audience, the need for name cards identifying the member and his or her affiliation, and the need for 3-ring binders to contain project-related documents. It was the consensus of the Committee that the Department of Airports should be responsible for taking care of these items.

## FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF ISSUES

McClintock reviewed a working paper summarizing the issues and concerns identified at the February 7, 1989 Committee meeting. The Committee accepted the working paper and identified several additional issues that must be dealt with. These included the question of new off-Airport land uses and their consistency with Airport plans, the need for actual noise data (i.e., field noise measurements), and how the Department of Airports views the future role of Van Nuys Airport.

The Committee would like to have the DOA make a presentation on the role and function of VNY now and in the future, review the FAR Part 150 work program, and explain the roles of each of the project consultants at the May meeting. The Committee also wanted to know if field noise measurements apart from those associated with the Airport's noise monitoring system will be a part of the study? The Committee expressed concern that at this time there is no technical data

available for their review and consideration. It was a consensus of the Committee that McClintock should work with DOA staff to resolve these and other issues that could affect the progress of the study, including the need to expedite the work of the Technical Committee.

## **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS**

The Steering Committee expressed concern that the Technical Committee was only now beginning to address the issues related to the project. The Steering Committee felt that the Technical Committee should meet more often in order to make more progress. To allow the Technical Committee an opportunity to catch up the Steering Committee decided to devote their April meeting to public input. The May meeting would be devoted to hearing about the Technical Committee with regard to its role and responsibilities, scope of work, and the roles of the individual consultants.

McClintock next reviewed the City Council directive to have the curfew issue studied as a matter of first priority. He noted that the subject was discussed at the first meeting of the project Technical Committee. The Technical Committee determined that it would be necessary to review the curfew issue on the basis of operational, environmental, business (economic), and legal aspects if it was to do an adequate job. The Technical Committee outlined a scope of work that they would be pursuing. It included (1) a definition of the problem requiring a curfew, (2) the establishment of a data base for existing conditions, and (3) the cost factors involved. The Technical Committee is to make a report to the City Council on this matter in the near future.

McClintock noted that it has been his experience that the FAA prefers to see any recommendations concerning curfews evolve out of the FAR Part 150 process and not precede the process. He also noted that a nighttime jet ban at Portland, Maine drew strong FAA opposition because the proposed restriction did not address a specific noise problem, or show how the benefits of such a restriction would outweigh its disadvantages. He recommended that these factors be kept in mind with regard to any proposed noise abatement actions.

## **MEDIA PROTOCOL**

The Steering Committee was requested to review a draft protocol for dealing with the Media. Ms. Chris Eberhard of CommuniQuest was introduced. Ms. Eberhard explained that she was requested to draft recommendations for informing the media of key information regarding the VNY FAR Part 150 study. She also discussed her broader role in the FAR Part 150 study including the development of a community attitudes survey and a focused issues study. She indicated that the Technical Committee had identified a need to find an effective mechanism for providing the media with accurate and up-to-date information regarding the VNY FAR Part 150 study. She discussed a range of options and recommended a course of action including the designation of a group spokesperson, issuance of press releases, and a means of resolving internal conflicts should they occur.

The Committee expressed appreciation for Ms. Eberhard's work but questioned the need for a formal protocol. After significant discussion, the Committee determined that Mr. Laham or Mr. McClintock should be the spokespersons for the Committee on all technical and agenda items. The Committee agreed to take the remainder of the recommendations under submission and take action at a later meeting. A copy of the CommuniQuest recommendations are attached.

#### **SCHEDULED PRESENTATION**

Mr. Gharabegian is an acoustical engineer who had requested an opportunity to make a presentation to the Steering Committee at its February 7, 1989 meeting. Due to time constraints he was asked to present his information at this meeting as an agenda item. At the previous meeting he had provided the Steering Committee with a copy of his report entitled, "CNEL Contours for the GA Airports." This report was distributed with the minutes of the February 7 meeting. Mr. Gharabegian presented a discussion of the CNEL Metric and the problems in applying this metric to general aviation airports. He was especially concerned about the use of the "average day" criteria for the development of CNEL contours. He suggested the use of "busy day" criteria as an alternative to the average day required by the FAA for FAR Part 150 studies. The Steering Committee accepted Mr. Gharabegian's report and took action to refer it to the Technical Committee for their review and consideration.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The meeting was opened to comments from the public. Mr. Steve Vizcaino (sp?) of 1666 Addison St., Encino requested the Committee to look at low flying helicopters over his neighborhood and determine the extent of noise impact on the community from such operations. He requested that cumulative noise data be prepared for both helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft. Late night and early morning helicopter operations were also a matter of his concern.

Mr. Carl Davison of Van Nuys addressed the committee on matters of his personal concerns, including the project coordinator, his intent to video tape the Committee meetings, and Boeing 727 operations at the Airport. The Committee advised that it would look into the feasibility of Mr. Davison's proposal to video tape the meetings.

Mr. Ken Elsie (sp?) of Burbank addressed the Committee on the matter of technological improvements in aircraft engines that are making aircraft quieter.

## **NEXT MEETING**

The Committee set 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 18, 1989 as the time and date of its next meeting, if space is available at the Airtel to accommodate a public informational meeting. Alternative dates to be considered include April 25 and 27. The agenda is to be devoted to public input and a discussion of community concerns to be addressed as part of the FAR Part 150 study. Tentative dates of May 9 and June 13 were established for future meetings.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Minutes

**FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting/Public Workshop  
Tuesday, April 25, 1989

The fourth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., April 25, 1989 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mr. Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Samuel Greenberg, Chairman  
Renee Weitzer, Vice Chair  
Robert Chick, Member  
Don Schultz, Member  
Will Ross, Member

Clay Lacy, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Larry Van Nuys, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Joseph McGuire, Member

Sandor Winger, Member  
Joyce Emerson, Member  
Lisa Barrera, Member  
Rita Schneir (Alternate), Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator

Charles Zeman, Airport Manager  
Bob Hayes, Staff  
Paul Principe, Staff  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Robert Beard, Noise Abatement Officer

Tom Connely, Federal Aviation Administration  
Richard Dyer, CALTRANS, Div. of Aeronautics  
Other City Staff as Resource People  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Susan Loewenkamp  
Kelly Jensen

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the March 14, 1989 Steering Committee meeting were submitted for approval. Motion was made and seconded for approval. Motion approved.

## **PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

Chairman Greenberg turned the meeting over to M. McClintock for purposes of carrying out the Public Workshop phase of the meeting. Mr. McClintock explained the purpose of the FAR Part 150 Study being conducted for the Van Nuys Airport and explained the reasons for the workshop. He indicated that one of the primary reasons for the workshop was to allow the Steering Committee to gain a better understanding of the concerns of Airport users and the local residents with regard to the Airport.

McClintock introduced Ms. Chris Eberhard of CommuniQuest, who would conduct the workshop session. Ms. Eberhard explained the format of the evening's workshop session and consolidated the audience into groups of ten. She directed that each group select a spokesperson who would lead the individual groups in a discussion of issues and concerns.

She advised that each group would be asked to summarize their concerns at the end of the session and that forms would be provided to record comments. All input received as a result of the workshop would become part of the official project record and be supplied to the Steering Committee. She noted that the Steering Committee, staff and consultants would be available to assist in the group discussions.

The groups were allowed approximately one hour for discussion, and an additional hour was allowed for a recap and questions and answers. Highlights of the public workshop session are attached, and include a list of attendees, results of group tasks, synopses of individual group reports and individual comments and subsequent input in the form of letters and position papers.

## **NEXT MEETING**

The Committee was advised that the next Steering Committee meeting would be at the Airtel, at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 13, 1989.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Attachs.

Minutes

**FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, November 13, 1989

The fifth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., November 13, 1989 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mr. Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Samuel Greenberg, Chairman  
Tom Henry, Member  
Don Schultz, Member  
Kelly Jensen, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member

Robert Jackson, Member  
Joseph McGuire, Member  
Sandor Winger, Member  
Ginny Spielberg, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member

Rita Schneir (Alternate), Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Charles Zeman, Airport Manager  
Bob Hayes, Staff  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff

Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Susan Loewenkamp  
Robert Chick  
Will Ross  
Larry Van Nuys  
Clay Lacy

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the April 25, 1989 Steering Committee meeting were submitted for approval. Motion was made and seconded for approval. Motion approved.

## REVIEW OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP AND COMMUNITY SURVEY

Chairman Greenberg turned the meeting over to Mike McClintock for a report on the public workshop held on April 25, 1989. McClintock stated that the workshop was part of the Steering Committee's community outreach program and explained that one of the primary reasons for the workshop was to allow the Steering Committee to gain a better understanding of the concerns of Airport users and the local residents with regard to the Airport. He also explained that the Steering Committee would be conducting a survey of community opinion toward the Van Nuys Airport.

McClintock introduced Ms. Chris Eberhard of CommuniQuest, who conducted the workshop session and whose firm would be responsible for the community opinion survey. Ms. Eberhard gave the Committee a brief overview of the survey results of the workshop, which, she noted, was attended by approximately 120 people divided relatively evenly between homeowners and airport users.

Ms. Eberhard indicated that four primary areas of concern emerged as a result of the workshop. These were: (1) noise and safety considerations related to aircraft operations, (2) land use and development in the Airport environs, (3) the need for improved communications between the Airport and the community and the Airport and other City Departments, and (4) other environmental issues such as traffic and air quality. Each of these four categories was divided into specific items in her written report to the Committee.

Ms. Eberhard noted that her firm would also be responsible for the development of a Community Opinion Survey for the airport. At a recent meeting of the Part 150 Technical Committee, she presented a comprehensive survey form. The Committee reviewed the proposed survey form, suggested some changes and directed that it be revised from a mailout survey to a telephone survey and the form be brought before the Steering Committee for final review and approval.

She presented the revised form to the Steering Committee for review and comment. The Committee discussed the form and determined that the total number of questions needed to be reduced, and the survey itself to be more focused on issues concerning the Van Nuys Airport instead of general community issues. This included a provision for the introduction of the survey to say specifically what it was about, and the removal of several demographic questions at the end of the survey.

The Steering Committee also added questions concerning noise complaint procedures and people's perception of aircraft noise, and discussed whether the survey area should be focused on those areas immediately impacted by airport operations as opposed to a broader area affected by the airport. This discussion led to the addition of several more zip codes to those originally proposed. Whiteman Airport was also added to the list of airports that respondents might have concerns with. Motion was made, and seconded, for the survey to proceed with the above changes and for the requirement that the Committee have an opportunity to review the final questionnaire before commencement of the survey. Motion approved. Ms. Eberhard projected an early December commencement date for the survey, with preliminary results to be submitted by the end of January.



## **ECONOMIC IMPACT AND AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS SURVEY**

Mr. McClintock discussed the need for historical and forecast aircraft operational data and described the survey questionnaire to be distributed to all fixed-base operators and aircraft service operators at VNY. Questions were raised regarding the validity of the survey for determining operational levels because not all aircraft owners have aircraft based at the FBO's. It was acknowledged that this was true, and that steps would be taken to distribute the survey as widely as possible to include independent operators. It was further explained that the proposed survey was only one of several data-gathering techniques to be used, including FAA air traffic records. It was moved and seconded that the staff move ahead with the survey. Motion approved.

The next survey to be conducted is at the direction of the Los Angeles City Council and the Board of Airport Commissioners. The survey has been designed to assess the economic impact of implementing curfew ordinances being considered by the City Council and BOAC. The Steering Committee has been charged with assessing these potential impacts and reporting back to the Council and BOAC. Discussion of the ordinances and their potential economic impacts were carried out. The Committee raised the question of the potential impact of the ordinances on pilot proficiency. Some Committee members were concerned that the proposed operational restrictions could limit the ability of some pilots to remain current with regard to their proficiency as pilots. They were concerned that this could have a potentially adverse impact on aviation safety. Motion was made, and seconded to include questions on safety matters in the survey, and to implement the survey. Motion approved.

## **BULL CREEK DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

Mr. McClintock advised the Committee that an independent study of the reuse of the 91-acre California Air National Guard Base at VNY was currently underway, and that several alternative use scenarios had been proposed. He noted that the Part 150 Technical Committee had reviewed these alternatives and had recommended that an additional alternative, involving the use of the entire site for aviation and aviation-related activities, be submitted to the BOAC for their consideration as another scenario to be evaluated. Discussion ensued on the types of uses proposed by the consultant for the Bull Creek project, and it was noted that the VNY Citizens Advisory Council had approved their own alternative for the use of the site. Concern was also expressed that if the Steering Committee were to approve the recommendation of the Technical Committee, it would not be consistent with the alternative recommended by the Advisory Council. It was noted that the action requested of the Steering Committee was only to recommend that the BOAC consider an evaluation of the alternative of aviation use for the ANG site. Motion was made, and seconded, to request the BOAC to evaluate the alternative of aviation and aviation-related uses for the Bull Creek site. Motion approved.

## **STUDY SCHEDULE**

Mr. Laham presented a brief discussion of the proposed project schedule for the VNY FAR Part 150 study. He noted that this information was also contained in the agenda packets of the Committee members for their additional review.

## **FIELD NOISE MONITORING**

Mr. Laham reported that field noise measurements were conducted at VNY during the period of September 13-17, 1989. The purpose of the noise monitoring was to determine the time of day and specific types of aircraft using the airport in conjunction with individual noise events. The noise consultant is currently using these data, along with other information, to prepare noise exposure maps and identify areas of noise-sensitive land use. Additional information on the field noise monitoring is anticipated to be presented at the next meeting of the Committee.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. A gentleman expressed his concern that the blast fence at the north end of the airport was not adequate to protect his residence from jet engine noise and backblast. He would like this issue to be reviewed as part of the study, along with early morning and prolonged engine-testing and runups. Dr. Silver commented that the total use of the Bull Creek site for aviation uses would contravene the interests of area homeowners.

Additional concern was expressed that the airport needed an expanded permanent noise monitoring system. A gentleman presented a case for the fact that there are currently a number of aviation and aviation-related businesses on the airport and that many of these businesses do not generate noise and annoyance. He made the point that not all aviation and aviation-related uses are noise generators and that the reuse of the Bull Creek area by aviation firms would not necessarily result in any significant increase in aircraft operations or noise levels.

## **NEXT MEETING**

The Committee was advised that the next Steering Committee meeting would be at the Airtel, sometime in January, 1990.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Minutes

**FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, January 10, 1990

The sixth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., January 10, 1990 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mr. Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Samuel Greenberg, Chairman  
Robert Chick, Member  
Clay Lacy, Member  
Will Ross, Member  
Tom Henry, Member  
Don Schultz, Member

Kelly Jensen, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member

Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Charles Zeman, Airport Manager  
Bob Hayes, Staff  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Chris Eberhard, CommuniQuest

Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Susan Loewenkamp  
Joseph McGuire  
Larry Van Nuys  
Ginny Spielberg  
Sandor Winger

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the November 13, 1989, Steering Committee meeting were submitted for approval. Rita Schneir noted that the minutes indicated her status on the committee was as an alternate, and that this was incorrect. It was so noted,

and a motion was made and seconded for approval of the minutes as corrected. Motion approved.

## **FURTHER DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY OPINION SURVEY**

Chairman Greenberg turned the meeting over to Mike McClintock for a discussion on the status of the Community Opinion Survey. He explained that at its last meeting the Steering Committee had reviewed the preliminary format for the community opinion survey and had made several changes to its content and format.

McClintock introduced Ms. Chris Eberhard of CommuniQuest, who had prepared the survey forms and who had made the suggested changes. Ms. Eberhard gave the Committee an overview of the changes made to the survey. Member Will Ross had previously provided the Committee with a letter (attached) setting forth his concerns about the survey. Mr. Ross reviewed some of his concerns with the Committee.

The Committee discussed several aspects of the proposed survey, including whether or not to include any mention of Van Nuys Airport in the introduction to the survey, whether or not questions regarding the overall ranking of community concerns (e.g., drugs, traffic, etc.) were valid, the location of airport questions versus demographic questions, and to what extent the zip code areas to be surveyed were representative of airport impact areas.

After considerable discussion of issues, the Committee determined that the survey should be revised to (1) indicate that it is a survey of various issues concerning neighborhoods in the area of Van Nuys Airport, (2) that there be a lead-in to the questions concerning the airport, (3) add a wrap-up question concerning whether or not the respondent wished to say anything else concerning the airport, (4) Add a qualifying question to employment status to determine if respondent employed at home, (5) delete "aircraft collision risk" from aircraft safety question, (6) ask for first and second-most important issues, (7) rank impression of Van Nuys Airport, and (8) offer noise complaint phone number to those who may be interested.

Ms. Eberhard discussed the proposed schedule for the survey and anticipated that it would be carried out in mid-January with final results available in March.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. Mr. Carl Davidson expressed his opinion concerning the proposed survey.

## **LIFEGUARD VIDEO PRESENTATION**

Mr. Timothy Fives of Chatfield Air Ambulance, Inc., an airport tenant, presented a video concerning the use of Van Nuys Airport by his firm for organ transplant flight

operations. [prior to Mr. Fives presentation those committee members who had seen the video were allowed to leave the meeting] Mr. Fives explained that ..."major medical centers in Southern California have come to rely on the helicopters and small corporate jets based at Van Nuys Airport to fly surgical teams at short notice across the region and across the country." Chatfield Air Ambulance, along with many transplant surgeons and hospitals, are concerned that any closure of Van Nuys Airport to nighttime operations would represent "a potentially life-threatening disruption to organ transplant missions." Mr. Fives noted that organ transplant flights currently operate 24 hours per day under an exemption from the airport's noise ordinance.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

The Committee was advised that the next Steering Committee meeting would be at the Airtel, sometime after March 1990.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Minutes

FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, August 29, 1990

The seventh meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:05 p.m., August 29, 1990 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mr. Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Samuel Greenberg, Chairman  
Robert Chick, Member  
Will Ross, Member  
Tom Henry, Member  
Don Schultz, Member

John Slifko, Member  
Fausto Capobianco, Alternate  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member

Ginny Spielberg, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Charles Zeman, Airport Manager  
Robert Beard, Noise Abatement Officer

Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Chris Eberhard, CommuniQuest  
Tim Merwin, Landrum & Brown  
Eric Hansen, Landrum & Brown  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Clay Lacy  
Susan Loewenkamp  
Joseph McGuire  
Larry Van Nuys  
Sandor Winger

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 10, 1990, Steering Committee meeting were submitted for approval. Don Schultz requested that the minutes be revised to note that he objected to the inclusion of certain zip code areas in the survey. It was so noted, and a motion was made and seconded for approval of the minutes as corrected. Motion approved.

## REPORT ON COMMUNITY OPINION SURVEY

Chairman Greenberg turned the meeting over to Mike McClintock for a report on the Community Opinion Survey conducted for the Van Nuys Airport in January and February 1990. McClintock introduced Ms. Chris Eberhard of CommuniQuest, who carried out the survey. Ms. Eberhard presented an overview of the results of the survey.

The Committee discussed the survey results and questions were raised with regard to the numbers of people interviewed in each zip code area. Concern was expressed over the fact that some of the zip code areas farthest away from the airport had the most interviewees (see attached summary of individuals surveyed, as submitted by member Schultz) and that this could possibly have skewed the results of the survey. Ms. Eberhard stated that there was a very high overall confidence level for the survey, but that in specific zip code areas with small numbers of respondents, the confidence level would not be as high.

After considerable discussion the Committee moved to receive the survey with the condition that in order for the information in the survey not to be misused, an explanatory note should accompany the survey report. Motion seconded and approved. The Committee directed Coordinator McClintock to prepare language expressing the Committee's concern and explaining that although the survey was conducted over a broad area and that public perception of the Airport was positive overall, the survey nonetheless indicated that in certain areas close to the Airport significant numbers of people were concerned about aircraft noise and safety (see attached memo).

## DISCUSSION OF BASE CASE MAP

Coordinator McClintock introduced this agenda item with the explanation that a FAR Part 150 study consists of two components. The first component entails the preparation of "Noise Exposure Maps (NEM)," and the second the development a "Noise Compatibility Program (NCP)." FAR Part 150 requires the development of two noise exposure maps; a base case map, and a map based on a five-year projection of airport activity. The agenda item deals with the base case NEM for Van Nuys Airport.

Maury Laham introduced Tim Merwin of Landrum & Brown, the project noise consultant. Mr. Merwin presented the Committee with the Base Case NEM and a tabular report of noise impacted land use. He recounted a history of the development of the NEM and the methodologies used to prepare the contour. He noted that the FAA's Integrated Noise Model, Version 3.9 (INM 3.9) was the computer model used to prepare the contour. The NEM

was also based on field observations and aircraft traffic counts, airport radar data, and other airport and FAA information required for the preparation of the NEM. The Committee discussed the assumptions and methodologies used by Landrum & Brown to develop the NEM with Mr. Merwin and staff. Mr. Laham advised the Committee that the base case NEM would be used in conjunction with the five-year NEM to evaluate up to ten noise abatement alternatives, and that the next steps in the FAR Part 150 process would be to complete the five-year forecast NEM and to analyze the alternative future noise control scenarios. It was noted that with the development of the five-year forecast NEM, the first component of the FAR Part 150 study would be completed. No further action by the Committee was required.

## **ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL SCENARIOS**

Mr. Laham introduced the subject by noting that the project Technical Committee had reviewed a list of twenty alternative noise control scenarios for the Van Nuys Airport. The Technical Committee selected five scenarios from the list of twenty and added two more. Mr. Laham discussed the seven noise control scenarios selected by the Technical Committee with the Steering Committee and responded to questions concerning the various alternatives. Concern was expressed over the legality of some of the alternatives in light of Federal preemption and possible discrimination. The Committee felt that the magnitude of the noise problem at Van Nuys Airport was such that the measures recommended for inclusion in the study by the Los Angeles City Council and Board of Airport Commissioners were justifiable and should be retained for analysis. The Committee noted that at this stage the alternatives were only to be analyzed and that implementation was the responsibility of the Council or BOAC.

A comment was made that Scenario 4 might be in conflict with a recently proposed BOAC noise control ordinance, and that the conditions of the BOAC ordinance should be substituted for Scenario 4. A motion was made to this effect, but failed. The seven alternative noise control scenarios will be submitted to Landrum & Brown for analysis.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. Mr. Carl Davison advised the Committee that he had conducted his own survey of 140 people and that all had expressed concern over aircraft noise. Mr. Davison also apprised the Committee of two pieces of pending legislation. Mr. McClintock offered to make copies of the legislation available to Mr. Davison (attached).

Dr. Gerald Silver commented that the base case NEM appeared to correlate well with independent noise studies conducted for VNY. He also suggested that an independent audit of DOA noise data should be carried out and that all such data must be distributed to the community. He expressed frustration at the apparent delay in the FAR Part 150 process and pointed out that FAR Part 150 sets forth a list of allowable noise abatement options. He provided copies of two letters (attached) to the Committee. The first was to Congressman Howard Berman commenting on a lack of study progress.



The second letter was addressed to the study coordinator, requesting placement of two noise abatement alternatives on the Committee agenda. Mr. Laham provided the Committee with copies of the DOA response to Mr. Silver's letters (attached).

Ms. Carol McCombs asked why only Congressmen Berman and Beilenson were represented on the Committee? Mr. Laham responded that although other areas may be subject to noise and overflight from VNY, the areas represented by the two congressmen are the most seriously noise impacted and as a result represent an important issue in their districts. Ms. McCombs read a letter expressing her concerns over increased jet activity at VNY and the interruption that this represents to her daily life. She concluded by stating that the people who are the most seriously affected by aircraft noise should have had a greater voice in the survey.

Ms. Penny Newmark asked why there could be such a wide discrepancy between the conclusions of the VNY Community Opinion Survey and similar surveys conducted by Congressmen Beilenson and Berman. She was advised that the surveys by the congressmen were not scientific.

Mr. Eli Adut took exception to the survey methodology and results. He stated that noise has increased and that he cannot sell his property.

Mrs. Trudi Schultz asked when the study would be done? Mr. Laham responded that the study should be completed in the Fall of 1991.

Mr. John Sells wanted to reemphasize the actual number of people who are annoyed by aircraft noise in zip code 91406.

Mr. David Aibel stated that the noise problem was worsening and that the study should proceed post haste.

A lady asked how the public could know if their noise complaints have been logged? Mr. Beard responded that to his knowledge that all noise complaints received on the VNY noise complaint line are logged-in and follow-up contacts are made where possible.

A gentleman questioned the use of the "estimated" noise levels set forth in FAA Advisory Circular 36-3E as the basis for an enforceable noise ordinance? He was advised that this is the advisory circular accepted by the FAA for this purpose.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

## Minutes

### FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, January 9, 1991

The eighth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:15 p.m., January 9, 1991 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. In the absence of Mr. Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, Mr. Tom Henry, Vice-chairman opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Tom Henry, Member  
Robert Chick, Member  
Clay Lacy, Member  
Will Ross, Member  
Don Schultz, Member

John Slifko, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member  
Ginny Spielberg, Member

Rita Schneir, Member  
Frankye Schneider, Member  
John Denver, Alt. for Joe McGuire  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Robert Beard, Noise Abatement Officer

Wanda Williams, Staff  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Samuel Greenberg, Chairman  
Susan Loewenkamp  
Joseph McGuire (represented by alt.)  
Larry Van Nuys

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the August 29, 1990 Steering Committee meeting were submitted for approval. Motion was made and seconded for approval of the minutes. Motion approved.

## VAN NUYS AIRPORT JET DEPARTURES

Gerald A. Silver of the Homeowners of Encino provided the Committee with a printout of jet aircraft IFR (instrument flight rule) departures at Van Nuys Airport from January 1, 1989 through August 14, 1989. Mr. Silver told the Committee that he had used several computerized data bases to organize the jet departure data on the basis of aircraft type, ownership, and the time and date of the operation from FAA air traffic control tower flight strips. These data were then sorted on the basis of the estimated aircraft noise levels (A-weighted decibels) as set forth in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 36-3(E). The result was the list of all jet aircraft instrument departures that he had provided to the Committee, which consists of approximately 5, 000 takeoff operations.

Mr. Silver explained that the jet noise levels ranged from a low of 62.6dBA to a high of 89.7dBA. He noted that about two-thirds of the total number of jet departures were by aircraft rated at or below a threshold noise level of 74.8dBA, and that the remaining one-third were by aircraft having rated noise levels above 76.6dBA. Mr. Silver noted that the Committee was charged with finding fair and equitable means to reduce aircraft noise at Van Nuys Airport. He suggested that the Committee consider the alternative of prohibiting operations by aircraft which would exceed a threshold noise level of 74.0dBA. He stated that it was his opinion that this would have virtually no adverse economic consequences on any of the small piston-engine aircraft using the Airport, and that this would serve to eliminate an estimated 90% of the noise which was being created by less than 10% of the aircraft in the operational fleet mix.

Mr. Silver called the attention of the Committee to his letter of April 10, 1990, in which he asked the Committee to adopt the following recommendations formulated by the Homeowners of Encino:

1. A 74.0dBA single event noise level limit during daylight hours based on the takeoff noise levels set forth in FAA Advisory Circular 36-3.
2. Prohibitions against intersection takeoffs and formation takeoffs.

Mr. Silver noted that these procedures were in effect at Santa Monica Airport and were legally permissible and acceptable to the FAA. The Homeowners of Encino specifically want to ban operations of such noisy jet aircraft as the Learjet 24 and 25 series, Sabreliner 40 and 60 series, Lockheed Jetstar 1329, and the IAI Westwind 1123, among others.

A concern was raised with respect to the effect that a ban on intersection takeoffs might have on IFR departures. It was noted that such takeoffs are controlled by the tower and that in each case a specific departure time is assigned for air traffic control purposes. Of concern was that such a prohibition could adversely affect the flow of regional air traffic if assigned departure times were missed due to congestion at the runway end. It was suggested that the potential effects of this alternative be discussed with the local tower chief. A further point was raised with respect to formation takeoffs. It was noted that because of aircraft separation requirements such takeoffs are not allowed. Further discussion disclosed that the actual issue

was actually formation flying over the Airport environs by several vintage piston-engined aircraft which form up immediately after departure.

The Committee discussed the value of the information presented and suggested that, if possible, additional correlation be done to incorporate arrival data. Mr. Silver expressed his willingness to work with the Department of Airports in this regard.

A Committee member noted that of the jet aircraft comprising the one-third component above 74.0dBA represented a large number of jet charter operations, and that these operations were not always by the same company for the same reason, but represented charters from a wide variety of businesses. A commentator from the audience expressed his concern over the use of the noise levels set forth in FAA AC 36-3 as the basis of the proposed noise standard, since such noise levels were only estimated. He suggested the use of FAA AC 36-1E which uses actual measured noise levels, and which, in his opinion, was the only proper way of proceeding. Moderator McClintock argued that such was not the case, and that AC 36-3 was the advisory circular recommended by the FAA for such purposes.<sup>1</sup> However, it was conceded that in actuality the best way to proceed would be to use actual field noise data from a permanent noise monitoring system to set performance standards.

#### DISCUSSION OF AD HOC AIRPORT NOISE WORKING GROUP

This item was placed on the agenda in response to a letter dated November 1, 1990 from the Van Nuys Airport Ad Hoc Noise Working Group. This group was formed after a Department of Airports public hearing on an EIR for a proposed noise regulation for Van Nuys Airport. The purpose of the group was to provide an opportunity for members of the Van Nuys Airport Association to meet with the leaders of the surrounding community in an effort to formulate workable airport noise recommendations and propose effective solutions. The working group was organized by Mr. Phil Berg of the Van Nuys Airport Association and Mr. Don Schultz of the Ban Airport Noise organization. According to their letter, the group was formed because it was felt that the proposed noise regulation did not address any of the identifiable noise problems at the Airport, and that before any such ordinance be adopted appropriate environmental and economic studies should be conducted.

---

1. The reason for this is that AC 36-1E is based on the FAR Part 36 requirement for reporting aircraft noise levels in units of Effective Perceived Noise Levels in decibels (EPNdB). Airport and community noise measurement and analysis systems rely on noise rating scales that are based on A-weighted decibels (dBA). In addition, EPNdB is not a conveniently measured noise level. It is calculated from field or laboratory noise measurements according to a formula that provides correction factors for duration of the event and the presence of audible pure tones or discrete frequencies in the noise signal. EPNdB is used by the FAA as the noise certification metric for large transport and turbojet aircraft and helicopters. It is for this reason that AC 36-3 was published. It provides a standard reference source for aircraft noise levels that is consistent with the noise impact analysis metrics used in airport and community noise control.

The Committee was provided copies of the group's November 1 letter and Mr. Laham's response dated November 21, 1990. The consensus of the ad hoc working group's first meeting was that noise problems at Van Nuys Airport seemed to fall into three main areas, as follow:

- o pilots are following poor procedures or failing to follow recommended procedures,
- o the pattern altitudes for both fixed and rotary wing aircraft are compressed too low to the ground because of the glide slope angle to the Runway 7 ILS approach to the Burbank Airport, and
- o helicopter operations cause many complaints because of current routings, altitudes, and procedures, especially public service helicopters such as those used for fire control.

The group's letter contained a series of preliminary noise abatement recommendations. Mr. Laham's letter responded to the issues and recommendations raised in the group's November 1 letter. Mr. Schultz was called upon to discuss the recommendations of the working group with the Committee. Mr. Schultz stated that since the working group was to have another meeting the following night that it would be inappropriate to discuss the recommendations without first having them formally approved by the full working group. Mr. Berg indicated that the letter from the group was intended to be for the information of the Committee at this time, and that he too felt that the complete working group should have an opportunity to refine the recommendations before the Committee should discuss them or take any form of action.

## RESULTS OF ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL SCENARIO ANALYSES

Mr. Laham introduced the subject by noting that the project Technical Committee had previously reviewed a list of twenty alternative noise control scenarios for the Van Nuys Airport. The Technical Committee had selected five scenarios from the list of twenty and had added two more. At its last meeting the Steering Committee discussed the seven noise control scenarios selected by the Technical Committee and directed staff to submit them to the project noise consultant for analyses.

Mr. Laham then reported on the results of the analyses of the future noise control alternatives. Mr. Laham provided the Committee with copies of the noise contours and land use impact data for each of the seven alternatives. In response to a question concerning whether the noise contours were based on actual noise measurements, he noted that one cannot measure future noise events, but that the FAA's computer noise model was used to analyze the potential noise consequences of the alternatives on the bases of the projected numbers and types of aircraft operations, and flight track and runway use percentages for future conditions.

Mr. Laham noted that between the base case scenario (1990 conditions) and the five-year forecast condition (1995) operational activity was projected to increase. Alternative 1 (touch-and-go restrictions) would serve to reduce the 1995 noise impact area by only a very small amount, because

the vast majority of touch-and-go operations are carried by small piston-engined aircraft whose cumulative noise effects are largely masked by jet aircraft operations. He further noted that he did not feel that the small reduction in incompatible land use afforded by this alternative would be commensurate with the hardship it might impose on the operators of small piston-engined aircraft.

Alternative 2 would prohibit takeoff by all aircraft (excluding military, law enforcement, and emergency operations) between 11:00 p.m. 7:00 a.m. every day. The reduction in impacted area from this alternative was due in part to the fact that only about 10 percent of the total operations at Van Nuys Airport occur at night, and of these a significant number are by the quieter business jets. It was pointed out however, that on a single-event noise level basis this alternative would eliminate an estimated one to three nighttime operations by noisy aircraft.

Alternative 3 would require reduced thrust/power cutbacks for all jets departing VNY, based on the National Business Aircraft Association (NBAA) noise abatement procedures. This was considered to be a significant reduction and this alternative is one that is capable of being implemented immediately as the FAA, aircraft manufacturers and NBAA all have published noise abatement departure procedures that have been proven to be both safe and quiet.

Alternative 4 would prohibit all but FAR Part 36 Stage III aircraft after 1994. However, Mr. Laham pointed out that a 1994 deadline for implementation of a Stage III requirement would probably not be feasible, and recommended a similar scenario based on 1998 conditions. Discussion ensued over the feasibility and effectiveness of allowing non-Stage III aircraft to be re-engined or re-nacelled to comply with the FAR Part 36 Stage III requirement, and whether or not such aircraft could take a weight penalty on departure and be in compliance with Stage III noise level standards.

Alternative 5 would extend the 74.0dbA takeoff curfew to between 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Alternative 6 would maintain the 74.0dBA takeoff curfew from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. and then establish a 78.0dBA takeoff curfew from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Alternative 7 would establish a 24-hour 74.0dBA takeoff limit.

The various alternatives and their potential benefits and consequences were discussed by the Committee. The 74.0dBA and FAR Part 36 noise criteria were questioned on the basis of the presumption that they could affect up to 51% of the aircraft using Van Nuys Airport and have severe economic impacts. Alternatives 4, 5, 6, and 7 were suggested as having the potential for the greatest adverse economic impact, with Alternative 7 being considered the worst alternative from an economic impact standpoint.

The Committee discussed the various alternatives and their potential affects on the Van Nuys Airport noise problem. A point was made that helicopter noise should not be overlooked, since this was considered to be a major source of the problem. Mr. Laham advised the Committee that a helicopter study was currently underway, and that it would deal with the flight track and low overflight issues. The report would be presented to the Committee in the near future.

Mr. Laham requested the Committee to reflect on the various alternatives and to consider which ones would represent fair and equitable solutions to the problem, and to suggest modifications or combinations to be given further consideration. Commissioner Chick recommended, and the Committee concurred, that DOA staff should take the steps necessary to provide information to the Board of Airport Commissioners so that the noise abatement departure procedures associated with Alternative 3 can be implemented prior to the completion of the study.

The Committee directed staff to perform further analyses on two additional scenarios. The first additional scenario would require compliance with the noise abatement departure procedures established in Scenario number 3 and prohibit any aircraft with a noise level that exceeds 78.0dBA based on the respective manufacturer's noise abatement procedure for a given aircraft, throughout the entire 24 hour day. The second additional scenario would require compliance with the noise abatement departure procedures established in Scenario number 3 during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and impose a maximum takeoff noise limit of 74.0dBA (again based on manufacturer's noise abatement criteria for each aircraft) during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Member Lacey reminded the Committee that any noise level standards imposed at the Airport must be capable of being verified through flight testing and field measurement so that specific classes of aircraft are not discriminated against. Member Winger also noted that a noise monitoring system was needed at the Airport which was capable of identifying exactly which aircraft were responsible for the noise. This brought up questions concerning the capabilities of the aircraft noise monitoring system at the Airport and how this system might be used to enforce a noise ordinance. It was suggested that this issue be the subject of an upcoming meeting, and that the DOA Noise Abatement Officer, Mr. Beard, make a presentation to the Committee on the subject of the existing and proposed noise monitoring systems.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. Mr. Harry Berg expressed dissatisfaction with the noise level standards being considered by the Committee. He recommended actual measured noise levels be used, as opposed to estimated noise levels.

Mrs. Prudy Schultz was concerned that there had been no newspaper or radio announcements of the meeting.

Mr. Frank Barrena expressed concern over the consultant's noise monitoring efforts at his home.

Mr. Carl Davison advised the Committee that he was upset about a variety of matters and wanted to see the Airport closed.

Mr. Robert Humphries expressed concern over low overflights by B-727 aircraft, near misses, congested airspace and the need to relocate the approaches to Burbank Airport.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.



## Minutes

### FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, February 27, 1991

The ninth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:15 p.m., February 27, 1991 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. With the absence of Mr. Samuel Greenberg, Chairman and Mr. Tom Henry, Vice-chairman, the moderator, Michael McClintock opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Clay Lacy, Member  
Joseph McGuire, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Wanda Williams, Staff  
Steve Crowther, Staff  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator  
Robert Beard, Noise Abatement Officer

The following committee members were absent:

Samuel Greenberg  
Robert Chick  
Will Ross  
Don Schultz  
Lisa Barrena  
Ginny Spielberg  
Frankye Schneider  
John Slifko  
Susan Loewenkamp  
Larry Van Nuys

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 9, 1991 Steering Committee meeting were submitted for approval. It was the consensus of the members present that approval of the minutes be continued to the next meeting when more members could be present.

#### DISCUSSION OF NOISE MONITORING SYSTEMS

Mr. Tony Florence of Technology Integration presented information on his company's airport noise and operations monitoring system (ANOMS). He advised the Committee that ANOMS is a noise and operations monitoring

system that gathers, evaluates and distributes information for noise abatement programs, including predictions of the potential impacts of proposed noise abatement procedures, assessment of noise abatement program performance, data for program enforcement, and information of benefit to noise impacted communities.

ANOMS can also match noise data from remote noise monitoring stations with flight tracks from airport radar (ARTS). Mr. Florence noted that the various data inputs are automatically linked within the ANOMS system, which provides a quick and efficient means of identifying noise sources and determining noise impacts. ANOMS systems have been installed at the Oakland and Orlando International Airports, and at the Fort Lauderdale Executive and Sarasota-Bradenton Airports.

The Committee discussed the characteristics of the ANOMS system and asked specific questions of Mr. Florence. Of significance was the fact that the system was an interactive and highly flexible system with aircraft noise comprising but one component. Additional systems components include a radar tracking system and a data base management program which allows the user to identify specific aircraft noise events and to verify flight tracks. Mr. Florence concluded his presentation by advising the Committee that although the ANOMS system can be quite sophisticated, it is first necessary to determine what the specific noise management goals of an airport are in order to determine which system components would be required.

Robert Beard, Department of Airports Noise Abatement Officer, followed Mr. Florence with a discussion of the capabilities the City's existing noise monitoring system at VNY. He noted that the current noise monitoring system in operation at VNY is a new system with seven remote monitoring sites and is capable of many of the functions in the ANOMS system, with the exception of when aircraft flight tracks are identified. The ANOMS system employs a passive radar monitoring device which provides almost instantaneous aircraft flight track information. The VNY noise monitoring system requires taped data from the FAA. FAA policy requires a fifteen day delay before such information can be released. Both systems rely on FAA data to identify a specific aircraft for correlation with a given noise event. This information is also subject to the FAA's fifteen day delay procedure.

The main purpose of the existing VNY noise monitoring system is to provide data for the preparation of quarterly and annual noise contours as required by the State of California. The system can also be used to track noisy aircraft, but the fifteen day wait is still necessary before the field noise information can be correlated with the FAA flight data.

Maury Laham advised the Committee that the purpose of the two presentation was to inform participants of the capabilities of the various noise monitoring and management systems. He stated that it was the goal of the Technical Committee to achieve a real-time noise monitoring and management program which could accomplish six tasks. These tasks were to (1) identify aircraft by "N" number, (2) identify the aircraft owner, (3) identify the aircraft operator, (4) provide FAR Part 36 takeoff noise level information for the specific type, (5) provide noise abatement takeoff noise level information, and (6) provide actual takeoff noise level information to assess performance or compliance with noise regulations. The Committee discussed the objectives for the system and some of the technical problems associated with being able to identify aircraft on the basis of "squawk" codes (many GA aircraft only "squawk 1200" and cannot be differentiated). The recom-

mended solution was to use time-coordinated recordings of FAA air traffic control tower transmissions to correlate with flight strips and other operational data. Further discussion ensued over the practicality of empirical versus published noise data, and the enforceability of specific noise abatement measures.

#### **DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL SCENARIOS 8, 9 AND 10**

Maury Laham advised the Committee that the Technical Committee had recommended that Scenario 9 (reduced takeoff/thrust power settings and prohibition of all aircraft having FAR part 36 noise levels in excess of 74dBA between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.) be adopted as the preferred alternative. Laham discussed the various scenarios and their potential effect in reducing aircraft noise levels at VNY. He noted that at the Committee's last meeting Scenarios 8, 9, and 10 were recommended for analysis. On the basis of this analysis it was concluded that the combination of noise procedures in Scenario 9 would result in the most significant equitable noise level reductions overall.

#### **SUBMITTAL OF NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS**

Mr. Laham advised the Committee that as a result of recent directions from the FAA the Base Case and 5-year Noise Exposure Maps will be submitted to the FAA for their review and approval in advance of the Noise Compatibility Program. Mr. Laham distributed a preliminary copy of the FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program for VNY. He discussed the various noise abatement and land use compatibility recommendations and requested the Committee to also review the document and respond back to him.

#### **DISCUSSION OF CONSOLIDATED MASTER PLAN**

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. Gerald Silver provided the Committee with additional tables of jet aircraft operations at VNY between June 30, 1990 and December 31, 1990.

Mr. Carl Davison expressed dissatisfaction with the noise level standards being considered by the Committee. He recommended actual measured noise levels be used, as opposed to estimated noise levels.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Minutes

FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, June 18, 1991

The tenth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:20 p.m., June 18, 1991 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. With the passing of Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, and in the initial absence of Mr. Tom Henry, Vice-chairman, the moderator, Michael McClintock opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Larry Van Nuys, Member  
Don Schultz, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member

Robert Jackson, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Wanda Williams, Staff

Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Robert Chick  
Joseph McGuire  
Clay Lacy  
Will Ross  
Ginny Spielberg

Frankye Schneider  
John Slifko  
Sandor Winger

**CONFIRMATION OF CHAIRMAN**

Moderator McClintock informed the Committee that as a result of the untimely passing of Chairman Samuel Greenberg April 24, 1991, it was necessary to confirm Robert A. Chick of the Board of Airport Commissioners as the new Chairman, and reconfirm Tom Henry as Vice Chairman. Motion was made and seconded for approval. Motion carried.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 9, 1991 and February 27, 1991 Steering Committee meetings were submitted for approval. Motions were made and seconded for approval of the minutes. Motions approved.

## APPROVAL OF NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS (1990/95)

Moderator McClintock advised the Committee that this matter was carried over from the February 27, 1991 meeting because of the limited attendance at the meeting. It was noted that this meeting was also sparsely attended and the question was raised concerning whether or not any action should be taken under these circumstances. After discussion, it was determined that if any Committee business was ever to be completed it would have to be as a result of the concurrence of the majority of those members present and voting.

Mr. McClintock noted that the Noise Exposure Map (NEM) component of the FAR Part 150 process is important in that the base case (1990) and five-year forecast case (1995) noise exposure maps establish the baseline criteria against which potential noise abatement measures are evaluated. He explained that it was very important to submit the noise exposure maps to the FAA for review and approval for two primary reasons. The first reason is that it takes a minimum of 180 days for the FAA to review and approve the maps. The second reason is that the second, and most important component of the FAR Part 150 process--the Noise Compatibility Program--cannot be reviewed by the FAA until the Noise Exposure Map component has been approved. A timely submittal of the noise exposure maps will result in less delay in the FAA's review and approval of the Noise Compatibility Program.

The Committee questioned the nature of the maps to be submitted to the FAA. It was explained that the only maps being submitted were the 1990 and 1995 noise exposure maps. Noise exposure maps for Alternative Noise Control Scenarios 1-10 would be submitted separately as part of the Noise Compatibility Program component.

Discussion was held concerning the fleet mix and operational levels for the 1995 noise exposure map. Mr. Laham explained that the fleet mix and operational assumptions for jet aircraft were quite conservative in that they projected a 47% increase in operations over the next five years. This growth rate exceeded that projected by both the state and FAA, but was nonetheless justified on the basis of the dynamic nature of Van Nuys Airport. Concern was expressed that projected piston-engine aircraft operations might have been overstated for 1995 conditions. It was explained that with the exception of business aircraft, such operations are generally in decline, and that in any event it was the noisier classes of jet aircraft which would dominate the noise contour.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the two noise exposure maps and to submit them to the FAA for review and approval. Discussion was held on the fact that many members were absent. Consensus was to proceed on the basis of those present having to be able to decide if anything is to be accomplished. Motion to approve maps and to submit them to FAA was approved.

## **ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL SCENARIOS 1-10**

Action on this item was postponed until next meeting. Member Voorhis provided the Committee with copies of the Fort Lauderdale Noise Compatibility Program for their information (Attachment 1). He suggested that the format used to summarize the various noise abatement alternatives was useful and could be applied to the Van Nuys study. Mr. Laham advised that staff would review the document and develop a similar summary table for Noise Control Scenarios 1-10.

## **DISCUSSION OF CONSOLIDATED MASTER PLAN**

Mr. Laham referenced the "Van Nuys Airport Plan and Environs" map, which is a compilation of portions of the adopted General Plan elements which include and surround Van Nuys Airport. He requested that members review the plan and suggest any changes that would prevent the introduction of new incompatible land uses in the Airport environs. The Committee received the plan.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. Representing Gerald Silver, Mr. Joe Danziger provided the Committee with additional tables of jet aircraft operations at VNY between January 1, 1990 and December 31, 1990 (Attachment 2).

Mr. Carl Davison expressed his dissatisfaction.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

## Minutes

### FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, November 4, 1991

The eleventh meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:20 p.m., November 4, 1991 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Chairman Robert Chick opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Robert Chick, Chairman  
Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Sandor Winger, Member  
Don Schultz, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member

Joseph McGuire, Member  
Clay Lacy, Member  
Will Ross, Member  
Ginny Spielberg, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member

Rita Schneir, Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Ron Kochevar, Airport Manager  
Robert Beard, Noise Abatement Officer  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Lisa Barrera  
Larry Van Nuys  
John Slifko  
Frankye Schneider

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the June 18, 1991 Steering Committee meetings were submitted for approval. Motion was made to approve the minutes as submitted. Discussion ensued over the lack of quorum at the June 18 meeting and whether or not any action could be taken to approve the minutes. Motion for approval was withdrawn. It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the June 18, 1991 meeting be revised to reflect the fact that due to lack of a quorum at the meeting any actions taken were only as a consensus of the Members present and that the agenda items for the June 18 and November 4, 1991 meetings be rescheduled for the December 2, 1991 Committee meeting. Motion seconded and approved.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. No comments were received.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.



Minutes

FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, June 18, 1991  
(as revised 11/5/91)

The tenth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:20 p.m., June 18, 1991 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. With the passing of Samuel Greenberg, Chairman, and in the initial absence of Mr. Tom Henry, Vice-chairman, the moderator, Michael McClintock opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Larry Van Nuys, Member  
Don Schultz, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member

Robert Jackson, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Wanda Williams, Staff

Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Robert Chick  
Joseph McGuire  
Clay Lacy  
Will Ross  
Ginny Spielberg

Frankye Schneider  
John Slifko  
Sandor Winger

It was noted that the Committee was one member short of having a quorum. Discussion was held on whether or not any business could be conducted. It was the consensus of the members present that the Committee should proceed with the agenda since there was no formal requirement for a quorum, and that any action taken would be a matter of consensus and would be subject to review by the Committee as a whole.

## CONFIRMATION OF CHAIRMAN

Moderator McClintock informed the Committee that as a result of the untimely passing of Chairman Samuel Greenberg April 24, 1991, it was necessary to confirm Robert A. Chick of the Board of Airport Commissioners as the new Chairman, and reconfirm Tom Henry as Vice Chairman. It was the consensus of the members present that this be so.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 9, 1991 and February 27, 1991 Steering Committee meetings were submitted for approval. It was the consensus of the members present that the minutes be approved.

## APPROVAL OF NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS (1990/95)

Moderator McClintock advised the Committee that this matter was carried over from the February 27, 1991 meeting because of the limited attendance at the meeting. It was noted again that this meeting was also sparsely attended and the question was raised concerning whether or not any action should be taken under these circumstances. After discussion, it was determined that if any Committee business was ever to be completed it would have to be as a result of a consensus of the members present.

Mr. McClintock noted that the Noise Exposure Map (NEM) component of the FAR Part 150 process is very important in that the base case (1990) and five-year forecast case (1995) noise exposure maps establish the baseline criteria against which potential noise abatement measures are evaluated. He explained that it was very important to submit the noise exposure maps to the FAA for review and approval for two primary reasons. The first reason is that it takes a minimum of 180 days for the FAA to review and approve the maps. The second reason is that the second, and most important component of the FAR Part 150 process--the Noise Compatibility Program--cannot be reviewed by the FAA until the Noise Exposure Map component has been approved. A timely submittal of the noise exposure maps will result in less delay in the FAA's review and approval of the Noise Compatibility Program.

The Committee questioned the nature of the maps to be submitted to the FAA. It was explained that the only maps being submitted were the 1990 and 1995 noise exposure maps. Noise exposure maps for Alternative Noise Control Scenarios 1-10 would be submitted separately as part of the Noise Compatibility Program component.

Discussion was held concerning the fleet mix and operational levels for the 1995 noise exposure map. Mr. Laham explained that the fleet mix and operational assumptions for jet aircraft were quite conservative in that they projected a 47% increase in operations from 1990 to 1995. This growth rate exceeded that projected by both the state and FAA, but was nonetheless justified on the basis of the dynamic nature of Van Nuys Airport. Concern was expressed that projected piston-engine aircraft operations might have been understated for 1995 conditions. It was explained that with the exception of business aircraft, such operations are generally in decline, and that in any event it was the noisier classes of jet aircraft which would dominate the noise contour.

The consensus of the Members was to approve the two noise exposure maps and to submit them to the FAA for review and approval. Discussion was held on the fact that many members were absent. Consensus again was to proceed on the basis of those present having to be able to decide if anything is to be accomplished.

#### **ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL SCENARIOS 1-10**

Action on this item was postponed until next meeting. Member Voorhis provided the Committee with copies of the Fort Lauderdale Noise Compatibility Program for their information (Attachment 1). He suggested that the format used to summarize the various noise abatement alternatives was useful and could be applied to the Van Nuys study. Mr. Laham advised that staff would review the document and develop a similar summary table for Noise Control Scenarios 1-10.

#### **DISCUSSION OF CONSOLIDATED MASTER PLAN**

Mr. Laham distributed copies of the "Van Nuys Airport Plan and Environs" map, which is a compilation of portions of the adopted General Plan elements which surround Van Nuys Airport. He requested that members review the plan and suggest any changes that would prevent the introduction of new incompatible land uses in the Airport environs. Discussion was held concerning the nature of the plan and whether or not it was the "Master Plan" for Van Nuys Airport. The nature of the document was reiterated as being a compilation of the approved General Plan elements for the areas surrounding the Airport. The Committee received the plan.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. In the absence of Gerald Silver, Mr. Joe Danziger provided the Committee with additional tables of jet aircraft operations at VNY between January 1, 1990 and December 31, 1990 (Attachment 2).

Mr. Carl Davison expressed his dissatisfaction.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

## Minutes

### FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, December 2, 1991

The twelfth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., December 2, 1991 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. M. McClintock, the project moderator opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Robert Chick, Chairman  
Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Sandor Winger, Member  
Don Schultz, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member

Rick Voorhis, Member  
Joseph McGuire, Member  
Will Ross, Member  
Larry Van Nuys, Member  
Ginny Spielberg, Member

Robert Jackson, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Wanda Williams, Staff  
Ron Kochevar, Airport Manager  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

John Slifko  
Frankye Schneider  
Clay Lacy

#### CONFIRMATION OF CHAIRPERSONS

As a result of the death of Steering Committee Chairman Samuel Greenberg on April 24, 1991, Robert A. Chick, President of the Board of Airport Commissioners was confirmed as the new Chairman of the Steering Committee. Tom Henry was reconfirmed as Vice Chairman (Item carried forward from June 18, 1991 meeting for confirmation by majority of Steering Committee membership).

#### PUBLIC INFORMATION WORKSHOP

Moderator McClintock introduced this item by noting that it was the stated intent of the Steering Committee to use this meeting as an additional opportunity for public comment on the FAR Part 150 Study for Van Nuys Airport. The original intent of the meeting was to focus on the development of the Noise Exposure Maps for 1990 and 1995, ten alternative noise control scenarios and the draft

Noise Compatibility Program. However, in light of the controversy that had developed over the July 16, 1991 recommendation of the Project Technical Committee that the Planning Department conduct a study to determine the appropriateness to replan/rezone certain residential areas in the Airport environs to airport compatible uses, the Steering Committee concurred with a recommendation to focus on this issue first because of the large number of people present who were concerned with this issue.

Members of the Steering Committee expressed their opinions opposing the proposed replanning/rezoning recommendation. Motion was made and seconded to deny the recommendation of the Technical Committee. Discussion was held with respect to modifying the motion to delete one specific residential area cited by a member of the public as being rendered undesirable as a result of illegal activities. It was noted that such activities should be brought to the attention of the police and so dealt with. The motion to deny the July 16, 1991 recommendation of the Technical Committee was approved unanimously.

Councilwoman Joy Picus stated her appreciation of the Committee's action and reaffirmed her commitment to protect local neighborhoods.

The Committee's attention was directed to the remainder of the program. Mr. McClintock discussed the requirements of FAR Part 150 for the development of airport noise compatibility programs. He noted that a FAR Part 150 Study has two components, i.e., a Noise Exposure Map (NEM) component and a Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) component.

The NEM component consists of two noise exposure maps. The first map is a map of existing (base year) conditions and represents historical aviation activity. For the Van Nuys Airport FAR Part 150 Study, 1990 was selected as the base year. The second noise exposure map is based on a five-year forecast of aviation activities at the airport. The base case and five-year forecast noise exposure maps prepared for Van Nuys Airport were reviewed with the Committee and the public.

Mr. McClintock discussed the requirement for the NCP component of the FAR Part 150 Study, noting that it would incorporate a variety of operational, preventive, and remedial measures to enhance the compatibility of the airport with the surrounding community. Critical to the development of the NCP was the consideration of a variety of noise abatement alternatives. The Technical Committee had developed and analyzed ten separate noise abatement/control scenarios. Mr. McClintock summarized the ten scenarios and discussed their pros and cons. He also reviewed a table of comparative impacts and a cost benefit analysis prepared for the ten different alternatives.

The discussion of the draft Noise Compatibility Program was deferred to the December 9, 1991 meeting in order to allow the public an opportunity to comment on the issues at hand.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Correspondence was received from State Assemblyman Terry B. Friedman on the subject of Airport noise policies (Attachment 1).

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. A number of individuals spoke in regard to aircraft noise and annoyance in general and concerns were raised with regard to the following specific issues:

1. The time and location of engine-runups for maintenance purposes. (Chairman Chick stated that this was an issue that could be brought before the Board of Airport Commissioners for action prior to completion of the NCP. The Committee concurred.)
2. The size of N-numbers (identification numbers) on aircraft should be enlarged to facilitate aircraft identification.
3. Principal aircraft flight tracks, and primary arrival and departure tracks for helicopters should be published.
4. Formation flights by vintage aircraft was both a noise and safety concern.
5. Noise concerns should not be directed solely at jet aircraft (some piston-engined aircraft can be as noisy, or noisier).
6. Helicopters were noted as being particularly bothersome.
7. Lack of administrative response and follow-up to noise and other complaints was cited as an important factor to the community.
8. A means of recording complaints and publishing responses is needed.
9. What powers do the Board of Airport Commissioners have with respect to controlling aircraft noise?
10. What would be the effect of a 74dBA noise limit; as opposed to a 78dBA limit?
11. Prohibitions on night flights, the use of thrust reversers at night and in the early morning, and air shows were suggested.
12. Another noise control scenario was suggested (Scenario 11) which would incorporate the suggestions made by "Stop the Noise" (see Attachment 2).
13. What are the potential legal liabilities/ramifications of the various noise control scenarios considered or recommended above?

After public comments were received, the Committee determined that, because of time considerations, it would be necessary to continue the discussion of the Noise Compatibility Program over to a subsequent meeting.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:55 p.m. the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 p.m., December 9, 1991 at the Airtel Hotel.

## Minutes

### FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, December 9, 1991

The thirteenth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., December 9, 1991 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Commissioner Robert Chick, Steering Committee Chairman, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Robert Chick, Chairman  
Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Don Schultz, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Joseph McGuire, Member

Larry Van Nuys, Member  
Ginny Spielberg, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator

Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Wanda Williams, Staff  
Ron Kochevar, Airport Manager  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Sandor Winger  
Lisa Barrera  
John Slifko  
Will Ross  
Frankye Schneider  
Clay Lacy

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Chick called for the approval of the minutes of the January 9, February 27, June 18, and November 4, 1991 Steering Committee meetings. Motion made, seconded and approved.

## DISCUSSION OF DRAFT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM

Chairman Chick noted that this item was continued from the December 2, 1991 Steering Committee meeting, and asked the Project Coordinator to present an overview of the draft Noise Compatibility Program (NCP). Mr. McClintock began the discussion by noting that the draft NCP had been modified by deleting all references to the rezoning or replanning of residential areas in proximity to the Van Nuys Airport as a result of action taken at the December 2, 1991 Steering Committee meeting.

Mr. McClintock described the requirement for the NCP component of the FAR Part 150 Study, noting that the draft NCP incorporates a variety of operational, preventive, and remedial measures to enhance the compatibility of the airport with the surrounding community. With the help of an overhead projector, Mr. McClintock presented the various components of the December 3, 1991 draft Noise Control Program (Version No. 3).

Chairman Chick requested comments or questions from the Committee. A question was raised with respect to whether or not the noise ordinance discussed on pages 10-12 was currently in effect. Mr. Laham responded that this was the case and that the inclusion of the ordinance was an important component of the NCP. Additional discussion was held with respect to enforcement procedures and what penalties or sanctions were imposed under the ordinance, and whether or not this information should be included in the NCP. It was recommended that the complete text of the noise ordinance, including penalty provisions be included in the NCP. Mr. Laham noted that a representative of the City Attorney's office would be present at the next Steering Committee meeting.

A question was raised concerning whether or not avigation easements would be a requirement for participation in the residential acoustical insulation program? Mr. Laham responded that it has been the policy of the Los Angeles Department of Airports to accept an easement in return for the acoustical treatment of residences. He noted that this is due in part to the large expenditure of public funds, on the order of \$25,000 per unit, required to acoustically retrofit a home of standard construction in Los Angeles. He further noted that 80 percent of project funding for such a program is typically provided by the FAA, and that such funds are in short supply. Therefore, those projects in which an avigation easement is given up in return for acoustical insulation tend to be funded before those projects where easements are not involved.

Mr. Chick indicated that the Board of Airport Commissioners has already taken the question of avigation easements under advisement, but has not as yet taken a formal position with respect to requiring full-, partial- or even any easements as part of a residential soundproofing program. Mr. Laham further commented that it is also a requirement of the State Airport Noise Standards that for an acoustically treated residence to be deemed a compatible land use an avigation easement is required. A comment from the audience noted that the acoustical treatment of a home does not improve the exterior living environment (i.e., around the pool or patio).



A question was asked concerning the burden of proof for identifying noise violators. Mr. Laham described the current process, but advised the Committee that with the acquisition and installation of the Airport Noise Management Monitoring System recommended in the draft NCP, such identification would be enhanced and a data base provided to regulate violators. Concern was expressed that specific enforcement procedures needed to be spelled out for the short term. Mr. Laham advised that this was an issue that should be discussed with the City Attorney at the next meeting.

A comment was made that helicopter operations at 1,300 feet above mean sea level (MSL) is in actuality only 500 feet above ground level (AGL), given that the Airport elevation is approximately 800 feet. It was explained that this is due in part to the necessity of maintaining a 500 feet vertical separation between helicopters (at 500 feet AGL), light aircraft (at 1,000 feet AGL), and high performance aircraft (at 1,500 feet AGL). Among the reasons for the relatively low operational altitudes was the fact that the glide slope for the instrument landing system at Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport crosses Van Nuys Airport, thereby requiring aircraft operating at Van Nuys to remain relatively low. The draft NCP recommends that a study be conducted to assess the feasibility of raising the Burbank glide slope. If feasible, an additional 200-300 feet of airspace could be attained at Van Nuys.

A question was asked concerning how the noise abatement departure procedures (i.e., power cutbacks) would be enforced, given that their implementation would be on a voluntary basis only. Mr. Laham noted that there were a number of reasons for the voluntary nature of the recommended procedure. First of all, without the permanent noise monitoring and management system in place, it would be difficult to determine if the power cutbacks were being used or not. In the interim it is expected that peer pressure from pilots' groups would serve to control aircraft operators who might choose not to fly quietly. Secondly, the use of such procedures must be at the discretion of the pilot for safety reasons. There is no reason, however, that such procedures cannot be used most of the time provided that either the FAA or the aircraft manufacturer has identified safe and appropriate noise abatement departure procedures for a specific aircraft.

Mr. Laham indicated that if this measure were to be adopted, staff would begin to compile data on noise abatement departure procedures from as many sources as possible in order to maintain a reference file on the subject for pilot information and use. The Committee recommended that if the measure is to be adopted as part of the NCP, that sanctions for noncompliance be considered in the form of a city ordinance if voluntary compliance does not work. However, it was noted that with proper feedback associated with the automated noise monitoring system voluntary compliance should work, as evidenced by the Santa Monica Airport system.

## DISCUSSION OF ISSUES RAISED AT 12/2/91 MEETING

Chairman Chick requested moderator McClintock to review the list of issues and concerns developed at the December 2, 1991 public information meeting. McClintock noted that many of the issues raised at the previous meeting were being dealt with already. For example, the time and location of jet engine-runups for maintenance purposes was one of the concerns expressed by the public, and the Committee had already taken action to request the Board of Airport Commissioners to undertake a study of the feasibility for designating a site on the Airport to be used exclusively for engine maintenance testing. The recommendation also included the provision for a potential "hush house" or enclosed test facility.

The second issue evolved around the small size of aircraft identification numbers ("N-numbers") and the difficulty this presents in identifying aircraft. McClintock noted that several years ago the FAA reduced the required size of such numbers and that the City could not mandate that larger numbers be used on aircraft at Van Nuys Airport because this was a federal issue. He advised the Committee that a letter to the FAA expressing concern over the small size of N-numbers and the problem this presents in attempting to identify aircraft would be in order.

A continuing concern was expressed with regard to the primary aircraft flight tracks, and principal arrival and departure tracks for helicopters. It was commonly understood that all aircraft do not fly a precise course through the sky, but certain flight tracks are used consistently more than others. These tracks should be published for the information of the public. Noise abatement tracks for both helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft should also be emphasized.

Formation takeoffs and flights by vintage aircraft were listed as both a noise and safety concern. McClintock noted that existing airport rules prohibited formation takeoffs. Formation flights are under the control of the FAA and are not prohibited. The concern was that such flights are noisy and that they are generally carried out by vintage aircraft. The public felt that such activities were improper over populated areas.

The public stated that noise concerns should not be directed solely at jet aircraft (some piston-engined aircraft can be as noisy, or noisier than jet aircraft). McClintock noted that the Committee has been asked to consider both a noise limit and a ban on all jet operations. He suggested that the Committee might want to keep in mind the fact that a ban on jet operations at night time because of noise would not work if noisier piston-engine aircraft were allowed to operate.

Helicopters were noted as being bothersome, particularly with respect to low altitude operations and failure to follow noise abatement arrival and departure procedures. The draft NCP set forth five separate policies for dealing with this issue.

Lack of administrative response and follow-up to noise and other complaints was cited as an important factor to the community. Mr. Laham had responded to this issue in an earlier discussion in which he noted that with the acquisition and installation of the noise monitoring and management system recommended in the NCP, that the airport could be more responsive to community complaints and be able to follow-up with both the violator and the complainant.

The community wanted to know what powers the Board of Airport Commissioners have with respect to controlling aircraft noise? It was pointed out that a representative of the City Attorney's office would be present to discuss this question at the next meeting.

The effect of a 74dBA noise limit, as opposed to a 78dBA limit was expressed as a matter of interest to the community. Mr. Laham noted that on the basis of information provided by Dr. Silver, approximately two-thirds of the jets operating at Van Nuys are below the 74dBA standard and one-third are above. Implementation of the 74dBA standard would eliminate a number of jets currently based at the airport, and could result in their operators going out of business. Many of these operators have existing agreements with the Department of Airports and could take legal action if forced to cease operations under the 74dBA criteria. He also noted that most of these aircraft are considered to be in compliance with FAR Part 36, Stage 3 requirements and can fly legally anywhere in the U.S. The 74dBA criterion would be more stringent than FAR Part 36, Stage 3 and could be difficult to uphold.

Discussion centered around how loud 74dBA actually was, and where the FAR Part 36 takeoff noise measurement point was located [N.B., 6,500 meters from start of takeoff roll). It was pointed out that aircraft noise levels are calculated on the basis of maximum gross takeoff weight, and such factors as noise abatement departure procedures and less than the maximum gross weight departures (not all jets are going to the east coast) would result in significantly lower decibel levels.

Prohibitions on night flights, the use of thrust reversers at night and in the early morning, and air shows were suggested as a means of reducing individual single event noise issues. A member of the audience expressed his belief that all airport noise standards should be based on single-event noise levels. It was explained that this is the direction in which the City is moving, but to do so will require installation of the noise monitoring system recommended in the draft NCP.

A member of the audience noted that the proposed 74dBA standard could result in some airport tenants being forced out of business. Because of this it was suggested that new jet operators be required to comply with the 74dBA standard, but that existing operators be allowed to phase out their noncomplying aircraft over time. Staff noted that the City's proposed noise control ordinance provides for the phaseout of noisier jet aircraft.

## **SCENARIO NO. 11**

Chairman Chick noted that the Committee had received a letter (attached) from Dr. Gerald M. Silver concerning the criteria to be used in developing another noise abatement scenario (Scenario No. 11). Dr. Silver discussed the parameters of the proposed scenario, including:

1. A ban on all jet flights (except emergency) from 10:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m.
2. A 74dBA single event noise limit on all aircraft from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.
3. Eliminate most touch-and-go and helicopter operations on weekends and holidays.

The Committee instructed staff to run Scenario 11 as set forth above, and such additional iterations of the scenario as staff deems appropriate. Some Committee members expressed concern over the practicality of this scenario. Mr. Chick advised that the scenario was being run at the request of the public, and that the Committee would have a chance to vote on it at the appropriate time. In the meantime it was important to move ahead with the analysis of the scenario.

#### **FUTURE MEETINGS**

The Committee set January 27 and February 24, 1992 as dates of its next meetings.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Correspondence was received from State Senator Herschel Rosenthal on the subject of noise regulation for Van Nuys Airport (attached). Senator Rosenthal's statement was read to the Committee.

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. Dr. Gerald Silver spoke on the issues of a nighttime curfew and the enforcement of noise abatement procedures. A question was asked concerning the status of the noise monitoring system.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

**Minutes**

**FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport**

**Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, January 27, 1992**

The fourteenth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., January 27, 1992 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Chairman Robert Chick opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Robert Chick, Chairman  
Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Sandor Winger, Member  
Don Schultz, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Larry Van Nuys, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member  
Frankye Schneider, Member

Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Ron Kochevar, Airport Manager  
Breton K. Lobner, Assistant City Attorney  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Wanda Williams, Staff

The following Steering Committee members and staff were absent:

Joseph McGuire, Member  
Will Ross, Member  
Ginny Spielberg, Member  
John Slifko, Member  
Clay Lacy, Member  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The Minutes of the December 2, 1991 and December 9, 1991 Steering Committee meetings were submitted for approval. Motion was made and seconded for approval of the minutes. Motion approved.

## DISCUSSION OF SCENARIOS 1-11

Chairman Chick, stated that the phrase "possible action" listed under Item #2 should be disregarded. Chairman Chick requested that letters prepared by two elected officials be provided to the Committee. Correspondence was received from California State Senator Herschel Rosenthal and State Assemblyman Terry B. Friedman on the subject of Airport noise policies (Attachment 1). Chairman Chick invited the public to comment on Scenarios 1-11 prior to Committee discussion.

Gerald A. Silver, of the Homeowners of Encino Organization addressed the Committee regarding the nighttime jet ban proposed under Scenario #11. Mr. Silver indicated that the objective of the proposed scenario is to terminate noisy jet operations during nighttime hours and that a ban similar to a Santa Monica aircraft ban should be considered for VNY. Mr. Silver indicated that a total nighttime aircraft ban should be considered and that the Committee could also consider establishing a lower nighttime CNEL limit that would have a similar impact.

Chairman Chick stated that in the absence of Project Coordinator Michael McClintock, Maurice Laham the Project Administrator would act as the meeting's project moderator.

Mr. Laham asked Ron Kochevar, VNY Airport Manager to introduce Diane Sayre's replacement as the VNY Public Relations Specialist. Mr. Kochevar introduced Stacey Geere to the Committee.

Mr. Laham noted that in addition to discussion of Scenarios 1-11, the agenda included a discussion of the proposed Noise Compatibility Program. Mr. Laham asked Dennis Quilliam, Staff to provide a description of Scenario #11 and to summarize the economic impact matrix prepared for the eleven (11) scenarios.

Mr. Quilliam indicated that Scenario 11 would impose a maximum 74 dBA noise cap from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and prohibit jet operations from 10:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m., of the following day. Mr. Quilliam stated that Scenario #11 would be the most effective in reducing noise impacts for residents, and that the matrix chart was patterned after an analysis completed for the Fort Lauderdale Airport. Mr. Quilliam stated that the FAA's Integrated Noise Model (INM) was used as the basis for representing noise levels.

Mr. Laham provided a brief description of Scenarios 1-10. Mr. Laham indicated that Scenario #11, while impacting fewer residents near VNY, would create a dilemma for jet operators that have take off noise levels less than other non-jet aircraft based at VNY. Mr. Laham described the matrix categories used by staff to summarize economic impacts.

Committee Member Sandor Winger asked staff to explain what the terms "Minor Impact", "Moderate Impact", "High Impact" and "Very High Impact" indicate when measuring economic impacts.

Mr. Quilliam stated that the use of categories was an effort to establish a basis for comparing the scenarios. The only category subject to quantifiable criteria was the reduction in CNEL with no quantification in the remaining categories. Mr. Quilliam indicated that the City Attorney's Office had been consulted prior to development of the matrix and that Environmental Management Bureau staff came up with the final categories and estimates.

Mr. Laham indicated that Assistant City Attorney Breton K. Lobner was present to discuss the City

Attorney's assessment of the scenarios.

Mr. Lobner prefaced his remarks by stating that the City Attorney's Office did not conduct a formal assessment of potential litigation for all eleven (11) scenarios.

Chairman Chick asked Mr. Lobner to contrast Scenario #11 with a precedent setting Santa Monica court case that prohibited that City's enforcement of a jet ban.

Mr. Lobner indicated that the Santa Monica court case was litigated approximately ten (10) years ago and ended with the court declaring the proposed ban discriminatory against jets as a class. Mr. Lobner indicated that the court went on to state that a noise regulation must be rational and must address a real problem. Mr. Lobner indicated that the current maximum noise level regulation in effect for Santa Monica may not have a significant impact on jet operations because of the airports proximity and accessibility to LAX and other airports, and that the regulation might have a greater impact if implemented at another airport where there are fewer nearby airports. He indicated that not much guidance can be derived from the Santa Monica regulation and that if VNY attempted to adopt a similar regulation, aircraft owners and operators would be able to gather documentation that showed the regulation is actually intended to ban jets --and is therefore discriminatory.

Robert Jackson, Committee Member indicated that comparisons between Santa Monica and VNY cannot be made since the Santa Monica Airport contains a 5000 foot runway length, versus an 8000 foot runway length at VNY, does not have an Instrument Landing System (ILS) and cannot accommodate the range and size of general aviation aircraft based at VNY.

Chairman Chick asked Mr. Lobner if the court record revealed the Santa Monica regulation financially impacted any operators.

Mr. Lobner indicated that he believed the NBAA was behind the Santa Monica lawsuit, and that further research would have to be conducted to determine financial impacts in that case.

Larry Van Nuys, Committee Member asked Mr. Lobner if he felt there were any scenarios that would be legally unenforceable.

Mr. Lobner indicated that Scenario # 11 appeared to impose a discriminatory jet ban and Scenario #3 would encourage a "beat the box" pilot routine that could potentially result in an aircraft crash or safety concerns. Mr. Lobner cited a Westchester, New York court case that held that a regulation should be based upon studies, hearings or other sequential evidence that reasonably lead to adoption of a regulation. Mr. Lobner indicated that arbitrary selection of a 74 dBA or 78 dBA noise level maximum would be difficult to defend in court.

Lisa Barrena, Committee Member recalled that the 74 dBA noise maximum was considered for VNY in 1978 and was based on the average noisiest level for piston aircraft based at VNY.

Mr. Silver expressed that the matrix is subjective and speculative and does not reflect a corollary benefit gained by residents near the airport.

Don Schultz, Committee Member stated that the final wording of the Santa Monica Ordinance does not

reference jets.

Robert Jackson reiterated that there are major differences between Santa Monica and Van Nuys.

Rick Voorhis, Committee Member asked Mr. Lobner to clarify why he believed problems would occur when using flight departure techniques.

Mr. Lobner responded that if the City mandates a particular takeoff procedure, problems will ensue, but that if pilots are allowed to select the appropriate takeoff technique, fewer problems would result.

Mr. Voorhis asked Mr. Lobner about his views on phasing out tenant leases to implement any of the eleven (11) Scenarios.

Mr. Lobner stated that typical lease provisions call for full and free access to the airport at all hours and that any regulation potentially restricting these and other provisions must be found to be reasonable.

Rita Schneir, Committee Member asked Mr. Lobner if sanctions or penalties incorporated in any noise regulation would subject the airport to possible litigation.

Mr. Lobner stated yes.

Several members of the public expressed support for Scenario #11.

Hank Miller, President of the Mid San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce submitted a written statement endorsing Scenario #9. ( Attachment 2).

Mr. Laham noted that Staff was asked to prepare the matrix at the request of Committee Member Rick Voorhis and that the Committee had agreed during the June 18, 1991 meeting to provide general impact estimates only.

Mr. Van Nuys stated that a lot of problems are caused by helicopter noise.

Mr. Laham indicated that Communiquet Marketing, was retained to complete a two part Study of helicopter noise. Phase I of that study contains specific helicopter recommendations that will be incorporated into the Noise Compatibility Program and a Phase II study is currently being prepared.

Chairman Chick indicated that additional information regarding impacts of the 11 scenarios will be required in order to make reasonable comparisons. The Chairman suggested Committee members develop questions concerning the scenarios and pass them on to staff and the City Attorney's Office with particular attention to information for Scenarios # 9 and #11.

Mr. Winger recommended that during the February 24, 1992 scheduled Steering Committee meeting, a "noise simulation" demonstration similar to one conducted during the February 7, 1989 meeting be conducted.

The Committee directed Staff to contact the Noise Consultant that conducted the previous demonstration.



Mr. Schultz questioned the accuracy of jet operation information presented on the base year and 5 year maps. Mr. Schultz stated that according to DOA records, approximately 200,000 square feet of new hangar space has been proposed for VNY, and that the added hangar space should be taken into consideration when figuring future jet operation levels.

Chairman Chick stated that there are an appropriate number of Scenario alternatives that address the noise impacts and that the Committee should accept the base case and 5 year case maps.

Mr. Schultz indicated that the projections provide a false sense of security to residents and made a motion to require preparation of new base case and 5 year case projection maps. The motion failed by Committee vote.

### **Discussion on the Draft Noise Compatibility Program**

Chairman Chick asked for Committee and public discussion on Agenda Item # 3, the NCP.

Mr. Schultz stated that aviation easements proposed under Section I (Land Use) of the Draft NCP, Version No. 3, dated December 3, 1991, would eliminate a property owners ability to sue the Airport for future noise complaints. Mr. Schultz indicated that he would also be interested in knowing the fiscal impact of insulating a residence and if property values would be expected to increase.

Mr. Laham indicated that property values would probably increase.

Phil Berg, representing the VNY Ad Hoc Committee indicated that the Committee would support a Scenario similar to Scenario #9, provided the regulation is flexible and would allow pilots to continue to operate at VNY.

Mr. Silver stated that sanctions, fines, or a system of warning pilots should be implemented as part of the NCP.

Chairman Chick reminded the Committee and public that the Board of Airport Commissioners will convene at VNY on February 18, 1992 and that the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations will be reviewed at the February 24, 1992 Steering Committee meeting. The Chairman requested DOA staff to provide more descriptive information regarding Scenario economic impacts, to the extent possible, and stronger analysis from the City Attorney's Office on potential litigation aspects of the alternative scenarios.

The Committee members agreed to meet on February 24, 1992 and on March 24, 1992.

Public Comments were received regarding the resident and aviation impacts of specific scenarios.

Chairman Robert Chick adjourned the meeting at 9:26 p.m..

## Minutes

### FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, February 24, 1992

The fifteenth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., February 24, 1992 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mr. Tom Henry, Steering Committee Vice Chairman, chaired the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Don Schultz, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Joseph McGuire, Member  
Will Ross, Member

Sandor Winger, Member  
Ginny Spielberg, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member  
Rita Schneir, Member

Frankye Schneider, Member  
Clay Lacy, Member

Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Steve Crowther, Staff  
Ron Kochevar, Airport Manager  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee members were absent:

Robert Chick  
Larry Van Nuys  
John Slifko

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice Chairperson Henry called for approval of the minutes of the January 27, 1992 Steering Committee meeting. Motion made, seconded and approved.

At the request of representatives of State Senator Herschel Rosenthal and Assemblyman Terry B. Friedman, Vice Chairperson Henry consented to having prepared statements concerning airport noise restrictions read to the Committee (a copy of Senator Rosenthal's statement is attached). The Committee asked if the statement in the Senator's January 27, 1992 correspondence concerning his willingness to sponsor legislation to "protect the City from legal action on the

basis of airport noise limits" was still valid? The Committee was advised that, to the knowledge of Mr. Rosenthal's representative, this was still the case.

Assemblyman Friedman's representative stated that he "urged adoption of Scenario 11," -- as the citizen's scenario -- because it "is the alternative which ensures proper consideration of local residents" (no written copy of the statement was made available).

## **AIRCRAFT NOISE DEMONSTRATION**

In response to the Committee's January 27 request, Dr. David Dubbink presented a real time demonstration of aircraft noise levels. Dr. Dubbink's presentation included noises from a variety of sources as perceived in the outdoor environment, including a lawnmower as well as aircraft. He demonstrated what aircraft noise sounded like at a variety of locations, including the end of the runway. He also demonstrated the effects of noise abatement takeoff procedures and acoustical insulation in residences. Dr. Dubbink responded to several questions from the Committee and the audience concerning aircraft noise levels and noise abatement technology.

## **AD HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Moderator McClintock called upon Don Schultz to present the January 21, 1992 recommendations of the Van Nuys Airport Ad Hoc Working Committee concerning aircraft noise mitigation at the Airport. Mr. Schultz noted that the Ad Hoc Committee was formed by leaders from the surrounding community and aircraft operators as a result of the first public hearing on the VNY Noise Control Ordinance. The Ad Hoc Committee became concerned because the proposed Noise Control Ordinance did not address the problem of pilots using poor takeoff procedures and the inability of the community to have meaningful input to the noise complaint process.

Mr. Schultz stated that the Ad Hoc Committee recommended use of modified jet noise abatement departure procedures as established by aircraft manufacturers and the National Business Aircraft Association (NBAA). Modified or reduced noise takeoff procedures would vary with aircraft type, size and weight, with some aircraft being required to fly a steeper takeoff profile while others could utilize a shallower climb profile. The takeoff parameters would be established through continuous measurement of individual aircraft noise levels using approved noise abatement departure procedures.

In addition, the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations consisted of the following eight points:

1. Establish an automated data system that will provide the following information for turbo jet or turbo fan aircraft departures:
  - a. Aircraft "N" number sorting by types of jets;
  - b. Aircraft type;
  - c. Aircraft owner;
  - d. Aircraft pilot;
  - e. Part 36-3E listed noise departure level;

- f. NBAA, or aircraft manufacturer's noise abatement departure level;  
and
  - g. Actual departure noise level recorded by VNY noise monitors.
2. Contract with an acoustical consultant to calibrate VNY southerly noise microphones to permit accurate and consistent "real time" monitoring of noise abatement jet aircraft departures.
  3. Install, with permission of the FAA, a radio receiver with Dictaphone capabilities that will identify airport tower clearance "N" number and "real time" departure information.
  4. Provide a message on the ATIS system that states, "due to excessive aircraft noise levels, aircraft departing VNY should fly in a friendly manner, "utilizing NBAA or manufacturer's noise abatement procedures.
  5. Acquires ANOMS, or a similar system, that has the capability to interface with ARTS 3 data, track aircraft by altitude, provide a hard copy of individual flight information characteristics, and provide automated noise monitoring correspondence capabilities.
  6. Create the position of a VNY Noise Abatement Office that would report directly to the Van Nuys Airport Manager, with primary responsibilities of monitoring aircraft noise events, coordinating with aircraft pilots and citizens, and providing written and verbal responses to noise complaints.
  7. Larger, clearer signs be posted at every run-up area describing recommended noise abatement procedures, including altitudes and locations at which turns should be initiated after departure, and noise sensitive areas to be avoided.
  8. The Department of Airports request the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct a study resulting in increasing the glide slope angle for Burbank Airport's Runway 7 ILS approach to the maximum practicable, so that operational altitudes at VNY can be raised without conflict with Burbank Airport traffic.

The two essentials of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations were the noise monitoring system and a Noise Abatement Officer that reports directly to the VNY Airport Manager.

The Steering Committee discussed the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. A question was raised with respect to enforcement of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations in the context of existing enforcement procedures. Mr. Laham responded that the Department of Airports maintained two full-time officers at Van Nuys Airport whose duty it was to record all nighttime departures by aircraft having a departure noise level of greater than 74dBA. For these aircraft the owner is notified and the pilot is required to provide documentation within two days of whether the flight was an emergency. If the pilot cannot confirm that the flight was an emergency then he is fined \$750 for the first offense and additional amounts for any subsequent nonemergency events. He expressed the hope that with the implementation of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations that the

community would be able to know of this process and its enforcement consequences.

An aircraft operator at Van Nuys stated that his firm had in fact been fined by the City for not complying with the 74dB rule. Further discussion ensued over the number and nature of nighttime flights at VNY. Mr. Laham explained that the 74dBA standard applied to all nighttime departures except emergency operations. Mr. Laham also pointed out that with the automated system the Ad Hoc Committee was recommending, the City would have the ability to determine the performance of individual aircraft with the NBAA departure procedure. Actual performance would be compared with what the NBAA would expect with their procedure and what the FAA published in AC 36-3 for the specific aircraft involved. If a pilot were to fly more noisily than the NBAA procedure, the City would know exactly who it was, how high he was and the noise levels associated with the event, and be able to take action to remedy the situation.

Members of the Committee asked questions concerning the enforceability of this program. Mr. Laham responded that the City would be able to identify those pilots who were not "flying friendly" and report them to the aircraft owner for disciplinary action. The Committee wanted to know what "teeth" were in the program. Mr. Schultz responded that the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations were not meant to have teeth, but were designed to offset a proposed Noise Ordinance that no one supported. The concern was that if the proposed Noise Ordinance were to be implemented, the Airport could become dominated by jet aircraft. With the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee it was hoped that aviation and non-aviation communities could work together to influence the character of operations at the Airport and that peer pressure, combined with the automated reporting system and noise abatement officer, would serve to ensure that all pilots using the Van Nuys Airport would fly quietly.

Concern was expressed among several Committee members that the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations should require "teeth" in the form of an enforceable standard. Mr. Laham replied that enforcement was the prerogative of the City Attorney, but that the proposed automated noise system did have the capability to support an enforceable noise standard. A member of the Ad Hoc Committee advised that with the data generated by the proposed automated noise system, the basis for a tangible enforcement system would be in place, but that it was not the charge of the Ad Hoc Committee to develop a system of penalties.

Moderator McClintock noted that before an enforcement program could be established, it would first be necessary to establish a noise abatement plan. In other words the plan must come first and then the enforcement mechanism and penalties would follow through the City's legal and administrative process, probably in the form of an ordinance. He recommended that the Committee remain focused on the Noise Compatibility Program and deal with the issue of enforcement and penalties as a separate issue.

Gerald Silver commented that he had served on the Ad Hoc Committee and that he was in favor of the recommended program, but felt that the recommendations should be used to supplement a strong noise regulation, not replace it.

Mr. McClintock asked Mr. Schultz if it was the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee to have their recommendations adopted in lieu of Scenario 9. Mr. Schultz replied that it was his intent that the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations supplement the

Noise Compatibility Program, but also be adopted in lieu of the City's proposed noise ordinance. Mr. Laham commented that he felt the Ad Hoc Committee recommendation was very good in that it supplemented Scenario 9 and would go a long way toward bringing peace between the Airport users and the community. On the other hand if it did not work out as envisioned, the next step toward restrictive actions could be taken including sanctions for noncompliance.

Mr. Laham stated that he envisioned the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations as perhaps a new scenario, or Scenario 12. It was his understanding that the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations were designed to supplant Scenario 9. He felt that the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations represented a well reasoned and balanced response to the proposed noise ordinance by the homeowners and aviation community. He stated further that it his understanding in talking with Ad Hoc Committee member Phil Berg that "Scenario 12" was being recommended in lieu of Scenario 9.

Moderator McClintock noted that it had been previously agreed that the Committee would not take any specific action on any of the scenarios at this meeting, but would be expected to recommend an approved Noise Compatibility Program at its March 24 meeting. In which case it would be necessary for the individual Committee members to review the various alternatives and be prepared to act on March 24. Mr. Schultz advised that he felt it would be necessary for the Ad Hoc Committee to meet one more time before March 24 to reaffirm its intent with respect to its recommendations. Vice Chairman Henry requested that the Ad Hoc Committee hold its meeting as soon as possible and get back to Mr. Laham in order to get their final recommendations agendized for the March 24 meeting.

Committee member Lacy advised that Scenario 11 and the 74dBA noise limit is not feasible, and that the Ad Hoc Committee was trying to come up with a workable alternative that would help both the residential community and aviation. Mr. Lacy felt that immediate benefits could accrue to the community with the adoption of "Scenario 12" without having to wait for such hardware items as a radar tracking system. Mr. Laham reminded the Committee that it was the opinion of the City Attorney at the last meeting that Scenario 11 was not legally supportable.

## **DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL SCENARIOS**

Mr. McClintock introduced the item by noting that the Committee had pretty much focused on two of the eleven noise control scenarios. These were Scenarios 9 and 11. Scenario 9 is the scenario recommended by the Project Technical Committee and is currently incorporated in the December 3, 1991 draft of the Noise Control Program. Scenario 11 included at the request of Gerald Silver. Mr. McClintock summarized the characteristics of the two scenarios, and noted at the January Steering Committee meeting staff had been directed to prepare a cost/benefit analysis of the eleven scenarios.

Mr. Dennis Quilliam of the Airport Department provided the Committee with supplemental information concerning the relative noise benefits and economic impacts of the various alternatives. Of the two principal alternatives, Scenarios 9 and 11, Scenario 9 would provide moderately beneficial noise reductions (380 residences would remain in the noise impact area) and low financial costs. Scenario 11 would result in highly beneficial noise reduction (4 residences within the noise im-

pact area) and very high financial costs. Mr. Quilliam presented the Committee with a list of aircraft that would be prohibited from VNY if the 74 DBA standard in Scenario 11 were to be implemented. A list of potential replacement aircraft and their replacement costs (used) was also provided. Mr. Quilliam estimated the total replacement cost for aircraft displaced from Van Nuys Airport if Scenario 11 were implemented would be on the order of \$346 million. These costs would be significantly higher if new aircraft were to be purchased instead of used aircraft. Members of the Committee pointed out that these figures only considered the cost of the replacement aircraft, and that with interest and finance charges the costs could double.

Committee Member Rick Voorhis read a prepared statement (attached) on the economic effects of government regulations and the implications of the FAR Part 150 process. He concluded that the recommendation made by the Ad Hoc Committee were excellent, and that he felt that the correct scenario would be one that provides definite noise mitigation while preserving the Airport's economic base. Gerald Silver spoke to the issue of the cost/benefit analysis. He stated that the study had overlooked a number of direct benefits that would accrue to the community should the 74dBA standard be adopted. He advocated adoption of Scenario 11.

#### **DISCUSSION OF DRAFT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**

Mr. McClintock noted that during the course of the meeting considerable discussion had already been held on the components of the Noise Compatibility Program and what was needed was for the members of the Committee to go back and think about what the program should contain, what scenario should be recommended for adoption, and what, if any, noise standard should be applied. Consideration should also be given to all the public comments and testimony that the Committee has received over the course of fifteen separate meetings and workshops.

Mr. Laham outlined the process by which the Board of Airport Commissioners would act to approve the FAR Part 150 program recommended by the Steering Committee. He noted that the BOAC would consider the opinion of the City Attorney with respect to the recommendation of the Steering Committee. After the BOAC takes action on the NCP, the program will be submitted to the FAA for its review and approval. If the FAA finds legal or operational problems, they will not approve that element of the NCP. He concluded that the plan submitted to the BOAC and the FAA must be reasonable and realistic if there is to be any chance of having the NCP approved and implemented.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

The Committee set March 24, as the date of its next meeting.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The meeting was opened for specific comments from the audience. Mr. John Sells, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee described a noisy aircraft event in which he personally filed a noise complaint and asked the Airport to respond. The

Airport police had no record of the flight in question. He believed the system does not now work and advocated the system proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. John Winthrop gave his perspective on the issue as an airport business tenant. He stated that the Airport must exist in harmony with the community, and it is his desire to coexist because it would be in the interest of his business.

Mr. Don Dunford expressed his support for Rick Voorhis's position statement.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.



**Minutes**

**FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport**

**Steering Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, March 24, 1992**

The sixteenth meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., March 24, 1992 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mr. Robert Chick, Steering Committee Chairman, conducted the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Robert Chick, Chairman  
Tom Henry, Vice Chairman  
Don Schultz, Member  
Rick Voorhis, Member  
Joseph McGuire, Member

Will Ross, Member  
Sandor Winger, Member  
Ginny Spielberg, Member  
Robert Jackson, Member  
Lisa Barrena, Member

Rita Schneir, Member  
Frankye Schneider, Member  
Larry Van Nuys  
Clay Lacy, Member  
Maurice Laham, Project Administrator  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff

Steve Crowther, Staff  
Wanda Williams, Staff  
Ron Kochevar, Airport Manager  
Michael McClintock, Project Coordinator

The following committee member was absent:

John Slifko

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Chick called for approval of the minutes of the February 24, 1992 Steering Committee meeting. Motion made, seconded and approved.

## APPROVAL OF ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL SCENARIO

At the request of Chairman Chick the order of the agenda was changed to move item #3 to #2, and the discussions of alternatives were limited to only those scenarios of greatest interest and the most likely to be approved by the Committee.

Raising a point of personal privilege, Member Ross expressed concern that his position on the various scenarios may have been misrepresented. He stated that he had not expressed his thoughts about the scenarios to anyone and that he came to the meeting with a completely open mind. He indicated that he had not made a decision concerning which of the various scenarios he would support and would listen to his fellow members and the public before making such a decision.

Chairman Chick noted that Scenarios 9, 11 and 12 were considered the principal scenarios to be considered. Moderator McClintock described Scenario 9 as being associated with the December 3, 1991 draft "Van Nuys Noise Control/Mitigation Program" which required airplanes departing Van Nuys to use take off thrust and power settings that reduce take off noise over the community (keeping within the respective aircraft manufacturer and NBAA safety criteria) FAA approved safety levels), and aircraft exceeding 74 dBA as expressed in FAA AC 36-3 would be prohibited between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

Scenario 11 was brought before the Committee at the request of Gerald Silver. Under this scenario there would be a maximum take-off limit of 74 dBA on departing aircraft which would apply from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. Jet operations would be prohibited from 10 p.m. to 8 a.m. The current limit of 74 dBA would remain in effect for all non-jet operations from 11 P.M. to 7 a.m.

Scenario 12 represented a combination of scenario 9 plus recommendations of the Ad Hoc working committee that included some additional administrative as well as management procedures that would further serve to reduce noise impacts on the community. There are eight items associated with this alternative, as follows:

1. The establishment of an automated data system that would provide information for turbo jet or turbo fan aircraft departures at the airport:
  - a. Aircraft "N" number for sorting by types of jets,
  - b. Aircraft type,
  - c. Aircraft owner,
  - d. Aircraft pilot,
  - e. Part 36-3E listed noise departure level
  - f. NBAA, or aircraft manufacturer's noise abatement departure level, and
  - g. Actual departure noise level recorded by VNY noise monitors.
2. Contract with an acoustical consultant to calibrate some of the noise monitoring microphones around the airport so that we would be able to get an accurate and consistent "real time" departure information.
3. Install, with the permission of the FAA, a radio receiver with Dictaphone capabilities that will identify airport tower clearance "N" number and "real time" departure information.

4. Provide a message on the Airport Traffic Information System (ATIS) that indicates "due to excessive airport noise levels aircraft departing VNY should fly in a friendly manner," utilizing NBAA or manufacturer's noise abatement procedures.
5. Acquire ANOMS, or a similar system, that has the capability to interface with ARTS 3 data, track aircraft by altitude, provide a hard copy of individual flight information characteristics, and provide automated noise monitoring correspondence capabilities.
6. Create the position of a VNY Noise Abatement Office that would report directly to the Airport Manager, with primary responsibilities of monitoring all aircraft noise events, coordinating with aircraft pilots and citizens, and providing written and verbal responses to noise complaints
7. Larger, clearer signs be posted at every run-up area describing recommended noise abatement procedures, including altitudes and locations at which turns should be initiated after departure, and noise sensitive areas to be avoided.
8. The Department of Airports request the FAA to conduct a study that could result in increasing the glide slope angle for Burbank Airport's runway 7 ILS approach to the maximum practicable, so that operational altitudes at VNY can be raised without conflict with Burbank Airport traffic.

The two key components of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations were the noise monitoring system and a hands-on Noise Abatement Officer who would report directly to the VNY Airport Manager.

The Committee raised a question concerning the NBAA departure procedures and specific aircraft noise levels. Member Lacy responded that there is no specific decibel level associated with the NBAA procedure. He indicated that with the installation of the proposed ANOMS system such a level could be established. One of the ways that such a level would be established would be through the use of the power cutback procedure, which would be the guideline for deciding if someone wasn't flying quietly. Having the pilots demonstrate what they could do to reduce noise would help to establish standards for various types of aircraft.

Chairman Chick noted that representatives of various elected officials had asked for an opportunity to speak to the subject. Assemblyman Friedman's representative, Kelly Davis, stated that he urged adoption of Scenario 11 (a written copy of the statement was made available and is attached). The Administrative Assistant to Congressman Howard Berman provided a statement from him urging the adoption of Scenario 11 (a copy of the statement is attached). Committee member Tom Henry, Deputy for Councilman Wachs, read a letter addressed to Chairman Chick to express his concerns (copy attached). Chairman Chick read a letter from Senator Rosenthal supporting the adoption of Scenario 11 (attached).

Chairman Chick opened the meeting for specific comments from the audience. Gerald Silver, president of Homeowners of Encino, described having received a floppy disk from Van Nuys Airport containing 12,000 jet operations. He split them into arrivals and departures, and concluded that more than 2/3 of the airport operations already conformed to the 74 dBA limit and that 26% of the jet operations at VNY were carried out by only 5-6 operators. Mr. Silver stated that 38% of all jet

operations are attributable to only 20 aircraft and 30 planes comprise 46% of the jet operations. He was in favor of the 24-hour 74 dBA noise level limit with no nighttime jet operations.

Mr. Rob Glushon, Encino Property Owners' Association expressed support for Scenario 11. He stated the community wants peace and quiet at night.

Mrs. Wendy Fish expressed her concern on behalf of the North Hills, Northridge, Granada Hills and Sepulveda residents with respect to aircraft landings. She stated that the landing noise was unbelievable and asked if it had been considered in the noise modeling efforts. She would like to have a limit on the landing noise levels. Mr. Laham responded that aircraft landing noise was considered in the development of the Noise Exposure Maps.

Mr. Frank Buda, North Hills homeowner, expressed his concern over nighttime jet arrival noise. He would like to see a nighttime jet ban and is in support of Scenario 11.

Mr. Hank Miller, President of San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of Scenario 9. He expressed concern for economic considerations and future joblessness if undue restrictions were to be placed on the airport.

Mr. Carl Davison expressed his frustration and felt that more notification to residents should be given.

Ms. Prudy Schultz, BAN (Ban Airport Noise), stated that BAN can not support Scenario 11 because of its potential legal ramifications. She would like to see the continuation of the Steering Committee.

Mr. Phil Berg, Van Nuys Airport Association & Ad Hoc Noise Group Co-Chairman, stated that Scenario 11 would not answer homeowner concerns. He agreed that improved communication between the community and the airport operators is very necessary. He supported Scenario 9 together with the Ad Hoc committee's recommendations.

Mr. Cliff Benjamin stated that corporate jets make the greatest noise and that the landing noise levels are increasingly terrible. He commented that police helicopters are flying at extremely low levels as well.

Mr. Ron Fish did not feel that Scenario 9 seemed viable in that it doesn't change the noise problems.

Mr. Brad Hoffman supported Scenario 11. He commented about being tired of shaking windows, and wants a quieter airport.

Lisa (no last name was provided) stated that her small children are awakened in fear in the middle of the night as a result of the aircraft noise.

Mr. Bill Cray stated that the airlines do not do short finals except in cases of emergency.

Mr. Alex Tulda expressed strong concern about low flying aircraft on landing. He stated that airplanes have skimmed the tops of the trees in his yard.

Mr. Steve Viscaino suggested that with Scenario 11, the FAA include policies and enforcement of violations to pilots who do not follow the regulations. He proposed costly fines as a form of penalty. Mr. Viscaino also expressed the need for a strong helicopter policy. He stated that between planes and helicopters out of VNY Airport, there has been an increase of noise to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Leo Beckman asked how many years of study are necessary before resolutions occur.

Mr. Frank Buda expressed additional concern over noise levels decreasing the value of the homes in his and surrounding neighborhoods. He also expressed his concern for exhaust fumes creating serious and long-term health effects.

Mr. Howard Berg, airport user, indicated that the FAA will turn down Scenario 11. He also pointed out that the AC 36-3 manufactured number is for certification purposes only, and that 36-1 is used for actual measurement of the noise levels of aircraft. He stated that 74 dBA is not reasonable and that AC 36-1 should be used to determine reasonable noise level limit.

Mr. John Byron, North Hills resident, indicated that he has several times looked for the identification numbers on low-flying aircraft and has yet to find one. He feels they should be painted on the aircraft for reporting purposes. He has also observed that, on the weekends, engine tests have been done at the end of the runway for sometimes more than an hour at a time, releasing hydrocarbons into the surrounding neighborhoods. This was of great concern to him.

Mr. John Winthrop, The Air Group and resident of North Hills, indicated he would endorse Scenario 9 or 12, or a combination of the two.

The public discussion was closed and Chairman Chick expressed his appreciation to the citizens who shared their concerns with the Committee. Mr. Chick called for the committee's comments and discussions.

Mr. Voorhis observed that the discussions have continued for three years now, and whenever critical points in the study have been discussed it turns into an emotional issue. He also indicated that there had been a lot of misinformation given out during this particular meeting. He stated that this isn't the end -- rather it's the beginning of a process where something can start getting done to solve the noise problems at VNY. He recalled a statement by the City Attorney that Scenario 11 was illegal and that the FAA could not approve it. He expressed his support for Scenario 9.

Lisa Barrena stated that she had fought the airport for 32 years and felt that litigation would not be productive. She expressed her support for Scenario 9.

Will Ross, Attorney with Defense Department and Van Nuys homeowner, was concerned about aircraft landings over North Hills. He stated that this was the first time he had heard of the problem, and felt it to be a serious concern. He also expressed concern for the absence of penalties for violation of noise abatement procedures. He indicated that helicopters remain a serious concern of his. He felt that a large part of the airport's problems lie with the FAA. He also expressed concern about the runups. He believed the hush house was going to be implemented with no objection.

Rita Schneir made reference to the public comment and her observance that the public might feel that tonight would be the end of these discussions. She indicated that she believed this to be the beginning. She asked for clarification from airport staff whether there could be modification of airport rules, regulations, ordinances, as new problems arise or new solutions come up to old problems. Staff assured her that this would be the case.

Chairman Chick indicated that whatever plan is selected, the Board of Airport Commissioners would have to consider it at an open public meeting in Van Nuys, and that an announcement of the meeting would be made.

A representative of the Ad Hoc committee indicated that they had attempted to address the noise problem as a total airport problem, not as a departure problem only. He also noted that the ANOMs system would identify both arrivals and departures, as well as aircraft (and helicopter) flight tracks and altitudes. With this system it could be determined if an aircraft was on the glide slope to VNY Airport.

Robert Jackson clarified an issue with respect to Federal Express aircraft at VNY Airport. He indicated that there were none, but that trucks do pick up and deliver at the airport. He also suggested that those concerned about small aircraft "N" (identification) numbers should express such concerns to the FAA or congressional representatives. In regard to the concerns of North Hills residents, the ILS for Van Nuys is among the steepest in the United States. He indicated all ILSs are typically 3.0 to 3.9 degrees. Van Nuys is 3.9. He stated that Scenario 11 was unachievable from a legal standpoint.

Tom Henry noted that he has seen much polarization between both sides in the past three years. He wanted to see something that will work and believed Ad Hoc Scenario #12 should be the preferred alternative.

Rita Schneir commended Don Schultz and Phil Berg and the work of the Ad Hoc Committee for their efforts and recommendations. Because of the concern about the landings, Rita suggested that in item #1 of the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations where the final word is departures, that the word "operations" be substituted to include both arrivals and departures.

Mr. Schultz expressed his strong support for Scenario #9. He stated for the record that a hush house was also included in Scenario #9 as part of the December 3 draft program.

Frankye Schneider asked about bringing the Steering Committee back together for project implementation review. Chairman Chick noted that this was an element of the proposed NCP.

Sandor Winger mentioned the contributions of the Van Nuys Community Advisory Council in bringing the community together, and the fact that the FAR Part 150 study was recommended by the Advisory Council as a means of solving the airport noise problem. The community working together has often meant compromise, and he felt that Scenario 9 represented a good compromise between airport and community interests. He applauded the work of the Ad Hoc committee in modifying Scenario 9 to come up with Scenario 12, and recommended its adoption. For the record he stated that a "Hush House" was included as part of Scenario 9.

Clay Lacy mentioned the fact that the VNY air traffic control tower is considered a "level 3" tower and should be upgraded to a level 4 tower. He asked for the Committees support for this upgrade because it could mean more tower personnel on duty over the course of the day, better operational control, and a more efficient operation.

Bob Jackson noted that it would be a good idea if the tower were to be operated 24 hours a day.

Chairman Chick closed the Committee discussion and noted that a motion would be in order with respect to recommending approval of a preferred Noise Control Scenario for inclusion in the NCP.

Member Winger moved that the Committee recommend adoption of the Ad Hoc committee's Scenario 12 (Scenario 9 plus the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations) with the inclusion of provisions for a "hush house" and the word change recommended by Member Schneir to substitute the word "operations" to cover both arrivals and departures. The motion also included continuation of the Steering Committee as a planning review committee and deletion of the word "southerly" from item 2 of the Ad Hoc committee recommendations. Seconded by McGuire. Mr. Chick called for a show of hands for those voting for the motion. He noted that those favoring another alternative or scenario should vote only in favor of that scenario, as the scenario with the most votes would be the scenario to be recommended to the BOAC.

Those voting in favor (aye) of the motion included: Members McGuire, Jackson, Van Nuys, Lacy, Winger, Chick, Voorhis, Schneir, and Schneider. Those voting against (no) the motion included: Members Henry, Barrena, Ross, Schultz, and Spielberg. Motion carried on a vote of 9 for to 5 against.

Mr. Schultz offered an amending motion to include the adoption of Scenarios 12 and 9 with the Steering Committee to be set up as a review board for at least two years, after the recommendations of Scenarios 12 and 9 are fully implemented with the understanding that the Part 150 study would be continued. Seconded by Ross. Mr. Chick called for a vote on the motion. Those voting in favor of the motion included: Members McGuire, Van Nuys, Henry, Barrena, Ross, Chick, Schultz, Voorhis, Schneir, and Schneider. Those voting against the motion included: Member Winger. Members abstaining included: Jackson, Lacy, and Spielberg. Motion carried on a vote of 10 in favor to 1 against and 3 abstentions.

Motion was made by Member Ross in support of Scenario 11. Seconded by Spielberg. Mr. Chick called for the vote. Members voting in favor of Scenario 11 included: Member Spielberg. Members voting against the motion included: Members McGuire, Jackson, Van Nuys, Henry, Lacy, Winger, Barrena, Ross, Chick, Schultz, Voorhis, Schneir, and Schneider. Motion failed on a vote of 13 noes to 1 aye.

Chairman Chick noted that Mr. Schultz's motion would be forwarded to the BOAC for their consideration and approval as part of the recommended Noise Control Program for Van Nuys Airport.

Mr. Voorhis moved that the Committee recommend that the BOAC procure and install the Airport Noise & Operations Monitoring System (ANOMS) or similar system as soon as possible. Seconded. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Voorhis moved to recommend that the BOAC accept the Ad Hoc committee recommendation in lieu of the proposed noise regulation for Van Nuys Airport. The Chair ruled that such action was inappropriate in that the subject was not on the meeting agenda. No action was taken.

#### **APPROVAL OF NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS**

Mr. Chick introduced the agenda item. Mr. Schultz moved that the Committee withhold approval of the five-year forecast Noise Exposure Map until a new map could be made which would give consideration to the effects of adding 200,000 square feet of proposed new hangar space at the airport. Seconded. Discussion of the subject followed, with Mr. Schultz amending his motion to include preparation of an additional five-year forecast map based on a 100% increase in jet operations for the five-year forecast period as a worst case scenario. Seconded. Motion carried on a vote of 9 in favor to 5 against.

#### **APPROVAL OF NCP**

Mr. Chick called for a motion approving the submittal of the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) to the BOAC. Member Voorhis moved approval of submitting the NCP to the BOAC, along with the recommendations set forth in Mr. Laham's memorandum on "proposed Amendments to NCP," dated March 9, 1992 as amended by the Steering Committee during discussion (attached). Amendments to the memo are: Do not delete Item B of Section II or Item K of Section III of the NCP, which deal with raising the Burbank glideslope; change the wording to arrivals or departures (from arrivals and departures) to avoid contra flow in the recommendation dealing with Helicopter Flood Basin Operations. Mr. Davison's recommendations for a letter to the FAA supporting larger "N" numbers on aircraft and the Committee's recommendation to support the tower upgrade were included in the motion. Motion seconded. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Ross moved that section 3L be added to the NCP to incorporate a requirement that all future new airport leaseholders (FBO's) would be allowed to base only FAR Part 36 stage 3 aircraft at the airport. Seconded. Approved.

Mr. Henry moved that another map be run based on a 100% increase in jet operations for the five year forecast and that this be submitted along with the rest of the Noise Exposure Maps to the FAA for review and approval. Seconded. Approved

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Public comment having been received on the individual agenda items, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.



## RECAP OF APPROVED MOTIONS

### APPROVAL OF ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL SCENARIO

#### Motion #1:

Member Winger moved that the committee recommend adoption of the Ad Hoc committee's Scenario 12 (Scenario 9 plus the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations) with the inclusion of provisions for a "hush house" and the word change recommended by Member Schneir to substitute the word "operations" to cover both arrivals and departures. The motion also included continuation of the Steering Committee as a planning review committee and deletion of the word "southerly" from item 2 of the Ad Hoc committee recommendations. Seconded by McGuire.

Those voting in favor (aye) of the motion included: Members McGuire, Jackson, Van Nuys, Lacy, Winger, Chick, Voorhis, Schneir, and Schneider. Those voting against (no) the motion included: Members Henry, Barrena, Ross, Schultz, and Spielberg. Motion carried on a vote of 9 for to 5 against.

*[Note of clarification: Motion #2 by Mr Schultz amended Motion #1 by Mr. Winger, as indicated, according to a ruling by Chairman Chick that Motion #2 had a higher affirmative vote count than Motion #1]*

#### Motion #2:

Mr. Schultz offered an amending motion to include the adoption of Scenarios 12 and 9 with the Steering Committee to be set up as a review board for at least two years, after the recommendations of Scenarios 12 and 9 are fully implemented with the understanding that the Part 150 study would be continued. Seconded by Ross. Mr. Chick called for a vote on the motion. Those voting in favor of the motion included: Members McGuire, Van Nuys, Henry, Barrena, Ross, Chick, Schultz, Voorhis, Schneir, and Schneider. Those voting against the motion included: Member Winger. Members abstaining included: Jackson, Lacy, and Spielberg. Motion carried on a vote of 10 in favor to 1 against and 3 abstentions.

Chairman Chick noted that Mr. Schultz's motion would be forwarded to the BOAC for their consideration and approval as part of the recommended Noise Control Program for Van Nuys Airport.

#### Motion #3:

Mr. Voorhis moved that the Committee recommend that the BOAC procure and install the Airport Noise & Operations Monitoring System (ANOMS) or similar system as soon as possible. Seconded. Approved unanimously.

## APPROVAL OF NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS

### Motion #4:

Mr. Schultz moved that the Committee withhold approval of the five-year forecast Noise Exposure Map until a new map could be made which would give consideration to the effects of adding 200,000 square feet of proposed new hangar space at the airport. Seconded. Discussion of the subject followed, with Mr. Schultz amending his motion to include preparation of an additional five-year forecast map based on a 100% increase in jet operations for the five-year forecast period as a worst case scenario. Seconded. Motion carried on a vote of 9 in favor to 5 against.

## APPROVAL OF NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM

### Motion #5:

Member Voorhis moved approval of submitting the NCP to the BOAC, along with the recommendations set forth in Mr. Laham's memorandum on "proposed Amendments to NCP", dated March 9, 1992 as amended by the Steering Committee during discussion. Amendments to the memo are: Do not delete Item B of Section II or Item K of Section III of the NCP, which deal with raising the Burbank glideslope; change the wording to arrivals or departures (from arrivals and departures) to avoid contra flow in the recommendation dealing with Helicopter Flood Basin Operations. Mr. Davison's recommendations for a letter to the FAA supporting larger "N" numbers on aircraft and the Committee's recommendation to support the tower upgrade were included in the motion. Motion seconded. Approved unanimously.

### Motion #6:

Mr. Ross moved that section 3L be added to the NCP to incorporate a requirement that all future new airport leaseholders (FBO's) would be allowed to base only FAR Part 36 stage 3 aircraft at the airport. Seconded. Approved.

### Motion #7:

Mr. Henry moved that another map be run based on a 100% increase in jet operations for the five year forecast and that this be submitted along with the rest of the Noise Exposure Maps to the FAA for review and approval. Seconded. Approved.

**Minutes**  
**FAR PART-150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**  
**Van Nuys Airport**

**Steering Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday, October 29, 1996**

The meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part-150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:12 p.m., October 29, 1996, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Patricia Schnegg, Chairperson opened the meeting, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

The following Steering Committee members, Board of Airport Commissioners and staff were present:

Committee Members:

Patricia Schnegg, Chair	Bob Jackson
Tom Henry, Vice Chair	Harold Lee
James Acosta	Susan Little
George Anisman	Scott Lorimer
Harry Berg	Kenneth Millman
Ken Curry	Mary Rawlings
Debbie Dyer	Don Schultz
Laura Fay	Gerald Silver
Morrie Goldman	Rick Voorhis
	Alma Vorst
	Sandor Winger

BOAC:

William Dahl  
Warren Valdry

Staff:

John Driscoll  
Philip Depoian  
Michael  
DiGirolamo  
Breton Lobner  
Ronald Kochevar  
Melanie Teeter  
Maurice Laham  
Steven Crowther  
Dennis Quilliam  
Karen Hoo

The following Steering Committee member was absent:

Phil Berg

**INTRODUCTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Chairperson Schnegg introduced herself and asked each committee member to introduce themselves.

**DISCUSSION - PURPOSE OF STEERING COMMITTEE**

Chairperson Schnegg stated that the Board of Airport Commissioners (BOAC) was committed to working with the community and that the BOAC formed the Steering Committee, appointing her as Chair, to recommend how the airport and the community can be more compatible. The mission of the Steering Committee is to update the forecast to submit to FAA and obtain FAA approval of the Part-150 in order to receive monies for noise mitigation and improve the noise situation at VNY.

Maurice Laham, Airport Environmental Manager, provided an overview of the components for a Part-150 Study, followed by a background and status report on the work completed by the previous Steering Committee for the Part-150 Study.

Mr. Laham described the Part-150 Study as consisting of:

- 1) Noise Exposure Maps (NEMs) identifying noise contours at the present level and at a five year forecast with mitigation measures imposed, and
- 2) A Noise Compatibility Plan (NCP) identifying measures to control noise.

He indicated that after a review process of eleven alternative scenarios, the previous Steering Committee chose Scenario No. 9 which constituted the heart of the NCP. This scenario established a voluntary Fly Neighborly Program in which pilots utilize noise abatement procedures in departing the airport.

The previous Steering Committee unanimously agreed upon the entire Part-150 Study and forwarded it to the BOAC. The NCP contains 28 measures, including the Fly Neighborly Program which are intended to control noise involving land use, helicopters and aviation strategies. Mr. Laham described each of the 28 measures. The FAA, however, did not accept the submittal because the forecasts of aircraft operations were not supportable.

#### **APPROVAL OF RULES GOVERNING THE STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

After discussion by the Committee, the chairperson asked the City Attorney to submit a report at the next committee meeting on the legal mandate for including members of the State legislation on the Committee. A motion was made, seconded and PASSED for the City Attorney to look at the intent of that section of the federal law concerning the Part-150 Study.

A motion was made, seconded and PASSED that the Committee adopt Robert's Rules of Order.

A motion was made, seconded and PASSED that Committee Member Schultz act as Parliamentarian.

A motion was made, seconded and PASSED that a quorum of the Steering Committee is constituted by a simple majority of appointed members.

A motion was made, seconded and by a vote of 15 ayes and 5 noes, PASSED that a motion is approved by a majority of those members present.

The chairperson clarified that the Committee is subject to the Brown Act and to public document disclosure laws. A public comment period would always be included at the end

of each committee meeting. The chairperson also clarified that comments would be taken before the committee voted on items of significance and that the voting on housekeeping items such as the Rules of Order the Committee was imposing on itself would not need to be commented on by the public.

#### **APPROVAL OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

The Chairperson explained that certain items should be discussed at the next meeting, including an updated forecast of aircraft operations, a preliminary description of noise exposure maps that are predicated on the forecasts, and a status of the measures proposed in the last Part-150 Study.

A committee member requested staff to investigate and analyze several measures, including "putting teeth" into the Fly Neighborly Program, obtaining real time information on the noise monitoring system, Stage 2 aircraft phaseout, imposing a curfew on helicopters, restricting night jet departures, and a nonaddition rule. The chairperson responded that the BOAC took action addressing those measures but the FAA has denied them. The chairperson added that they are continuing to work with the FAA in trying to gain approval and that it is more appropriate to address these items at a later time.

Another committee member called a Point of Order returning the discussion to the Chair's request for a motion to request staff for information as identified above. A motion was made, seconded and PASSED directing staff to submit such report for the next meeting.

A committee member requested that the documents for the next meeting be delivered in a timely manner and suggested a standard of at least one week to ten days prior to any meeting.

The chairperson questioned City Attorney Lobner on the release of Committee Member's address to the public. The City Attorney agreed that committee members are entitled to their privacy and at their own discretion may choose to individually release that information.

#### **APPROVAL OF THE NEXT MEETING DATE**

A motion was made, seconded and PASSED setting Tuesday, November 26, 1996, at 7:00 p.m. at the Airtel Plaza Hotel as the date of the next meeting of the Steering Committee. The committee agreed informally to hold subsequent meetings generally on the third Tuesday of the month.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Steering Committee received public comments from the audience.

Hal Singer questioned why he, as a homeowner, doesn't get a vote on noise matters concerning the airport and suggested use of Palmdale Airport.

Sandy Brown of State Senator Hayden's office questioned the criteria for committee membership and requested the inclusion of their office and State Senator Rosenthal's office on the committee and asked that the committee not reconvene until the City Attorney reports back on the legal requirements for committee membership.

Peter Ireland recommended that the public comment period start with public officials followed by the general public in the order the comment cards were received. He also recommended inclusion of the State Senators' offices on the committee even if it were not legally required; questioned why the FAA denied the previous Part-150; requested that exhibits identified in the materials passed out to be displayed at the committee meetings; commented on the failure of the Fly Neighborly Program; and stated his support for the recommendations of group Stop the Noise.

Vic Spears commented that the focus should be looking at the source of noise and how to eliminate the noise first before looking at noise contours; jets should fly in ways to minimize noise; and he recommended a mandatory noise program with fines.

Cheryl Tabbi questioned the nonprofit status of the group Stop the Noise and its solicitation for funds.

Carl Davison recommended participation on the committee by the State Senators and stated that he felt the committee was not complying with the Brown Act.

Jean Herweg requested financial information on airport operations and income; requested information how noise monitoring was done; requested notice of meeting dates and advance copies of documents; wanted to know the results of a consultant study; questioned the effectiveness of the Fly Neighborly program; questioned the link between the new runway and additional noise; stated that insulation would not alleviate noise problems outdoors in yard areas, limiting use of her property; stated that homeowners have not had sufficient voice in noise matters; supports State Senator's participation on the committee; recommended fines from noise violators be paid to affected homeowners.

John Crawford stated that being woken up by noise is destroying his quality of life and that he has not received responses from noise complaints filed by him.

Anne Carver requested restricting noisy jets from flying over residential; requested participation by the State Senators on the committee; recommended an extended curfew, elimination of Stage 2 aircraft and a nonaddition rule and no expansion of the airport. She also recommended enforcement of the curfew with fines. Chairperson Schnegg stated that

the BOAC has made efforts but was denied by FAA and suggested that the residents participate in a letter writing campaign to the FAA.

John Russell requested more participation by homeowners on the committee, as well as the State Senators and stated that the Fly Neighborly program was a failure.

Pamela Bossin-Arthur stated that she has only received one response to her noise complaints and did not believe that it was an emergency flight, as explained to her by the noise complaint staff; wanted to know how many committee members lived in the area (responding committee members raised their hands).

James Mergen complained about aircraft noise over his home.

Elizabeth Crawford requested agendas be made public; requested more advertising of the meeting date; requested mailing notifications and requested State Senator representation.

David Rankell stated that the noise monitoring system needed improvement; suggested fines for noise violators, a night curfew starting at 10:00 p.m., a helicopter curfew, a nonaddition rule; and requested State Senator participation.

Joan Luchs agreed with Sandy Brown's (representative of State Senator Hayden's office) position; stated that noise is affecting her sales of homes; questioned the qualifications of each committee member; requested Gerald Silver's agenda items be placed on the Steering Committee's agenda.

Ray Ferry stated that noise from routine maintenance is a problem and played a recording of such an incident that can be heard at his home; stated that the voluntary program is not working and that a hush house should be constructed.

Jeff Brain requested participation by the State Senators and State Assembly; requested adoption of Stop the Noise's recommendations; and suggested community workshops for more citizen input.

Mary Dominguez stated that there were more jets flying at night and that the Fly Neighborly program was not working.

Jay Day, representative of State Senator Rosenthal, stated that he has not received a response from a letter his office sent requesting information on how the Committee was formed and requested participation by the State Senators.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

**Minutes**  
**FAR PART-150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**  
**Van Nuys Airport**

**Steering Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday, November 26, 1996**

The meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part-150 Project Steering Committee was convened at 7:11 p.m., November 26, 1996 at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Patricia Schnegg, Chairperson opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members and staff were present:

Committee Members:

Patricia Schnegg, Chair  
Tom Henry, Vice Chair  
James Acosta  
George Anisman  
Harry Berg  
Debbie Dyer  
Laura Fay  
Bob Jackson  
Harold Lee

Scott Lorimer  
Kenneth Millman  
Mary Rawlings  
Don Schultz  
Gerald Silver  
Rick Voorhis  
Alma Vorst  
Sandor Winger

Staff:

Philip Depoian  
Breton Lobner  
Ronald Kochevar  
Maurice Laham  
Steven Crowther  
Dennis Quilliam  
Karen Hoo

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

Phil Berg  
Ken Curry

Morrie Goldman  
Susan Little

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The Steering Committee approved the minutes of the October 29, 1996 meeting with a correction noting Committee Member Laura Fay's suggestion to staff to obtain information on other airport's adopted Part-150 studies.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM**

Discussion ensued on the subject of materials being submitted by individual Committee Members. It was agreed that if a Committee Member wishes to submit materials to the whole Committee, the materials should be submitted to the Environmental Management Bureau at least two weeks prior to a scheduled meeting so that it may be included in each Committee Member's packet.

**DISCUSSION - Aircraft Operation Forecasts, Noise Exposure Maps, and Noise Compatibility Program Measures**

Reference was made to initiating discussion on agenda items 2A, 2B and 2C. Maurice Laham, Airport Environmental Manager, provided a brief summary of aircraft operation forecasts, noise exposure maps, and noise compatibility program measures, as contained in the staff report to committee members, dated November 7, 1996. He stated that it was staff's recommendation to



use the forecast modeled after the one being used for the Van Nuys Master Plan because of the numerous studies involved in developing the forecast and the consultant's expertise in these matters. Staff felt that these projections could be defended before the FAA. The FAA rejected the last submittal of the Part-150 Study because the 100% projected increase of turbojet operations by the committee appeared to be arbitrary and was lacking supporting data justifying that increase. Extensive discussions have taken place over the projections being used in the VNY Master Plan and the FAA has indicated their support for those projections.

The Chair opened it up for discussion of the forecast, the noise exposure maps and the noise compatibility program. Several Committee Members questioned the projected increase of Stage 3 jets and the projected decrease of Stage 2 jets. One Committee Member suggested that the economics of purchasing a Stage 2 jet and the need for retrofitting and refurbishment would encourage the purchase of Stage 3 jets that are more modern, fuel efficient, have the latest instruments and cost less to maintain. Staff responded that Stage 2 aircraft are no longer being produced and therefore their availability will become increasingly limited and maintenance will become more difficult. Also, the projections were based on a consultant's detailed analysis of the situation and that their expertise in these matters led them to these conclusions. Several Committee Members requested staff to present data at the next committee meeting on operations at VNY in the last five years identifying the percentage of Stage 2 and Stage 3 jets. The chart would include annual numbers for takeoffs and landings by aircraft type within the last five years, where this information is available.

The Committee also attempted to discuss the 28 measures contained in the previous Noise Compatibility Plan but decided that more information was needed on the current status of each measure and asked staff to present those at the next meeting.

A Committee Member requested information on the size of the impact area within the previous years. The Chair questioned the need to look at past statistics when the point of the Part-150 is to pick a base year and look forward.

The Chair requested an analysis of helicopter takeoff restrictions in the morning as a mitigation measure and requested the City Attorney to review the legal aspects of placing a curfew on helicopter operations.

A motion was made, seconded and PASSED that staff look at contour maps based on the Master Plan Study forecast. Staff asked for and received confirmation that the motion instructed staff to use the projections associated with the Master Plan process.

#### **DISCUSSION - City Attorney's Report on State representation on the Steering Committee**

The Chair summarized the City Attorney's report to the President of the Board of Airport Commissioners regarding Committee membership and the requirement to appoint representatives from the State Senator's office. The City Attorney stated that this was not a requirement under federal regulations pertaining to airport noise compatibility planning, but noted that officials of the state should be consulted. The Chair then referenced a letter from Daniel Garcia, President of the Board of Airport Commissioners, which would appoint Richard Dyer, staff with Cal Trans Division of Aeronautics as a non-voting member of the Committee.

The Committee then discussed the merits of adding members to the Committee. The City Attorney responded to a question regarding appointments to the Committee. He stated that the Committee does not have the authority to appoint members to this Committee and that this authority rests with the President of the Board of Airport Commissioners. The Committee expressed that it was their desire to send a message to the President of the Board of Airport Commissioners regarding Committee membership. After the Chair opened the floor for the public comment period (see below), a motion was made, seconded and PASSED by a vote of eleven ayes that the Chair inform the President of the Board of Airport Commissioners that it is the Committee's desire that representatives from State Senators Rosenthal and Hayden be included on the Committee.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The Steering Committee received public comments from the audience.

Esther Anne Billings stated that she was impacted by noise and that the noise levels have increased since she purchased her home in 1954. She suggested that aircraft be directed over some other area and not impact residential uses. She also stated her support of having the State Senators on the Committee.

Jay Day, representative of State Senator Rosenthal, stated that he has not received a response from letters from his office requesting information on how the Committee was formed and requested participation by the State Senators.

Anne Carver requested participation by the State Senators on the Committee and stated that since the last Committee meeting, she had be awoken twelve times by loud aircraft.

John Russell stated that a curfew be imposed and that all Stage 2 aircraft be banned.

Jean Herweg asked if the Board of Airport Commissioners get compensated for their participation. The Chair replied that they do not and that it was a policy of Mayor Riordan that no compensation be received for their participation. Ms. Herweg stated that there should be more balance on the Committee and recommended that Committee membership be comprised of 1/3 users, 1/3 representatives of elected officials, and 1/3 those who are impacted by noise.

Michael Mack stated that he didn't want a rubber stamp of the previous 28 measures, wanted noise eliminated, and stated that helicopters were not following the suggested route over the basin and flying over his neighborhood.

Robert Michlin stated his support for balance on the Committee and the inclusion of the two State Senators.

Norma Landau stated that soundproofing would only benefit a few people and that outdoor living was not possible, recommended a non-addition rule for Stage 2 jets, an early morning curfew on helicopters, enforcement of noise violations, and inclusion of the State Senators on the Committee.

David Rankell stated that sound insulation of homes would not work and would not alleviate noise in the Sherman Oaks/Encino area. He recommended a 1,000 feet minimum altitude for helicopters, a ban on Stage 2 jets and inclusion of the State Senators on the Committee.

Timothy Marx stated that many people are impacted and that people have a greater problem than the maps show. He recommended that helicopters should fly 500-1,000 feet above the ground.

Carl Davison stated that he felt the Committee had no credibility, that aircraft causes pollution, and stated that as a requirement for insulation, a clause regarding noise would be placed on the deed.

Elizabeth Crawford refuted the logic of purchasing older Stage 2 aircraft versus newer Stage 3 aircraft, stressed the importance of phasing out Stage 2 jets and requested inclusion of the State Senators on the Committee.

Joan Luchs stated that copies of staff reports should be made available to the public to keep and not just for review in the folders at the meeting. She recommended that the State Senators be included in the Committee and that the Committee address a broader scope of issues.

#### **APPROVAL OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

A motion was made, seconded and PASSED directing staff to bring back those items, as discussed earlier, to the next meeting for further discussion. The next meeting date was set for Tuesday, January 21, 1996 at 7 p.m. at the Airtel Hotel.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Minutes  
FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, April 24, 2000  
(as amended July 12, 2000\*)

A meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Study Steering Committee was convened at 7:10 p.m., April 24, 2000, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Leland Wong, a member of the Board of Airport Commissioners and Chairman of the VNY Part 150 Steering Committee, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members were present:

Leland Wong, Chair	Morrie Goldman	Kenneth Millman
Harry Berg	Tom Henry	Don Schultz
Ann Carver	Bob Jackson	Gerald Silver
Debbie Dwyer	Harold Lee	Rick Voorhis
Laura Shell	Susan Little	

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

James Acosta	Ken Curry	Alma Vorst
George Anisman	Mary Rawlings	Sandor Winger
Phil Berg		

#### INTRODUCTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Wong introduced himself and committee members introduced themselves and briefly described their affiliations. The chairman conveyed on behalf of the Board of Airport Commissioners the desire to have an adopted Part 150 Study in order to receive funding for programs such as sound insulation in the community surrounding VNY.

#### OVERVIEW of the PART 150 PROGRAM

Staff presented an overview of the history and purpose of the VNY Part 150 Study. The FAA sponsored study is comprised of three parts: a base noise map, a Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) with measures to mitigate noise impacts, and a five year projected noise map with the mitigation measures incorporated. The aircraft operations are used to establish the noise contour map and the mitigation measures are used to adjust the noise contour. The Study was submitted to the FAA but not approved because the aircraft operation forecasts were unacceptable. The centerpiece of the NCP is the fly friendly program which reduces noise from an otherwise expected impact of 4,000 dwelling units down to about 1,000.

Committee discussion ensued on the BOAC Resolution of approximately 30 years ago that established a definition of 12,500 pounds for aircraft functioning in air taxi

operations. It was explained that although this definition was applicable at the time it is no longer applicable since air taxi aircraft have evolved to larger capacities. Discussion also ensued on the success of the fly friendly program.

## AIRCRAFT OPERATIONAL FORECASTS

Staff explained how the aircraft operational forecasts were developed. Reference was made to the one page spreadsheet that was distributed, which displayed aircraft operations for a series of years. The aircraft types listed on the spreadsheet were taken from the FAA's Integrated Noise Model (INM), which is the established computer model used to generate noise contour maps for a Part 150 Study. These aircraft types are representative and may include several specific aircraft models. For example the Lear 25S category includes Lear 23S and Lear 24S and may include others as appropriate.

In the years 1995 thru 1999 the numbers shown were the actual operation levels that occurred for each aircraft type. The subsequent years of 2000 thru 2004 were forecasted by using a linear regression of the actual operations. There were exceptions to the linear regression for certain aircraft types. For Stage II aircraft it was assumed that the non-addition rule was in effect and that there would be no growth for these type of aircraft. Also, aircraft that were projected to have negative growth (falling below zero) were set at zero in future years.

\*A request was made by a committee member to determine what is the maximum aircraft operational capacity of the airport in terms of number of flights it can handle.

After discussion about various aspects of the forecasts a motion was made to adopt the forecasts as presented and to use them to generate noise contours with the INM created by the FAA. Direction was also given to staff to reexamine the forecasts and make adjustments if appropriate. The noise contours would be brought back to the Steering Committee at its next meeting for review. The motion was seconded and passed 13 to 1.

## NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM

Discussion was initiated on the measures in the Noise Compatibility Program and a motion was proposed to revisit these measures in light of the noise contours to be generated. It was suggested that the discussion be opened for public input. The following people spoke:

Robert Flamer said he represented the Tarzana property owners association. He questioned the forecast numbers with respect to jet operations and requested the noise impacts be addressed. He also cited the indiscriminate use of helicopters as a problem in the area around VNY.

David Augsburger stated he lived about three and 1/2 miles southeast of the airport. He stated that low flying aircraft created violent noise impacts and that there was a need for a working system to file noise complaints.

Carl Davison said he lived adjacent to the airport at Odessa and Hamlin. He questioned whether there was a public notice in the newspaper of this meeting. Staff indicated that public notices of the meeting were in two newspapers.

Jerry Brink questioned the forecasts for Stage II aircraft stating that they should be less because of attrition of older aircraft. He stated soundproofing was not going to solve the problem and maybe the solution is buying and demolishing homes with a bulldozer. He suggested signing an aviation easement agreement for soundproofing would lower their house value to zero.

Joan Luchs said the forecast numbers have to be based on a consistent methodology. She suggested that soundproofing was unacceptable because for people living in this area use of their entire property is part of the enjoyment of living in California, unlike other parts of the country where it doesn't matter.

James Stewart stated that the purpose for completing a Part 150 Study was to secure federal money for soundproofing from the FAA.

David Kellar indicated he represents the Sherman Oaks homeowners association. He suggested that the Steering Committee receive input on residential needs and on aviation needs and balance each of these in coming to the best conclusion.

Ms. Rohssler said she had lived in her home at the corner of Covello and Rubio Avenue since 1951. She described incidents of dangerously low flying aircraft.

The public comment period was closed.

A motion was made to go beyond the measures previously considered and look at a range of things including soundproofing, phase out of noisy stage two jets, curfews and helicopter noise control problems. The Chairman suggested that a motion was not needed because he could direct staff to do this. Staff agreed to provide an analysis of the individual measures in the existing proposed noise compatibility program for the committee to review along with consideration of other measures at the next meeting to be scheduled at a later date.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:40 P.M.

Minutes  
FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, July 12, 2000

A meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Study Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., July 12, 2000, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Leland Wong, a member of the Board of Airport Commissioners and Chairman of the VNY Part 150 Steering Committee, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members were present:

Leland Wong, Chair	Morrie Goldman	Kenneth Millman
George Anisman	Tom Henry	Don Schultz
Harry Berg	Bob Jackson	Gerald Silver
Phil Berg	Harold Lee	Laura Shell
Ken Curry	Susan Little	Rick Voorhis

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

James Acosta	Debbie Dyner	Alma Vorst
Ann Carver	Mary Rawlings	Sandor Winger

APPROVAL of MINUTES for April 24, 2000.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. Ms. Shell requested that the minutes be amended to reflect her previously asking for information on the maximum capacity of the airport. Motion passed unanimously as amended.

DISCUSSION of the NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM (NCP)

Chairman Wong asked Maurice Laham, Program Administrator, to give an overview of the 28 measures in the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP). Mr. Laham began with a summary of each measure and its status. He indicated that the 28 measures had previously been adopted by the Steering Committee and the Board of Airport Commissioners. However, the FAA did not approve the Part 150 Program at that time, not because of the NCP, but because of the aircraft operational forecasts.

Mr. Schultz indicated that half of the current Steering Committee was not there at that time and therefore not familiar with the measures. He suggested that reaffirmation be postponed until a later meeting after reviewing the measures. Ms. Shell asked why should the Committee resubmit measures that have been previously rejected by the FAA. It was indicated that the FAA had been approached primarily on an informal basis on some of the measures and that adoption of the program as a whole and formal submittal could change the status of their response to a more favorable one.

Mr. Harry Berg stated that considerable time and effort was spent previously to arrive at a consensus on the 28 measures in the NCP. He indicated that it would be counter productive to go over them again to any great extent. Based on this observation Mr. Berg made a motion to approve the items from the original Part 150 Study. Motion was seconded. Chairman Wong open the motion up for discussion. It was reiterated that the Committee needs to become more familiar with the 28 measures before taking any action on them.

Mr. Laham continued with his summary of the status of each measure. Discussion ensued on various helicopter issues including raising the operational altitude of helicopters to reduce noise impact and establishing a helicopter flight training facility at a specific location on the airport. The merits of these and other issues were discussed at length and whether to include or delete certain measures. Mr. Laham concluded his summary with a recommendation to include all of the measures.

Chairman Wong opened the discussion up for public input. The following persons spoke:

Charles Brink requested to see the documents before commenting on them. He also suggested the money for the hush house should be borrowed from LAWA.

Wayne Williams stated that the airport should never become scheduled and that it should eliminate all stage 2 aircraft very quickly. He also suggested getting rid of all noisy helicopters and noisy jets.

David Rankell indicated the Committee should not push through the 28 measures that were presented eight years ago but should take time to digest them.

David Augsburger suggested that there needs to be a system for citizens to complain about noise. He cited one plane in particular, a large-bodied older plane with a dark underbelly, as being outrageously noisy. He also expressed concern about planes that fly too low around the neighborhood.

Joan Luchs indicated that the issue of helicopters should be on the agenda. She also suggested that soundproofing, from a real estate point of view, is not the focus that it should be because only part of the property is mitigated.

Sue Cone said she has lived in Van Nuys for seven years and last November was the very first time that all the planes started coming over her house. She felt the reason nothing was being done was because it all had to do with money.

Chairman Wong closed the public input portion of the meeting and indicated that the issue of helicopters was intended to be addressed under agenda item 2b. He suggested deferring action on the 28 measures until another meeting could be scheduled, and making information on the measures available to the public. However, since there was a motion to adopt the 28 measures the Chairman ask Mr. Harry Berg, the maker of the motion, whether he would like to withdraw it. Mr. Berg declined to withdraw the motion.



There was discussion on what can be included in the Part 150 Study and what would require a Part 161 Study and the distinctions between the two processes. A comment was made that the original Part 150 took several years to develop after numerous public meetings with homeowners and airport operators. Reaffirmation of the 28 measures does not indicate anything other than agreement with the previous work and the issue of whether to include additional items is a topic that needs to be discussed.

A question was raised as to what is proper for a Part 150 Study and what is proper for a Part 161 Analysis. It was recommended that the City Attorney's Office decide which act is applicable to each potential measure.

A motion was made to defer any action on the 28 measures. The question was raised as to whether it was appropriate to entertain another motion when the first one had not been acted upon. Mr. James Stewart indicated he was a registered parliamentarian and that all that needs to happen is for someone to move to postpone his motion until the next meeting. The motion to postpone action on the original motion was seconded and passed by a group response of aye.

Chairman Wong open discussion on item 2a on the agenda. A Committee member suggested that staff might provide any additional measures to the original 28 if these are available. Chairman Wong asked staff to look into some potential new measures.

A motion was made by Gerald Silver to provide the Committee members with the following documents: FAA Advisory Circular 150/5050-4, Citizen Participation in Airport Planning, 150/5020-1, Noise Control and Compatibility Planning for Airports, and EE-90-03, Community Involvement Manual. Chairman Wong said he didn't think a motion was needed and indicated the materials will be provided.

A question was asked on whether a proposal that will require a Part 161 Analysis can be put in the Part 150 Study. It was suggested that because of the nature of a Part 161 Study a conclusion of such an analysis could lead to a proposal that was quite different from the one originally envisioned that prompted the analysis. Because of this possibility it would be preferable to recommend a Part 161 Study be included in a Part 150 that is based on a generalized description of a possible measure, with the expectation that this general measure could change as a result of the analysis. Therefore, it is more appropriate to include a recommendation to do a Part 161 Study investigating, for example, helicopter curfews rather than to put in a specific measure.

The discussion on agenda item 2b, additional measures to be considered outside the scope of the Part 150 Study, led to a question on what the differences were between Part 150 and Part 161 requirements. Bret Lobner, Senior Assistant City Attorney, provided a comparative overview of the two regulations. He indicated that Part 161 and Part 150 are not legally tied to each other but that there are inferences between the Part 161 regulations and the Part 150.

An objective of a Part 150 Study is to establish a Noise Compatibility Program, get the federal government to agree with the goals set forth in the program and then obtain federal funding for such programs as soundproofing. Whereas, the purpose of a Part 161 Study is

to analyze the economic impacts of measures that are intended to reduce noise and find a way to allow the air commerce and navigation to continue operating. He confirmed the fact that no Part 161 has ever been completed to fruition anywhere in the country.

He indicated that there are two basic categories of studies within the context of a Part 161 Study. The first deals with Stage 2 aircraft, in which if everything is done correctly the federal government doesn't have the ability to consent or not consent to the regulation. The second category addresses those proposals that involve or impact in any way a Stage 3 aircraft, even one. In these situations the consent of the federal government is a requirement. If a proposed measure dealing with Stage 2 aircraft violates any of the criteria set forth in Part 161, such as being arbitrary or capricious or unreasonable or causes an undue burden on interstate commerce, then the FAA can impose litigation on the airport to prevent the implementation of the measure. Although the federal government's consent is not required in situations like this they can still seek to have a court stop the measure.

A question was raised as to why there was a difference between the noise contours that were generated for the State and those for the Part 150 Study in terms of number of acres and impacted residential units. Chairman Wong asked that a response be prepared explaining why there are differences between the documents.

Chairman Wong opened the discussion for public comment from the following:

Pat Kater expressed concern about increased helicopter and jet operations and that VNY will become a full force jet airport and the neighborhoods will die just like they did around LAX. He indicated frustration at trying to talk to the FAA.

Charles Brink offered to convert study documents to H.T.M.L.

Joan Luchs suggested banning of non-emergency flights between 10 and 7A.M.

Chairman Wong indicated that the 28 items in the NCP would be sent to the people on the sign up list and the materials suggested by Gerald Silver would be sent to the Steering Committee. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:15 P.M.

Minutes  
FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, November 8, 2000

A meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Study Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., November 8, 2000, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mark Schaffer, a member of the Board of Airport Commissioners and Chairman of the VNY Part 150 Steering Committee, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members were present:

Mark Schaffer, Chair	Bob Jackson	Don Schultz
Harry Berg	Harold Lee	Gerald Silver
Phil Berg	Susan Little	Rick Voorhis
Ken Curry	Kenneth Millman	Wayne Williams
Tom Henry	Deuk Perrin	Sandor Winger

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

James Acosta	Morrie Goldman	Laura Shell
George Anisman	Mary Rawlings	Alma Vorst

APPROVAL of MINUTES for July 12, 2000.

A motion was made by Harry Berg and seconded by Bob Jackson to approve the minutes for July 12, 2000. Motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION of the NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS (NEM)

Chairman Schaffer asked Maury Laham, Project Administrator, to provide a brief overview of the NEMs. Mr. Laham indicated that the five maps presented a snapshot of noise impacted areas around the airport derived from aircraft operation levels in 1999, the baseyear, and in a projection of five years from now, predicated on aircraft operations forecasted to occur in 2004. Two of the five maps represent different scenarios for 1999, with and without the fly friendly program. The impacted area would have been 348 acres if the fly friendly were not in effect. This potential impact area was reduced to 104 acres in 1999 as a result of the fly friendly program. The remaining three maps represent variations on the 2004 projection. The first map without the fly friendly program would yield 413 acres of impacted area. With the fly friendly program that number is reduced to 163 acres. With the soundproofing of 1200 homes that number is reduced to 74.3 acres.

Upon conclusion of the overview, Chairman Schaffer asked for a motion to approve the maps that were identified as the ones to be submitted to the FAA. Sandor Winger so moved with a second by Don Schultz. Chairman Schaffer opened the discussion for public input.

Jan Schneider spoke representing the North Hills Homeowners Group at the north end of the airport. She indicated that her home was ½ mile from northern end of the runway and questioned why one house would be included in the noise map and the house next to it might not be included. Maury Laham responded that the noise contour map is a planning tool generated by standardized methods to identify the limits of impacted areas. However, if the noise contour line falls on even a portion of a residential lot then the entire lot would be included in the noise map.

Charles Brink inquired about the public outreach for this meeting. Dennis Quilliam (Committee staff) stated that there were approximately six display ads in the Valley Edition of the Los Angeles Times and the Daily News for this meeting. Proofs of publication will be made available. Mr. Brink suggested other ideas to abate noise than soundproofing included removal of Stage 2 based and itinerant aircraft. He suggested the Committee not adopt this tonight. He said another approach would be to buy homes and demolish them.

Jan Shapiro expressed her complaint about rapidly increasing noise from aircraft. She suggested tour aircraft and others fly over industrial areas, not residential.

Raul Ruelas indicated the problem with soundproofing is that it doesn't address the noise outside of a residence making it difficult for children to play in their back yards. He also indicated there was still noise in the early morning hours despite the curfew.

Brian Moore expressed concern that soundproofing does not address the problem of noise outside of residences and the inability to converse while jets are flying over.

Dominique Bakewell stated that jets are going over his neighborhood constantly from Burbank and Van Nuys Airports.

Jon Rodgers referenced other Part 150 Studies that were previously done in the San Francisco area and indicated that they had numerous problems because they had made certain assumptions to develop the noise exposure maps. These assumptions later needed to be revised and the maps were thereby no longer representative of the noise situation. He suggested that the Fly Friendly program not be considered in developing the VNY noise exposure maps in order that the largest contour be represented with the greatest number of people in the contour thus being made eligible for Part 150 programs.

Chairman Schaffer closed this portion of the public input period and open the meeting for discussion on the motion from the Steering Committee members.

Gerald Silver indicated that based on the public comments the problem goes beyond the 65 CNEL. He made a substitute motion that the noise study be expanded to include the 60 and 65 CNEL contours, which he changed to include 60 and 55 CNEL contours. Chairman Schaffer ruled that the motion on the table should be voted upon first and the substitute motion could be considered after that action.

Harry Berg asked which of the five maps would be submitted to the FAA. Maury Laham indicated there were two official maps which are the base case for 1999 with the Fly Friendly Program in effect and the future case for 2004 with the Fly Friendly Program and the insulation program applied. These two maps would constitute the official submittal to the FAA. The other three maps were for comparison purposes only.

Kenneth Millman questioned who determined that the Fly Friendly Program would be used in producing the maps. Maury Laham responded that the Steering Committee for the VNY Part 150 Study in 1992 decided that the Fly Friendly program was to be included in the Study. In response to another question by Mr. Millman, Mr. Laham also indicated that the 15% of the aircraft pilots who do not comply with the Fly Friendly Program receive letters telling them that they've violated their individual program target.

Tom Henry requested whether the Part 161 Study or the helicopter curfew that were requested by the City Council to the Board of Airport Commissioners had been reflected in the development of the noise exposure maps. Maury Laham indicated they had not. He explained that the military category had gone from replicating the A7 aircraft to the A3 aircraft designation. That is why the contours that are currently under consideration are larger than those maps that were reviewed at the July 12th meeting. But all other assumptions are consistent and the scenarios are consistent in terms of comparing one to the other. Chairman Schaffer added that the non-addition rule is reflected in the 2004 maps.

Gerald Silver requested that the record clearly reflect his objection to his substitute motion not being recognized so that at a later date he can raise the objection to any subsequent motion because they were not following parliamentary procedures.

Harry Berg indicated that the Kansas City Part 150 Study established the 60 and 55 CNEL noise contours and all those lower noise contours for strictly land use management to stop building in these zones or to build compatible areas in these zones. He added that they would not change anything, just add more complexity to what is being done.

Phil Berg expressed concern that by adding more noise contours it is tantamount to the Part 150 Committee recognizing these other levels which in turn suggests some sort of comment as to what is expected to happen within these contours. As an example zone changes to make the land compatible with the airport. It might require that when someone makes permitted improvements to a bathroom that they also must install double pane windows.

Wayne Williams suggested an alternative approach, in addition to mitigation of soundproofing, would be to focus on other aspects that would eliminate noise at the airport, the types of aircraft, when they fly, and how much noise they make.

Rick Voorhis suggested that the prudent thing to do is to take a worst case type approach, as long as there is a reasonable basis. This would include some of the people who are complaining and who otherwise might be excluded from taking advantage of mitigation programs. The maps under consideration are defensible.

After extended discussion on procedure the motion to approve the noise exposure maps as presented, and identified as the ones that are to be submitted to the FAA, passed by a roll call vote of nine in favor and six opposed.

Gerald Silver made a motion that in addition to the maps referenced as baseline and the 2004 projection that both maps include the 60 and 55 CNEL contours. Wayne Williams seconded the motion.

Don Schultz expressed concern about the consequences of the motion. He suggested that making public through the FAA the 60 and 55 CNEL maps, over which the FAA has no power to remedy because they can only soundproof up to the 65 CNEL, would expose the general public to wide ramifications. Real estate agents could no longer deny that homes were in noise impacted areas because they would be on a noise exposure map. He suggested seeing the contours before any action was taken.

Susan Little suggested that such information would be helpful in a Part 161 process. She also indicated that this was something that the public should have an opportunity to comment upon in terms of opening themselves up to possible further liability.

Chairman Schaffer questioned whether it was feasible to do a map with these kinds of contours given the ambient noise from other sources.

Gerald Silver referred to a printed form that is used by the San Fernando Board of Realtors to explicitly recognize the noise problem from both Burbank and Van Nuys Airports. He also suggested that there is a discussion among the FAA and numerous cities throughout the country to revise the 65 CNEL Contour down to 60. After further committee discussion Mr. Silver amended his motion to reflect that a second map would be generated for internal purposes with the 60 and 55 CNEL contours added.

Chairman Schaffer open the discussion on the motion for public input.

Dominique Bakewell questioned whether the maps were going to be made available to the public. The maps that were posted on the wall of the meeting room were referenced.

Charles Brink suggested that the additional contours were needed to demonstrate the impact on homes outside the 65 CNEL. He indicated that the additional contour maps should be done without the Fly Friendly program.

Mr. Rodine questioned whether adding the 55 CNEL would add any illumination to the discussion. He suggested that it would carry the line for aircraft activity beyond a point at which it has any relevance, because the 55 CNEL for aircraft goes into areas where the ambient noise level is even higher.

Jon Rodgers said he wanted to reaffirm the statement that the FAA cannot fund beyond the 65 CNEL and airport funds cannot be commingled for that purpose.

Jan Schneider stated, in reference to the Fly Friendly Program, that anyone who flies over her house is not flying friendly at all and that the aircraft noise causes sleep deprivation.

Raul Ruelas concurred with the previous speaker that there is no Fly Friendly.

Chairman Schaffer closed the discussion for public input on the motion.

Gerald Silver indicated that his motion dealt with contour maps predicated on the CNEL metric and not single event decibel readings. He also stated that it was implicit in his motion that tabular information on the number of acres, dwellings and population within the contours would be provided. He suggested that there was nothing to prevent the airport from going beyond the 65 CNEL even if federal funding was not available.

Chairman Schaffer questioned whether what was being discussed was feasible to develop. Maury Laham indicated that 60 and 55 contour lines could be produced. However, land use data within those contours might be more difficult and that reliance would need to be placed on generalized land use data from SCAG.

Rick Voorhis questioned the purpose of spending staff resources to come up with a map until there is a purpose for what those numbers actually mean and what is going to be done with them. Otherwise it is an exercise in futility.

After extended discussion on the applicability of the motion the question was called. Chairman Schaffer summarized the motion as asking staff to prepare would be maps that delineate a 60 and 55 CNEL contour line that would not be submitted to the FAA but would be used for whatever purposes this committee chooses to use that information. It would include land use acreage and tabular information. Motion passed by a roll call vote of nine in favor and six opposed.

Gerald Silver suggested that a vote be taken to elect a chairman.

Sandor Winger indicated that the subject was not on the agenda and therefore could not be addressed under the Brown Act. He suggested discussion begin on agenda item 3.

Chairman Schaffer pointed out that at the meeting in July Harry Berg made a motion to approve the original 28 noise mitigation measures and that motion was deferred until this meeting. He indicated the motion is on the table and open for discussion.

Gerald Silver referenced the letter he submitted dated October 12<sup>th</sup> concerning the Noise Compatibility Program. He reiterated sections of his letter including the need to have a cap on Stage 3 aircraft, equalization of helicopter routes and top of the runway departure policy.

After discussion on the need to table the matter until a subsequent meeting a motion was made to adjourn. Motion failed on a roll call vote of 10 opposed and five in favor.

Wayne Williams indicated his opposition to measure # 10 which calls for an analysis of the feasibility of routing helicopter flights after 9 PM to over the flood control basin. He requested this measure be removed from the 28 measures to be voted upon because it would lead to increased noise from flights over homes south of the flood control basin.

Deuk Perrin questioned why a measure that calls for an analysis of the feasibility of routes necessarily all of a sudden included a measure that's going to direct helicopter operations over the homes south of the flood control basin. He indicated that the measure only calls for a study to be done.

After extensive discussion on measure #10 Gerald Silver offered a friendly amendment to remove #10 from immediate discussion on the motion to adopt the 28 mitigation measures, leaving it open for #10 to be considered at some future time. Harry Berg agreed to the amendment and the motion was amended to reflect all measures except #10. Discussion ensued on whether to also delete or amend measure #17 from the motion. Prior to any action on that consideration Chairman Schaffer opened the discussion for public input.

Charles Brink suggested that several other measures in the 28 noise mitigation measures should be removed because they deal with helicopter routes or land use issues.

Jon Rodgers stated that the Air Traffic Control does not function to abate noise. Its purpose is to separate aircraft traffic and to give clearances to pilots on which direction to fly.

Dominique Bakewell questioned why the money that was allocated for sound insulation couldn't be used for other purposes such as mufflers for Stage 2 aircraft.

David Rankell urged that measure # 10 be deleted.

Jim Wildman urged that serious consideration be given to leaving measure # 10 in.



Jan Schneider questioned why the noise abatement measures were only on departures and not on landings. She inquired about noise complaint procedures, which were discussed.

Raul Ruelas questioned why restrictions could not be placed on arrivals.

Chairman Schaffer closed the issue for public comment and asked whether there was any further committee discussion on the motion.

Don Schultz requested the motion be amended to also delete measure #11. Harry Berg declined to accept the amendment. The question was called and the motion passed on a roll call vote of 14 in favor and zero opposed.

Don Schultz moved to delete item #11 from the 28 conditions. Motion was seconded and opened for public discussion.

Charles Brink suggested item #12 be looked at carefully and that it should be added also.

Chairman Schaffer closed the public comment. The question was called and the motion to delete item # 11 passed on a roll call vote of 13 in favor and one opposed.

Gerald Silver moved to adjourn and the motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Chairman Schaffer opened the meeting for final public input. Hearing none he declared the meeting adjourned at 10:17 PM.

T:\ENVMGT\2000\00397DQ\PCDOCS\176439v1

Minutes  
FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Thursday, January 11, 2001

A meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Study Steering Committee was convened at 7:05 p.m., January 11, 2001, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mark Schaffer, a member of the Board of Airport Commissioners and Chairman of the VNY Part 150 Steering Committee, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members were present:

Mark Schaffer, Chair	Tom Henry	Laura Shell
Harry Berg	Bob Jackson	Gerald Silver
Phil Berg	Harold Lee	Rick Voorhis
Ken Curry	Susan Little	Wayne Williams
Lori Fernand (replaced Susan Little)	Deuk Perrin	Sandor Winger
Morrie Goldman	Don Schultz	

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

James Acosta	Kenneth Millman	Mary Rawlings
George Anisman (resigned 11/13/2000)		Alma Vorst

APPROVAL of MINUTES for November 8, 2000.

A motion was made by Don Schultz and seconded by Harry Berg to approve the minutes for November 8, 2000. Motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION on the NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM (NCP)

Chairman Schaffer referred to correspondence that was sent to each committee member requesting their suggestions for additional items to be included in the NCP. Items received in response that can be used for reference in the discussions included a letter from Gerald Silver, dated 12/21/2000, a memo from Maurice Laham, dated 9/21/2000, and a letter from Congressman Brad Sherman, dated 2/9/2001. Prior to Committee discussion Chairman Schaffer requested Bret Lobner, from the City Attorney's Office, to give a presentation on the requirements of a Part 150 Study compared to items that would require a Part 161 study.

Gerald Silver requested to make a point of personal privilege. He referred to a copy of the Burbank Airport's Part 150 update as a thoughtful analysis. He requested that comments from Mr. Lobner and others be an antecedent to a thoughtful discussion of his letter.

Bret Lobner indicated that the regulations pertaining to Part 150 and Part 161 are found in Title 14 of the Federal Regulations and are quite different. Part 150 is essentially comprised of two parts, a Noise Exposure Map(s) and a Noise Compatibility Program. This program requires the input of all those effected by the proposals in the Study including the FAA, local governments, residents and home owner groups, pilots and other users of the airport. The Part 150 program provides for

federal money to be made available, upon adoption of the Study, for such projects as soundproofing.

Part 161 is predicated on the idea that the Federal Government should review all noise and access restrictions proposed at airports. It is divided into two parts dealing with Stage 2 and Stage 3 aircraft. The distinction is that those local regulations proposed by an airport, which would affect Stage 3 aircraft, require the consent by the FAA. Whereas, local airport regulations proposed for Stage 2 aircraft require no such consent. An economic study that compares the noise benefits to the cost of proposed regulations is required for either Stage.

Chairman Schaffer indicated that he wanted the overview by Mr. Lobner to set the background for how this portion of the meeting would be conducted. He proposed making a distinction between those elements of Mr. Silver's letter that would require a Part 161 analysis from those that would not and to treat them separately. He also stated that he agreed with Mr. Silver that all of the items in his letter deserve discussion. He requested that Mr. Lobner identify each measure as to whether a Part 161 analysis is applicable.

Wayne Williams suggested that Mr. Silver had already made inference in a number of the measures in his letter as to whether a Part 161 was applicable. He questioned whether the Committee could discuss each item and bring Mr. Lobner in when needed. He expressed concern that certain items may be set aside without further discussion.

Chairman Schaffer responded that it was his intention to have a discussion on each and every one of the items. It was simply a matter of which to discuss first and which second.

Don Schultz suggested that Mr. Lobner's interpretation of the Part 150 and Part 161 regulations were an attorney's representation and Mr. Silver's interpretation was based on his research into other Part 150 Studies. It was up to the committee to review each item being proposed and to vote on each of them.

Sandor Winger indicated that there will be differences of opinion on what constitutes a Part 150 or a Part 161 but that his preference is to have the lead of counsel on which items are Part 150. He agreed that the Part 161 related items cannot be ignored and that they must be set for consideration at a later time.

Gerald Silver indicated the importance of completing a Part 150 first is to get federal funding for a Part 161. He stated he had no problem in prioritizing the order the items are taken. He suggested that it was crucial to look at other airports and that it is important to look at each of the measures prior to being sent to the FAA.

Chairman Schaffer suggested that the Committee consider the items that are clearly within the ambit of the Part 150 and then consider separately those items that are within the ambit of a Part 161 Study. The Committee can then make recommendations on each to the Board of Airport Commissioners. He requested to hear the sense of the group on how to proceed.

Gerald Silver stated that Mr. Lobner represents one point of view and not the only point of view. He said he was not convinced that putting aside the Part 161 related measures for later analysis was in agreement with the FAA's thrust of a Part 150 Study. He suggested that the Committee hear from the public on the issue.

Sandor Winger made a motion to follow the lead of the Chairman in allowing Mr. Lobner, the Committee's counsel, to identify those items first that are Part 150 and later those items that are

Part 161 for discussion. Harry Berg seconded the motion. Prior to discussion by the Committee on the motion Chairman Schaffer opened for public input.

Jim Wilder referenced proposals to equalize the distribution of flight tracks for aircraft using VNY. He indicated that pilots at Sky Harbor Airport in Phoenix were directed to fly over the Salt river which normally does not have water in it and therefore provides good dispersion of noise. Similarly, an airport in New Jersey has rivers and swamp land adjacent to it over which pilots fly to take advantage of their natural sound dispersal. He suggested that there was an analogous situation at VNY where flight tracks should be directed over the flood control basin south of the airport to utilize the natural sound dispersal there.

Charles Brink referenced the FAA's Part 150 checklist for measures that can be considered in a Noise Compatibility Study including capacity limits based on noise, landings based on the time of day, and landing fees based on weight or noise. He suggested the Committee would not fulfill its obligation if it did not review these measures. He said the FAA's web site for the checklist was: [WWW.FAA.GOV/ARP/APP600/14CFR150/NCPLIST.HTML](http://WWW.FAA.GOV/ARP/APP600/14CFR150/NCPLIST.HTML).

Jan Schneider claimed that no one advertised this meeting. She suggested it was necessary to advertise the meeting in order to get input from the public.

David Rankell expressed his disappointment that the advertising for the meeting was in the classifieds and suggested that Los Angeles area residents are being deceived.

Don Dufford suggested that an airport influence area be established and that it was wrong to allow residential housing to be developed in areas such as the nursery north of the airport which should have been left as open area.

Chairman Schaffer closed the public input portion and opened the discussion up to the Committee on the motion on the floor. Wayne Williams suggested the motion be repeated and Chairman Schaffer stated that the motion was that the Committee seek advice from Mr. Lobner as to which items would require a Part 161 and those items that do not, which would be addressed first. Sandor Winger indicated that Mr. Lobner identify which are Part 150, which are Part 161, and that the Committee take the lead for the Part 150 items first. He further clarified the motion to allow Mr. Silver to either concur or not concur with what Mr. Lobner identifies as Part 150 or Part 161.

Phil Berg indicated that several of the items in Mr. Silver's letter are already incorporated in the Part 150 Study. He suggested that Mr. Laham review which ones of the Part 161 and which of the Part 150 are already duplicated in the existing Part 150.

Gerald Silver requested further clarification on what was going to be done. He indicated he had no problem with prioritizing whether a proposed measure was considered Part 150 or Part 161 but questioned whether every item would be discussed. Chairman Schaffer suggested each item would be discussed but rather than hashing around with the parliamentary distinctions he requested the motion be withdrawn and each item be dealt with one at a time. Sandor Winger yielded and withdrew the motion.

Wayne Williams seconded a motion to proceed, which passed by voice vote.

Phil Berg indicated that previous measures were reviewed by a Technical Committee. He made a motion that this Committee defer the items currently under consideration to a Technical Committee and a workshop unit with a roundtable discussion among the local community and aviation

interests to discuss the merits and before bringing them back to this Committee for a final vote. Don Schultz seconded the motion.

Extended Committee discussion ensued on whether it was desirable to create a Technical Committee and have it review each of the proposed measures or whether to proceed with review of each item by the Steering Committee. It was suggested that all of the items in Mr. Silver's letter had been considered by the previous Technical Committee and that it would unnecessarily delay the process to recreate the Technical Committee. The merits of each item could be discussed and then input could be received from the public.

Tom Henry made a substitute motion to have the Committee go thru each item and either vote to include it in the Part 150 Study, refer it to a Technical Committee or disapprove it. The substitute motion was seconded by Gerald Silver. Sandor Winger offered an amendment to the Substitute Motion to consider only the Part 150 related measures. Mr. Henry declined to accept the amendment. A question was referred to Bret Lobner, with the City Attorney's Office, on the difference between Part 150 and Part 161 related measures.

Bret Lobner stated that all of the measures could be included in the Part 150 even if they did require a Part 161 analysis. It would be up to the Committee to decide whether they chose to have those measures that require a Part 161 analysis to be included in the Part 150 or treated separately. Either approach would be acceptable. The important distinction to understand is that just because a measure that would require a Part 161 analysis is placed in the Part 150 it does not preclude the need to fulfill the requirements of the Part 161 regulations for that measure. He explained that any measure that would apply to an aircraft access or noise regulation would be subject to Part 161 requirements.

Chairman Schaffer indicated that the reason he thought it was appropriate to separate out the Part 161 related measures in the discussion was so that everyone was aware that such requirements would apply, even if the measure(s) were included in the Part 150 Study. This awareness might affect how a particular measure is viewed and thereby influence the acceptability of that measure. Gerald Silver seconded the amendment made to the substitute motion by Sandor Winger. Mr. Winger withdrew the amendment. The question on the substitute motion was called. Chairman Schaffer called for public input.

An unidentified speaker questioned whether there would be public input when a vote is taken on whether to include a measure, refer it to a Technical Committee, or disapprove it. Chairman Schaffer indicated that before acting on one of those three things the Committee would seek public comment. Public input session on the substitute motion was closed. The motion passed with a roll call vote of nine to seven. Sandor Winger asked for a reconsideration of the vote. The motion then failed on a roll call vote of eight to eight.

Phil Berg repeated the original motion was to take the 18 items proposed in Mr. Silver's letter and return them to a Technical Committee for review in the same manner as the other items were reviewed for this Part 150 Study to have an equal playing field. After discussion Mr. Berg agreed to expand the intent of his motion to include all measures that were suggested to the Committee, including those in Maurice Laham's memo dated 9/21/2000 and the one from Congressman Sherman, to also be forwarded to a Technical Committee. He also suggested that the Technical Committee would be the same type of Technical Committee that was established for the previous items reviewed for this Part 150.

The question on the motion was called. A roll call vote was taken on whether to end debate on the motion. The vote was 16 no and zero yes. Debate on the motion continued.

Lori Fernand suggested that in order to ensure a level playing field there should be some community representation on the Technical Committee.

Sandor Winger offered a substitute motion that the Committee adopt and recommend to the Board of Airport Commissioners all previously adopted measures and items 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 15 of Mr. Silver's letter dated 12/21/00. Don Schultz seconded the motion.

Wayne Williams moved to adjourn. Motion passed 13 yes, 2 no, and 1 abstention.

T:\ENV\MGT\2001\010066DQ\PCDOCS #178251 v1

Minutes  
FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, May 29, 2001

A meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Study Steering Committee was convened at 7:03 p.m., May 29, 2001, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mark Schaffer, a member of the Board of Airport Commissioners and Chairman of the VNY Part 150 Steering Committee, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members were present:

Mark Schaffer, Chair	Kenneth Millman	David Tierney (substituting for Lori Fernand)
Harry Berg	Deuk Perrin	
Phil Berg	Don Schultz	Rick Voorhis
Bob Jackson	Laura Shell	Wayne Williams
Harold Lee	Gerald Silver	

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

James Acosta	Tom Henry	Alma Vorst
Ken Curry	Mary Rawlings	Sandor Winger
Morrie Goldman		

APPROVAL of MINUTES for January 11, 2001.

A motion was made by Wayne Williams and seconded by Bob Jackson to approve the minutes for January 11, 2001. Motion passed by voice vote unanimously.

CONSIDERATION of MOTIONS CARRIED OVER from January 11, 20001

Chairman Schaffer referred to the Committee's Parliamentarian, Jim Stewart, in confirming that both motions carried over from the January 11, 2001 meeting were on the table and could be acted upon. He indicated that the substitute motion should be considered first.

Wayne Williams made a substitute motion to move agenda item 3, Correspondence from Committee member Wayne Williams, to the beginning of the agenda and to be acted upon prior to the two motions on the table. Gerald Silver seconded the motion. Committee discussion focused on the desire to have an opportunity for the public to be able to hear all of the comments made by the Committee on each measure being considered. In addition, the public should be afforded the opportunity to provide comments on each measure. Chairman Schaffer suggested that the procedure be established for the Committee to

consider the block of 18 measures that staff recommended for adoption in the April 30, 2001 memo that was sent to the Committee. The remaining eight measures would then be considered one at a time. A further stipulation was made that if the 18 recommended measures were voted down that they would then be reconsidered individually. The maker of the motion agreed to this procedural approach. The question was called and the motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Discussion was opened on the amended substitute motion to adopt the block of 18 staff recommended measures. Chairman Schaffer repeated the 18 measures as numbered in the April 30, 2001 memo as follows: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26. The discussion was opened to public comment.

Charles Brink suggested that consideration of the motion would be a violation of the Brown Act because it wasn't on the agenda. He also said he thought it was arrogant to have a staff recommendation before public input. He referenced the FAA letter of March 2001 that indicated all of the proposed measures could be included in the Part 150 Study.

Muriel Kotin emphasized the importance that all of the items be voted upon including the curfew on non-emergency jets. She also advocated a phase out of Stage 2 jets and a cap.

Alan von Arx advocated the inclusion of the 60 and 55 dBA CNEL contours within the Part 150 Study. He acknowledged that the FAA has recommended against their inclusion because there is no statutory provisions requiring them to do so, but suggested that LAWA could adopt regulations to improve noise issues outside the 65 dB contour.

Joan Luchs indicated that all of the items should be discussed. She suggested that the Part 150 noise contour should be expanded in conjunction with the all night curfews. She requested that a balance be made between the economic issues and the fact that people don't want to buy homes in Hollywood Hills if a helicopter flies over and shakes the property.

Jan Shapiro referred to the ever burgeoning numbers of noisy jets and helicopters over the Cahuenga Pass. She suggested that effective and enforcing controls must be placed in the noise compatibility plan to address the problem.

Charles Hand suggested that while the proposal addresses the immediate area surrounding the airport it fails to address and consider the residents under the immediate flight paths. He inquired why his house was going to be worth \$10,000 less and that's a minimal benefit.

Sonia Brown indicated she was a member of school councils and a former T.V. reporter and a consultant to ABC News. She expressed her general concern about the schools in the vicinity of north of the airport and how the aircraft operations effect them.

Celestine Arnett stated she wanted to reiterate what the preceding speaker had said.



Chairman Schaffer closed the public session on that portion of the motion.

Laura Shell made a motion that in order to clarify the intent of each measure the words should and could will be changed to shall and will. Wayne Williams seconded the motion and it passed by voice vote unanimously.

Chairman Schaffer requested whether there was any further discussion by the Committee on the main motion. Hearing none, he requested a vote on the motion to adopt the 18 staff recommended measures, which passed unanimously by voice vote with no opposition. Discussion was initiated on the eight remaining measures under consideration.

Rick Voorhis posed a procedural question whether the two original motions (agenda items 1(a) and 1(b)) were still on the table. He indicated that the Committee had voted on one of the two motions and he inquired about what happens to motion 1(a). Chairman Schaffer responded that the Committee is dealing with the second half of the latest substitute motion or amended motion. The first half was to deal with the 18 measures, which was done by the Committee. The second half is to deal with the remaining eight measures that were not recommended. After discussion the consensus was to leave the two original motions on the table and proceed with addressing the eight remaining measures.

Gerald Silver suggested he explain what his intention was in measure # 5, which would establish a cap on Stage 3 aircraft based at VNY. He stated that there was no doubt in his mind that this measure would require a Part 161 Study and FAA approval because it involves Stage 3 jet operations. He referenced earlier documents that discussed an attrition of Stage 2 jets, which would be replaced by Stage 3's. He suggested that over time the increase in the number of Stage 3 jets would have a major impact on the noise contour.

Phil Berg indicated that this measure had already been addressed by the National Noise Policy of the early 1990's, which was established by the FAA, which identified that there wouldn't be any caps on Stage 3 aircraft. He suggested it was a waste of time to discuss it.

Wayne Williams said he realized that the FAA has said that this type of measure is off the table. However, because of the potential impacts from Stage 3 jets he thought it was important to send a message to the FAA to reconsider their position. He said he has had Stage 3 jets disrupt his conversation but has heard no sound from Stage 4 jets.

Rick Voorhis questioned what was a Stage 4 jet? Phil Berg stated he had never heard of a Stage 4 jet and suggested this is why it was a waste of time to discuss the measure because the FAA has already established the national policy on this.

Bob Jackson indicated that ICAO, the International Civil Aviation Organization, is discussing a possible Stage 4 but that is only a theoretical stage at this time.

Gerald Silver agreed that a Stage 4 jet doesn't exist today but there is a lot of pressure on manufacturers to go in that direction. He suggested that part of the thrust of the cap on Stage 3 is to encourage a look at Stage 4.

Don Schultz suggested that the Committee send the measure to the Board of Airport Commissioners and let them decide whether to pursue no action to the FAA. He said that if they don't hear from the Committee at all on this measure they may assume there is no community concern about adding an infinite number of Stage 3 jets and there is concern.

Chairman Schaffer said he understood the motivation of sending a message. But he was concerned that the message that goes out to the community is the wrong message, because it suggests that something can be done when he believes it cannot be done. He thought it is likely to lead to more frustration in the long run than it is to provide any positive benefit.

Kenneth Millman suggested the measure be opened for public comment.

Joan Luchs requested that the measure be sent to the BOAC and let them make the call. She indicated that without caps the contour and the area impacted would be increased.

Robert Rodine indicated that the exemption for Stage 3 aircraft was not simply an FAA regulation but an act of the Congress of the United States. He said it would be a mistake to include this measure and other recommendations would not be taken as seriously.

Charles Brink suggested that the measure would not ban all Stage 3 aircraft. If it were adopted it would place a limit on how many Stage 3 aircraft can be based at the airport.

Sonia Brown asked Phil Berg whether the Committee has anything to say about the number of aircraft that could be based at the airport. He said he did not believe so. Mr. Berg also suggested, in response to earlier comments by Ms Brown that the airport is not showing a profit, that it was the based aircraft that provides economic support for the airport and associated businesses. He indicated that if the based aircraft are continued to be eliminated it will result in aircraft coming to the airport to make noise but not leave any money.

Chairman Schaffer closed the public input portion of the discussion.

Deuk Perrin asked for staff input on whether the number of based aircraft can be limited. Maurice Laham indicated he did not believe they could be limited. He suggested the amount of land devoted for aviation purposes can be designated in a master plan, but an operator could not be told that he could have one big jet or three little ones in his hangar.

Kenneth Millman called for the question. The motion to adopt measure #5, to put a cap on Stage 3 based jets, was passed by a show of hands, 7 yes, 6 no.

Chairman Schaffer indicated that the next item was potential measure number six, whether to expand the Part 150 noise contours to include the 60 to 55 CNEL contours.

Gerald Silver indicated his intent for this measure was not to expand the noise contour soundproofing requirement. His intent was to try to change an FAA policy. He indicated that once a Part 150 is approved and the map is published it excludes residents within the 65 from suing for noise damages. The purpose is to identify those areas in the 55 and 60 contours to allow planners to look intelligently at the size of the contours.

Chairman Schaffer suggested that Mr Silver's objective is more relevant to the planning arm of the city and not the airport part of the city. He thought it would be appropriate to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission that they look at those other contour lines.

Maurice Laham responded to a question about the difficulty in generating a 60 and 55 CNEL stating that the contours get so large that they take in noise generated by the freeways and it's difficult to distinguish freeway noise from airplane noise. He added that the downside is to publish them in newspapers as an official record because when real estate is sold it has to be disclosed that it is in a sound problem area. Thousands of homeowners would be notified they have a sound problem over which nobody is going to spend any money to correct it. This would cause considerable problems in the real estate market.

Chairman Schaffer opened the discussion to public comment

Robert Michelin indicated that when he bought a house it would have been helpful to have a contour map. He said it probably wouldn't have changed his decision, but he could have seen how much of a problem this is. He said it's very clear that the Committee is not trying to fool anybody that they're going to get soundproofing.

Joan Luchs suggested that the Planning Department makes their decision based on information that's given to them by people that do the studies. They don't do the studies themselves. She stated the Planning Department doesn't have the resources to do it and depends on the public to give them the information. Even though it may not be a noise problem now, it's a basis for comparison in the future and it's the appropriate jurisdiction.

Robert Flamer indicated he thought it was important to find out just how far out the 60 and the 55 CNEL goes. He suggested it was important to understand how far-reaching the noise intrusion is, not just in the area of Van Nuys but stretching out throughout the entire Valley.

Charles Brink indicated that from his reading of technical journals the computer program can be designed to eliminate other steady state noises such as the freeway. He said he wanted to know how many people are affected in the 60 and he would be perfectly happy with the 60 CNEL map without the 55.

Allan von Arx indicated jets departing to the north in recent years have a tendency to bank to the northwest over his house. He suggested that these types of maps could show whether there is a shift in the contours, if they are updated from time to time, and maybe recognize there is a problem with early turns banking to the northwest.

Florence Riggs said she was a singing teacher. She said this is what she does during the day and she sang. She then sang while rattling silverware and said that's a plane going over.

Robert Rodine suggested the ambient noise for people living along Victory Boulevard is greater than a lot of aircraft going out of here. He also suggested that most of the noise is an annoyance rather than a significant impairment to human activity.

Barbara Hand indicated it's not an annoyance. She said that when some of those planes go over it awakens her grandchild. She said it has destroyed her way of life and to do the 55 and 60 because everybody has a right to know the level of sound is where they're living.

Kenneth Millman called for the question and the vote passed to call the question.

Chairman Schaffer requested a vote on the motion to add item number six to the approved list of NCP items by a raise of hands. The motion failed with six yes and seven no.

Chairman Schaffer made a comment about item number seven that the recommendation was to not include it in recognition of other existing measures that address the apparent intent.

Gerald Silver referenced an FAA publication issued in 1984 that proposed voluntary practices by pilots to avoid noise sensitive areas. He suggested it could be initiated by an airport operator and the locations would be published in a NOTAMS.

Committee discussion ensued on the difficulties involved in identifying where the noise sensitive areas would be located. It was also questioned to what outer extent from the airport the noise sensitive areas might be established. It was noted that studies had been done in the past to determine how noise sensitive areas could be avoided. It was concluded that the primary means of minimizing impact to these areas was to attempt to concentrate flight paths over the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin, the freeways and the industrial areas.

Chairman Schaffer opened the discussion for public comment.

Joan Luchs suggested the aircraft are suppose to fly over the freeway but they don't. She said they not only fly at 5:00 in the morning, they fly 2:00 in the morning on the other end.

Wendy Weiss reiterated what Joan Luchs said. She expressed concern that more be done to compromise some of the noise issues.

Marco Pereira question whether there was a way of knowing what is the altitude of aircraft flying out of the airport. Phil Berg responded that the airport has a noise monitoring system which includes the altitude and track of where they're flying.

Jon Rodgers questioned whether it was appropriate to use the noise monitoring equipment for the fly friendly program. He suggested that even though it is a voluntary program the letters that are sent to violators, which are based on information from the noise monitoring system, are very demeaning and threatening because of the implication of all of the nasty things that are going to happen. The FAA does not approve the use of noise monitors in enforcing any type of a preset noise threshold, whether it's voluntary or otherwise.

Charles Brink suggested that to argue the entire valley is a uniform sensitivity to noise is not appropriate. He said there are industrial areas and areas close to freeways and freeways are a sizable source of constant noise. He stated that putting on power at 3,000 feet is an excellent idea and the information should be published so pilots can respond voluntarily.

Taroe Li stated she had to pause her phone conversations from interference from aircraft flying overhead. She can be in the middle of a big business deal and lose the whole momentum. It's interfering with her ability to make money and prosper. She asked whether anyone has ever heard of the concept of mufflers on aircraft.

Joanna Drury suggested that planes flying overhead are not necessarily so loud that she can't carry on a conversation but it's an interruption. She said the frequency of planes has increased in recent years.

David Rankel said item seven should be adopted. He said the noise is much less next to the airport than it is in the region of Ventura and Sepulveda three miles south of the airport.

Chairman Schaffer closed the public portion of the discussion.

Don Schultz suggested the Committee may be going down a slippery slope if it were to adopt the proposed measure. He indicated that there was a certain group tonight complaining about noise. A few years ago it was a different group of people and a few years from now there would probably be another area represented. To establish a noise sensitive area in one location could result in shifting the noise to another area and so on.

Rick Voorhis called for the question. The question was called by a hand vote.

Chairman Schaffer asked for all those in favor of adding item number seven to the list of recommended NCP items, signify by raising your hand. The motion was defeated five in favor and eight opposed.

Phil Berg moved to adjourn and Rick Voorhis seconded the motion. Motion passed with two opposed. Meeting was adjourned at 9:50 PM.

Minutes  
FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Thursday, June 21, 2001

A meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Study Steering Committee was convened at 7:10 p.m., June 21, 2001, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mark Schaffer, a member of the Board of Airport Commissioners and Chairman of the VNY Part 150 Steering Committee, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members were present:

Mark Schaffer, Chair	Harold Lee	Gerald Silver
Harry Berg	Don Schultz	Rick Voorhis
Bob Jackson		

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

James Acosta	Tom Henry	Laura Shell
Phil Berg	Kenneth Millman	Alma Vorst
Ken Curry	Deuk Perrin	Wayne Williams
Lori Fernand	Mary Rawlings	Sandor Winger
Morrie Goldman		

There was no quorum and the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 pm

Minutes  
FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Monday, July 16, 2001

A meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Study Steering Committee was convened at 7:05 p.m., July 16, 2001, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mark Schaffer, a member of the Board of Airport Commissioners and Chairman of the VNY Part 150 Steering Committee, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members were present:

Mark Schaffer, Chair	Harold Lee	Gerald Silver
Harry Berg	Kenneth Millman	David Tierney
Phil Berg	Deuk Perrin	Rick Voorhis
Morrie Goldman	Don Schultz	Wayne Williams
Tom Henry	Laura Shell	Sandor Winger
Bob Jackson		

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

James Acosta	Mary Rawlings	Alma Vorst
Ken Curry		

APPROVAL of MINUTES for May 29, 2001 and June 21, 2001

A motion was made by Gerald Silver and seconded by another member (not identified) of the Steering Committee to approve the minutes of May 29, 2001 and June 21, 2001. Motion passed by voice vote unanimously.

CONTINUED CONSIDERATION of 26 PROPOSED MEASURES

The discussion was opened on agenda item 2(a), proposed measure # 10 of 26, which would equalize aircraft departure routes. Gerald Silver noted that he distributed materials to each of the Steering Committee members including letters from himself, Kenneth Millman, and Congressman Sherman. David Tierney of Congressman Sherman's Office expressed concern about whether votes should be taken on the measures at tonight's meeting in lieu of the recent city election. Chairman Schaffer stated that the process of the Part 150 Study had been going on for 12 years and with all due respect he would like to complete the process.

Gerald Silver moved to postpone the issues that are on the table and to not consider items that are on the current agenda at tonight's meeting. The motion was seconded by Kenneth Millman. After discussion on the main motion on the floor, the substitute motion and the motion to postpone a roll call vote was taken on the motion to postpone. The motion failed with four yes and 12 no. The discussion on measure # 10 was opened to the public.

Jim Wildman stated that the airport is surrounded on three sides except for a narrow strip of industrial on the east. It is wide open to the south, the Sepulveda flood control basin, where most departures occur. He indicated the measure should not even be considered.

Jon Rodgers suggested the measure was the same as a preferential runway use program. He indicated that it would involve enormous safety implications and opposed it.

Terry Stone asked for an explanation of the measure. Gerald Silver referred to a colored map prepared by the City Planning Department with various land uses. He said the purpose of the measure was to bring to the table a discussion about routes. David Tierney said the departure routes are not equally distributed, therefore impacting equally the communities.

Carol Medof said it isn't fair to distribute the noise over everyone because everyone's bothered. Also, it's not fair to have a resident of Encino have a thousand planes going over every day. You can't sleep, talk, think or take a nap. She supported the measure.

David Rankell suggested it is fair to distribute the noise through different departure routes and not put the burden all on the north or the south where the runways are located.

The public comment period on this item was ended and committee discussion began.

Deuk Perrin suggested the maker of the motion give their reason for the measure followed a staff explanation for their recommendation.

Maurice Laham said he'd like to break up the jet aircraft from the helicopters. He indicated that helicopters use the Stagg Street departure to the east and to the extent possible fly over compatible land uses. The jets take off to the south because of the wind and the flood control basin absorbs a lot of the sound. He said the jet and propeller aircraft should depart along flight paths that are consistent with the direction they're going.

Wayne Williams suggested the measure is talking about 100% of helicopters departing south. He said the helicopter noise should be spread around.

Robert Jackson described the helicopter route structure including Stagg Street West, Stagg Street East, Bull Creek South, Bull Creek North, and the Tracks Northwest. He said it is very misleading to make the statement that all the helicopters go south. They do not.



Phil Berg said that he had been involved for many years with studies to determine the best helicopter tracks with the intent of avoiding residential areas. He said most complaints were related to police and fire helicopters and police helicopters fly low as a visual deterrent to criminals. He suggested the helicopter routes, that are currently established, are pretty much evenly based on where the populace is located to the east and south. Helicopters don't necessarily go north and west because business is not in that direction. He believed that the routes today for helicopters are the best routes possible for this high-density area.

Kenneth Millman indicated that no matter what direction a helicopter takes off it can easily make a u-turn and go in the opposite direction. He didn't think mandating them going in one direction would really help because they generally go wherever they want to.

Don Schultz stated that there are six helicopter routes that evenly distribute the noise. Police and fire cannot be regulated and most helicopter routes are not really regulated. They are recommended routes that the helicopter pilots use. He indicated 80% of jet takeoffs are to the south. It would be irresponsible to say that they should use other routes. The areas east and west of the airport get the most takeoff and landing noise because aircraft are at the lowest. To the south the aircraft climb higher and the 65 CNEL footprint ends at the Sepulveda Basin. He said this is a poor measure and should be voted down.

Sandor Winger called for the question. The question was called by a hand vote with 10 in favor and five opposed. Chairman Schaffer said there should be a roll call vote on the measure. The measure was not approved with 11 no, two yes, and three abstained.

Discussion was begun on agenda item 2(b), proposed measure # 13 of 26, which would establish an airport influence area. Gerald Silver stated he introduced this measure because of the complaints from residents outside of the 65 CNEL. He indicated that jets flying under the fly neighborly program will reduce the amount of thrust to minimize the noise within the 65 CNEL. He suggested that once they have left the monitoring area they then give more thrust, which essentially shifts the noise outside of the 65. The purpose of the measure is not to increase the number of homes subject to soundproofing. The purpose is to create an awareness among the airport and operators that there are noise concerns.

Maurice Laham stated that the professional parliamentarian set the rules for this meeting and the thought the last motion was inconsistent with his determination. He indicated an influence area is a very confused concept that would place a cloud on a person's property. He said the federal government established the 65 CNEL as a discrete noise descriptor that everyone understands including the mortgage lender and the mortgage taker. He questioned where an influence area would stop observing that one man's noise is another man's music. He suggested it would put a cloud on property that would be depreciated in value with no remediation in terms of soundproofing or anything else. It's a bad idea.

Deuk Perrin questioned the author of the measure whether he had any specific land use measures in mind. Gerald Silver responded that the City Planning Department would be able to make changes in their zoning and their land use patterns.

The discussion was opened to public input.

Robert Rodine said he was opposed to the proposed measure because an area of influence based on complaints would be very subjective. Scientists recognized that with noise metrics there would be some complaints, even at 65 CNEL, and the proof is here. There are people who are here complaining in spite of the fact that a substantial portion of the community is not here and is not complaining. Science should be relied upon and not complaints.

Terry Stone said she lives one block west of the 65 CNEL and doesn't give a rat's ass where they put it. If the measure passes it will acknowledge she has problems with noise.

Sonja Brown indicated that jets and helicopters fly over the playground of the school she represents north of VNY. She suggested that the mitigation measures that have been passed so far do not address the concerns or the quality of life at our schools and the PTA and schools in our area will oppose all of the directions these measures are proposing.

Jon Rodgers indicated there are some areas where someone has only filed one or two complaints in five or six years and there are some people who have filed several thousand complaints in one or two years. He questioned how you could tell the difference between these. He suggested a noise complaint map be provided to the real estate community with the locations of all complaints and available to people buying property. He said the names, addresses and telephone numbers of those making noise complaints should be public records available to anybody buying property so they can decide whether the complaints are real.

David Rankell suggested the Committee's votes define whether a member is pro airport or pro homeowner. He repeated the phrase "shame on you" to about nine members of the Committee. He said it's an atrocity that they don't care about the future of Los Angeles.

The Committee Chairman closed the public input for the measure under consideration.

Gerald Silver suggested that the Airport Land Use Commission is not effective or the nursery north of VNY would not have been destroyed. He said the measure should be supported because it does not cost anything and doesn't require more land use requirements.

Rick Voorhis indicated an Airport Influence Area would supposedly result in changing the zoning in that area. He referenced one of the most memorable meetings during the 12 years of the Part 150 Study was the night that 300 angry residents came out because they thought their neighborhood was going to be rezoned. He opposed the measure because he didn't want to penalize specific neighborhoods based on who might make noise complaints.

Laura Shell indicated the measure is relatively vague in terms of how an influence area would be defined. She suggested deferring action on this item so that different possibilities could be examined on how an influence area could be defined based on percentage of complaints or noise levels around the airport. Kenneth Millman seconded the motion. Committee discussion ensued on the pro's and con's of deferring action on the measure. Motion failed with seven yes, eight no and one abstention.

Sandor Winger said that while he was chairman of the VNY Citizens Advisory Council for eight years he looked at the noise complaints every month. He indicated that the significant amount of calls were from a mathematically insignificant amount of people. Of 200 calls about 150 came from two or three families. If the influence area were based on phone calls all one would have to do is keep dialing the phone, and it would be used by people, just used by people. Therefore, he urged that the Committee vote no on the measure.

Tom Henry indicated that the measure was very vague but he was in favor of the spirit of what is trying to be accomplished. His concern was that planning departments can plan land uses in ways that a community may not want. He suggested there should be a nationwide look at extending the CNEL patterns beyond where they are now. He urged a no vote.

Harold Lee moved to call the question on the measure, which passed 10 to six. The measure to adopt item 2(b) on the agenda, #13 of 26, which would create an Airport Influence Area, failed on a roll call vote of two yes, 12 no and one abstention.

Kenneth Millman moved to suspend the Robert's Rules of Order on the call of vote until everybody has had a chance to speak. Tom Henry seconded the motion with an amendment to have a chance to speak once. Motion passed on a roll call vote of 12 yes and three no.

Committee discussion commenced on agenda item 2(C), #15 of 26, Provision for a Noise Abatement Officer. Sandor Winger moved to amend the motion to adopt this measure by removing the words "implementation of the NCP and ongoing noise compatibility planning effort". An unidentified member of the Steering committee seconded the motion.

The discussion was opened for public input.

Jim Wildman said he recalled noise complaints over aircraft being made at least 50 years ago. He indicated the measure was ambiguous about who the noise abatement officer would report to and that he should have the power to instigate fines against aircraft operators.

David Rankell listed several member names of the Steering Committee.

The public comment period was closed.

Tom Henry asked who does have the authority, is it the General Manager of the Airports?

Maurice Laham said it's the executive director, Lydia Kennard, who has the authority to implement the NCP, through her staff which have divided and separate responsibility. It's all coordinated with the Vans Nuys Airport Manager and the Noise Control Officer.

The motion to amend the measure passed by a vote of 14 yes, 1 no.

The motion to adopt the amended measure, #15 of 26, passed 15 yes and 0 no.

David Tierney moved to adjourn the meeting and Gerald Silver seconded the motion. The motion did not carry with a roll call vote of five yes and 10 no.

Discussion was initiated on agenda item 2(d), proposed measure #17 of 26, which would ratify Resolution 13369 passed by the Airport Commission on October 2, 1982.

Gerald Silver described the history of the airport and its relationship to the Resolution. He said in the 1970's most aircraft at VNY were general aviation including air taxis and charter that were usually less than 12,500 pounds. In the ensuing years the size of air taxis and charter went into the class of Lears and Gulfstreams and many of these were 75,000 pounds in weight. In the mid 1980's an effort was initiated to reaffirm a previous policy to maintain the airport as non-commercial with no scheduled airlines and increasing the weight definition of taxis and charters from 12,500 pounds to 75,000 pounds. He suggested that the airport management would subject such a reaffirmation to an environmental assessment. He said the proposed measure would restate Resolution 13369, passed October 2, 1982.

Maurice Laham stated that the Board of Airport Commissioners rejected challenges by airlines in the 1970's to make VNY a commercial airport. They affirmed that air charters, air taxis, and business jets could operate here but there wouldn't be scheduled commercial air carrier traffic. He indicated that the FAA at that time had a definition of air charter and air taxi as being 12,500 pounds. He suggested that was the definition our Board used to differentiate between scheduled commercial air traffic and air charters and air taxis. The FAA now defined them as being up to 60 seats and calls them business air charter aircraft. Also, that policy was never sent to City Council to be an ordinance and had no force of law. Staff recommends no on the proposed measure and that the FAA's current definition be used instead of the one they started 30 years ago and have since discarded.

Don Schultz indicated that the City Attorney had stated that the Resolution was not enforceable because it did not become an ordinance. He said he would like to see the Resolution enforced but that times have changed to where it's not going to work.

Discussion on the proposed measure was opened to public input.

Robert Rodine indicated the 12,500 pound limit was not the way to achieve the intent of the measure. When it was adopted 12,500 pound aircraft were very, very noisy. Today there are many aircraft that weigh well in excess of 12,500 pounds that are substantially quieter

than aircraft at the time of adoption of the Resolution. He suggested that the economic impact of such a measure would be very significant and he urged it be rejected.

Lisa Busch from Councilwoman Miscikowski's Office indicated that just because the proposed measure would require a Part 161 Study should not stop people from voting for it.

Jon Rodgers suggested this measure was a scheme to shift noise. He questioned who's going to make the deal with people to accept the noise that people don't like here.

David Rankell suggested that the airport was trying to hide this measure and he repeated the names of several members of the Steering Committee and asked for their yes vote.

The public comment period for this measure was closed.

Wayne Williams questioned what the weight limit was currently in place at LAX and ONT for Stage 2 aircraft. Maurice Laham indicated for business jets under 75,000 pounds at LAX and ONT there are no stage 2 prohibitions. For commercial jets they're all stage 3.

Phil Berg stated that the FAA in the National Noise Policy established noise criteria. Aircraft less than 75,000 pounds that were stage 2 could continue to operate. Stage 2 aircraft greater than 75,000 pounds could not operate.

Tom Henry indicated he would vote yes on the measure because the original Resolution was not acted upon by the City Council. He suggested the Commission should reevaluate it.

Rick Voorhis said the proposed measure was bad policy because it assumes there is a correlation between the weight of an aircraft and its noise level and that is false. There are business jets under 12,500 pounds that are the noisiest jets out there and larger aircraft that are much more quiet. He said this is a noise study not a weight study.

Gerald Silver said there are a growing number of businesses that are buying aircraft known as fractional ownership such as 737's. He said there should be limits on fractional ownerships. He questioned what the difference was between a resolution and an ordinance and suggested that according to case law there is very little difference between the two.

Bob Jackson said the 12,500 pounds is a ceremonial number that the FAA uses and was applicable in the 1940's and 1950's. He said the FAA does not recognize it anymore.

Gerald Silver moved to adjourn the meeting and the motion was seconded by David Tierney. Motion failed by a roll call vote of five yes and 10 no.

Motion to adopt item 2(d) on the agenda, proposed measure #17 of 26, to reaffirm Resolution 13369, failed with a roll call vote of seven yes and nine no.

David Tierney moved to adjourn the meeting and Wayne Williams seconded the motion. The motion failed with a roll call vote of seven yes and eight no.

Discussion was initiated on agenda item 2(e), #18 of 26, a total night-time curfew, between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM, on all jet operations, both departures and arrivals.

Gerald Silver indicated that certain members of the public were under the apprehension that a curfew meant no arrivals and no departures during evening hours. He said residents complain bitterly. The measure will require a Part 161 Study since it involves stage 3 aircraft. He said the measure will have a de minimis impact on the economy. He suggested that the airport is surrounded virtually on most sides by residential properties. And, one or two jets at night departing, though they be stage 3, can create an enormous problem.

Maurice Laham indicated that aircraft have to be able to land somewhere if they have a problem. So, it's totally irresponsible to have a rule that your runway's closed. Under the existing curfew no aircraft can be depart between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM that's louder than 74 dBA. That is actually quieter than some of the stage 3 jets. He suggested we have a fair and an equitable rule in place. He said he agreed that the proposed measure would a minimal effect economically because so few airplanes arrive and depart during those hours.

Discussion on the proposed measure was opened to public input

Robert Rodine referred to a meeting he attended where a lady said, in regard to the life flights that are conducted out of primarily Clay Lacy Aviation, "I don't care what those aircraft are carrying. I don't want them anymore." He suggested that when people express concern about the economic well being of the community we're characterized as being heartless and indifferent. He stated that there is no greater indifference to human life than the comment made by that lady. He questioned why, if the number of flights going out of this airport is negligible, then why is there such a public uproar about those flights.

Mat Mulqueen (Mr. Quintan) said he lived under the flight pattern, so to speak, just west of Hayvenhurst. He suggested if jets were eliminated between 10 and 7 it is not a bad thing.

Albert Mass said he lived in Encino and was irritated by the jet noise. He said he would like the curfew to be from 9 PM to 8 AM. Emergency aircraft should land wherever they can.

David Rankell suggested Chairman Schaffer had failed him and done nothing to help with the airport. He indicated he should resign from this Board.

Jon Rodgers said he was involved with a proposed curfew at Oakland Airport that would have been from 10 PM to 7 AM. He indicated that it was prompted because of multiple flights routinely departing at 3 AM. The reason these aircraft had to leave so early was to accommodate the curfews that existed in Tokyo and Seoul. The idea was dropped there.

The public comment period on this measure was closed.

David Tierney questioned how many departures were there during the proposed curfew period? Maurice Laham estimated four a night and about the same number of arrivals.

Morrie Goldman asked if there was a curfew and someone had an emergency would they still be able to land. Maurice Laham indicated that they would.

Rick Voorhis indicated that the proposed measure would discriminate against jets during the curfew period while allowing helicopter and propeller aircraft to operate. He questioned whether the FAA would permit such discrimination. Maurice Laham said it would not.

Robert Jackson referred to the TKC Formula for types, kinds and classes. He said it comes under FAR 36 and there can be no discrimination of these types and kinds.

Wayne Williams stated that the San Fernando Valley is screwed. Jets can come and go as they please in whatever volume they please. He said he was very very disappointed and he was sorry that this measure doesn't have a chance.

Gerald Silver indicated that he participated in City Council meetings in 1978 when the 74 dBA curfew was being debated. He said he was promised a nighttime curfew at that time.

Don Schultz suggested this measure is more appropriately handled through the Part 161 and he thought it's due for failure here tonight.

Deuk Perrin said it was extremely important to vote in favor of a curfew.

Kenneth Millman said the measure is not going to make a big impact financially. He suggested letting the BOAC say they don't want it. Let the FAA say it can't be done. But let's say to the community that we're going to try to help you out.

A roll call vote was taken on agenda item 2(e), #18 of 26, which would establish a nighttime curfew from 10 PM to 7 AM for all jet operations including departures and arrivals, and excluding emergencies. The measure passed with nine yes and seven no.

Rick Voorhis moved to adjourn and the motion was seconded by a member of the Steering Committee. Motion was apparently withdrawn.

Gerald Silver moved to adjourn and motion was seconded by a member of the Steering Committee. Motion failed on a roll call vote of four yes and 11 no.

Discussion was begun on the final motion of the original motion which is to adopt the whole package of NCP items that the Steering Committee has now gone through. The Chairman indicated that was the motion on the floor. The discussion was opened to public comment.

David Rankell suggested voting no on the package in order to hear all of the comments.

The public comment period was closed.

The Chairman defined the whole package as including the 24 of the original 26 measures that the Steering Committee previously voted on, an additional 19 measures voted upon at an earlier meeting (on May 29, 2001) and two more measures tonight for a total of 45 measures. He said the motion is to approve that whole package. He said a motion to conclude the Part 150 is a different motion. The motion to approve the whole package was passed on a roll call vote of 15 yes and zero no.

Kenneth Millman moved to adjourn and the motion was seconded by a member of the Steering Committee. Prior to voting on the motion the discussion was opened to the final agenda item for public input.

Jon Rodgers referred to the curfew at San Jose Airport. He said an aircraft operator who operated a G5 was prohibited from operating during the curfew. The operator claimed that his aircraft was a stage 3 and quieter than other aircraft that were allowed to operate. A judge ruled that he could operate despite what the airport authority said.

The public comment period was closed.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adjourn, which passed 15 yes and zero no.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 PM.



Minutes  
FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program  
Van Nuys Airport

Steering Committee Meeting  
Thursday, August 2, 2001

A meeting of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY) FAR Part 150 Study Steering Committee was convened at 7:00 p.m., August 2, 2001, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Mark Schaffer, a member of the Board of Airport Commissioners and Chairman of the VNY Part 150 Steering Committee, opened the meeting.

The following Steering Committee members were present:

Mark Schaffer, Chair	Harold Lee	Rick Voorhis
Harry Berg	Kenneth Millman	Lori Wheeler (for Laura Shell)
Morrie Goldman	Don Schultz	Wayne Williams
Tom Henry	Gerald Silver	Sandor Winger
Bob Jackson	David Tierney	

The following Steering Committee members were absent:

James Acosta	Ken Curry	Mary Rawlings
Phil Berg	Deuk Perrin	Alma Vorst

Chairman Schaffer began discussion of the first item on the agenda, whether or not the Steering Committee concurs with the BOAC action on July 19, 2001 adopting the Noise Compatibility Program and the Noise Exposure Maps.

Gerald Silver requested to submit a minority report and consideration of three motions that he had made through the mail. Chairman Schaffer said any member of this committee is authorized, welcome, and permitted to file whatever report he or she may choose. He indicated that motions are made on the floor not by mail and were not on the agenda and therefore could not be considered for action at this meeting.

Kenneth Millman expressed concern that his motion was not being heard. Chairman Schaffer explained that he had sent several memos to the Committee last December requesting their input on proposed measures. The responses were used to generate a comprehensive staff report including comments from the FAA on 26 proposed measures. These items were the basis of the discussion and consideration by the Committee over the next several meetings on which proposals should be included in the NCP. He said as a result there was plenty of opportunity to put items on the table in a timely fashion and in a

way that would allow the Committee to do something that the people here have been asking us to do, and that's take action rather than to keep talking about these items. Until something is submitted to the FAA there is no action being taken.

Don Schultz indicated that two meetings ago there was an obvious concentrated effort to be sure that there was not a quorum here. That was complete disrespect for the people that did show up and were ready to discuss a number of things on the agenda. He said that what is being done here is holding hostage people who need soundproofing for their homes. He stated that there was no reason to delay this any longer and he moved to approve item number one on the agenda. Sandor Winger seconded the motion.

Gerald Silver made a point of order that his motions were appropriately made through the mail. Parliamentarian Jim Stewart clarified that a motion is not made until it's made in this body seconded and stated by the chair. It doesn't matter how many letters are sent in. Unless there is a specific procedure delineated for doing that, the motion is not before this body until it's made here. The discussion was opened for public input.

David Rankell suggested that the folks that are going to receive the noise relief do not want it and want to hear other motions. He said to not deal with it is shameful.

Lisa Buch indicated that the additional motions that are outstanding should be considered. She also suggested a Part 161 Steering Committee be created to work on these issues.

Charles Brink indicated that there was no correlation between what was done in previous meetings. He said he was going to the District Attorney's office for prosecution.

Chairman Schaffer explained a number of the items overlapped and so they were combined into one measure. There were a total of 35 measures that were submitted to the BOAC, but they contained the substance of the 47 measures approved by this Committee. He also indicated that the Steering Committee is a committee that advises the Board of Airport Commissioners and that is the limit of its authority. Rather than argue over each jot and tiddle the focus should be on the spirit and intent of what is trying to be accomplished to get the soundproofing moving forward.

Jim Wildman expressed appreciation for the time and effort that the Committee has devoted trying to achieve closure to this long-standing problem of noise compatibility at VNY. He said he appreciated the patience in listening to endless complaints from the public including inane comments from adolescents enthralled with the sounds of their own voices.

Jan Shapiro said the impact of noise from the increase in media and sightseeing helicopters is beyond excessive. She questioned why this large number of competing media helicopters have to be roaring over homes as early as 5:00 o'clock in the morning when most of the freeways are now computerized by Cal Trans.

Jan Schneider stated that the sightseeing flights have got to stop. They are a noise nuisance and a flight hazard. She said in terms of the curfew that Burbank has the ability to stop all night landings except emergencies and Santa Monica has banned night flights. She questioned if the VNY tower is not operating after 11 PM who's directing these landings?

Zan Green said that the tourist and multimedia helicopter operations have ignored the community for years. He suggested one helicopter could service all the television stations.

Suzanne Saltzman passed on commenting.

Chuck Hand addressed his comments to a landing curfew. He said he noticed during the recent air show that he didn't see or hear any planes landing. He questioned what mechanisms were in force to accomplish that and asked if they could be used all the time?

Dominic Bakewell passed on commenting.

Donald Johannsen stated he was a therapist and counselor and suggested that perception pretty much becomes reality. He said if people perceive a helicopter going over at 10,000 feet or 300 feet then that's the way they perceive it. He said there has to be compromise.

Pat Kater said that after ten years of talking on the Part 150 somewhere along the line we have to get together and get this done. However, she indicated that to have a Part 150 Study go to the FAA at this time without a Master Plan for VNY is a mistake.

Chuck Hand referred to a problem that the City had with covered reservoirs and surrounding communities. The D.W.P. hired a mediator to resolve differences between the City and neighboring residents. He suggested the same approach could be done with the Part 150.

Chairman Schaffer closed the public input portion of the discussion.

Wayne Williams expressed his disappointment that the motions made through the mail would not be considered at this meeting. He said this was disgusting and a disgrace.

Gerald Silver suggested that maybe some of the LAWA people would be better if they worked for Southern Pacific rather than LAWA. He referred to several of the NCP measures that had been previously adopted by the Steering Committee and questioned various aspects of them. He compared the \$15 million that has been budgeted by the BOAC for soundproofing around VNY to the \$45 million that was calculated for the five year case in the Part 150 Study. He questioned whether item # 9, which would investigate the feasibility of repositioning a helicopter route from Bull Creek west to Balboa was fully discussed. He referred to item # 13 containing scenario # 9, which establishes the fly friendly program, and questioned whether everyone was familiar with it. He said item # 14, which directs departing pilots to avoid noise sensitive areas as being inconsistent with proposals being forwarded. He suggested item # 15, the top of the runway policy, did not

explicitly draw a difference between piston and jet aircraft. He referenced item # 27, keeping the tower open at night, and suggested this would be the first step in increasing the operations at night. He suggested that item # 32, which would set maximum daytime noise limits of 77 dBA for aircraft, would not be subject to a Part 161 Study for Stage 2 aircraft. He said item # 34-A should state no operations of any aircraft, arrivals or departures, except for emergencies, would be allowed between 10 PM and 7 AM. He questioned whether item # 35, which would put a cap on helicopters, should be reviewed by a helicopter task force. He also questioned whether people understood the Noise Exposure Maps.

Tom Henry proposed a substitute or amending motion to the motion that was on the table to concur with the BOAC action taken on July 19, 2001 to adopt the NCP. The amending motion (as clarified by Parliamentarian Stewart) would approve agenda item # 1 to concur with the adoption of the NEM and NCP provided the BOAC consider the motions made in the letter dated July 10<sup>th</sup> from Kenneth Millman that would extend the curfew hours on Saturday, Sunday and holidays to 10 pm to 9 AM, and the motion in the letter dated July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2001 from Gerald Silver that would eliminate tourist and sightseeing flights from VNY. He further stipulated that both of the amending motions would require a Part 161 Study. Kenneth Millman seconded the amendment to the motion.

Extended Committee discussion ensued on the pros and cons of the amendment. Comments included that the amendment would only ask the BOAC to consider the additional motions and that it would be up to them to decide on what action to take. By forwarding the additional motions to the BOAC it would reflect the desire of the Committee that these items were worth consideration. It was suggested that by adding consideration of the two motions to the concurrence with the BOAC's action it could be construed by the BOAC that the Steering Committee did not fully concur with the BOAC. It was also suggested that there was no substantiation that tourist flight activities actually posed the level of impact that warranted their discontinuation. A roll call vote was taken and the amended motion was not approved, with a vote of seven yes and seven no.

A roll call vote was taken on the main motion on whether to concur with the BOAC's action in adopting the NCP and NEM. The motion passed with 11 yes, one no and one abstention.

Parliamentarian Stewart stated that anyone voting in favor of a motion cannot then submit a minority report on that motion. Chairman Schaffer indicated that any member of the Steering Committee could submit any comments they wish to submit.

David Tierney made a motion to reconsider the vote on whether to concur with the BOAC. This motion was seconded by an unidentified member of the Steering Committee. The motion on whether to reconsider the previous vote passed eight yes and five no. A roll call vote was then taken again on the motion to concur with the BOAC action and it passed with eight yes, four no and one abstention.

The discussion was open for general public input.

Robert Rodine stated that he was a member of the Van Nuys Airport Citizens Advisory Council and was very familiar with the Brown Act. He said the intent of the Brown Act is to post an agenda 72 hours in advance of the meeting so that people will know what the business is to be conducted. He indicated it was a shame for Mr. Henry and Ms. Buch to come here with observations from an unidentified City Attorney telling this body that they should abrogate the Brown Act, or at least the logic and spirit of the Brown Act, in order to accommodate an end run on the purpose of this body. He said he was very disappointed.

Pat Kater indicated the way things have gone here is a continuation of 10 years of frustration. Reference was made to a little brochure in the lobby of this hotel that tells you when the tourist flights are going to take place. This is not an airport that's supposed to have published departures and it's against the rules.

Jan Schneider indicated people put their life savings into their home. She said the children are suffering horribly because of the airport. The pollution coming from the jets is creating respiratory problems in our children on our block. She said they're not trying to run people out of business but they are definitely being run out of their homes.

Charles Brink said he loved the LAWA meeting where they predetermined that there would not be a majority of people to have a quorum. He suggested the only way you can do that is to serially contact every member to do it. Serial communications are specifically prohibited in the Brown Act. He stated that the Committee should be aware that fraud is not defensible by the City Attorney and you have to pay for that out of your pocket.

Jan Shapiro stated that she came to the airport for almost a week and counted the airplanes. She said there an unbelievable number of tourist flights.

David Rankell said shame on you to seven members of the Committee. He referred to a Committee member as a hold out from the Mayor rear end administration.

Tom Henry said he thought public comment should be reserved to the issue at hand and not attacks on personal members of this body.

Dominic Bakewell suggested the money for soundproofing should be put into taking care of Stage 2 planes and getting them quieter. He said the next meeting should be on the runway.

Chairman Schaffer declared the public comment period closed.

Gerald Silver suggested it would show courtesy and a degree of grace on the part of the chair if he would be allowed to answer a question. He asked would you like to be graceful?

Sandor Winger moved to adjourn and Rick Voorhis seconded the motion that passed 13 yes and one no. The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 PM

# **Technical Committee Minutes**

Minutes

FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport

Technical Committee Meeting  
Thursday, March 2, 1989

The first meeting of the Van Nuys Airport FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program (VNY Part 150 Study) Technical Committee was convened at 3:00 p.m., Thursday, March 2, 1989 at the Airtel Plaza in Van Nuys. The meeting was opened by Maurice Laham of the Los Angeles Department of Airports. Mr. Laham will serve as overall Program Administrator and Chairman of this Committee.

Introductions

Introductions of Committee participants were made. The following members were present, as well as members of the Steering Committee and Consultant Team:

Maurice Laham, Chairman  
Renee Weitzer, Member  
Deuk Perrin, Member  
Richard Dyer, Member  
Thomas Conley, Member

Lisa Barrena, Steering Committee  
Robert Jackson, Steering Committee  
Donald Schultz, Steering Committee  
Kelly Jensen, Steering Committee

Christine Eberhard, Consultant  
Antonio Rocco, Consultant  
Stephen Allison, Consultant  
John Becker, Consultant

Robert Hayes, Staff  
Paul Principe, Staff  
Dennis Quilliam, Staff  
Charles Zeman, Staff

The following Committee members were absent:

Representatives of the:

Third and Twelfth Councilmanic Districts  
Los Angeles Department of Transportation  
County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning  
Southern California Association of Governments  
Van Nuys Airport Tenants Association

### Meeting Place and Time

Committee members selected the local Van Nuys area for meetings, with preference for the Airtel Plaza meeting rooms when available. Meetings would initially be scheduled for the first Thursday of the month, with additional monthly meetings scheduled as required. Time of the meetings was set for late afternoon hours, between 3:00 and 5:00 p.m.

### Curfew Issue

As a Los Angeles City Council directive, the issue of a proposed weekend and holiday aircraft operations curfew is to be addressed during the first phase of the study program. The Committee discussed the many and varied aspects of the issue, and concluded that a study outline should be prepared on the basis of today's discussion. The outline is to be submitted to the Committee for further discussion at the April meeting.

### Purpose of Technical Committee

Chairman Laham led a discussion on the VNY Part 150 Study process and the role of the Technical Committee. As part of this discussion, members of the Committee and the Consultants gave an overview of their respective roles.

### Media Policy

Due to some misleading information being given to the press, the Committee discussed protocol for dealing with the media. One of the Consultants, CommuniQuest, a firm specializing in opinion research and marketing communications, was asked to prepare recommendations for informing the media of key information regarding the study. The Committee requested direction be provided by the Steering Committee on the appropriate manner for the Technical Committee to respond to the media.

### Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.



Minutes

FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport (VNY)

Technical Committee Meeting  
Thursday, April 6, 1989

A regularly scheduled meeting of the VNY Part 150 Technical Committee was convened at 3:00 p.m., Thursday, April 6, 1989 in the Mulholland Room of the Airtel Plaza in Van Nuys. The meeting was opened by Maurice Laham of the Los Angeles Department of Airports (DOA) and Chairman of the Committee.

Attendance

The following Technical Committee members were present, as well as members of the Study Steering Committee and others.

Maurice Laham, Chairman of Technical Committee  
David Bleasdel, Technical Committee  
Thomas Conley, Technical Committee  
Richard Dyer, Technical Committee  
Deuk Perrin, Technical Committee

Joyce Emerson, Steering Committee  
Robert Jackson, Steering Committee  
Donald Schultz, Steering Committee

Steve Allison, Kennedy/Jenks/Chilton  
Robert Beard, DOA Noise Abatement  
Fred Beemis, VNY Administration  
Antonio Coco, Robert Crommelin & Associates  
Chris Eberhard, CommuniQuest Marketing  
Robert Hayes, VNY Public Relations  
Rene Lynch, Daily News  
Michael McClintock, McClintock, Becker & Associates  
Richard Mesa, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics  
Ann Payne, Beechcraft West  
Dennis Quilliam, DOA Environmental Management  
Charles Zeman, VNY Airport Manager

The following Technical Committee members were absent:

Rene Weitzer

Representatives of the:

Third and Twelfth Councilmanic Districts  
Los Angeles City Department of Transportation  
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning  
Southern California Association of Governments

The minutes of the March 2, 1989 meeting were approved as submitted.

The Chairman requested Mike McClintock, Project Coordinator, to summarize the proceedings at the last Steering Committee meeting. Mr. McClintock reported a presentation was made to the Steering Committee by Chris Eberhard on media protocol. The report was discussed and questions remained on whether a spokesperson was appropriate. Formal action on how to deal with the media by both the Steering Committee and Technical Committee was deferred to a later date. The need to have a podium and formal procedures for public input was discussed to facilitate the smooth operation of the committee.

Media protocol was discussed by the technical committee. In addition to a spokesperson there could be other people on the technical committee or others that could provide alternative perspectives to the majority view. Extended discussion did not conclude in endorsement of a spokesperson. It was agreed that staff can provide technical information such as meeting places and agenda items.

Tom Conley indicated the NEM and NCP checklists that were included in the agenda package were in draft form. The FAA has recently adopted the checklists in final form and Mr. Conley would provide those to the staff and committee. The checklists can be reviewed at a later meeting as guidelines for development of the Part 150 study.

Dennis Quilliam described the study outline for a possible weekend/holiday curfew. The outline contains tasks that will focus on economic analysis through survey of FBO's and aircraft operators. In addition to economic impacts other considerations will include environmental and legal ramifications of a curfew, and analysis of land use options on and off the airport. The committee concurred with the elements of the outline to be addressed and agreed that staff and the committee will continue to refine the study outline. That process will integrate the curfew tasks into the overall study outline, with a timeline to be developed to indicate when certain consultant and committee tasks are expected to be accomplished. Tasks related to the curfew will be addressed early in the study.

An ongoing discussion (to be continued in subsequent meetings) was initiated on the development of baseline and forecast data. Baseline data will initially be predicated on the categories of aircraft and operational parameters established in the Quarterly Noise Reports prepared by DOA for the State Department of Transportation. This information will be refined by ARTS data, FAA flight strip data, field measurements and control tower observations by noise consultants, and survey work with FBO's and aircraft operators. Forecasts will be conducted by DOA Facilities Planning Bureau based in part on the foregoing information, general aviation industry trends, economic factors in the area, and historic trends at VNY from survey/ questionnaires. All of these factors will be reviewed by the Technical Committee as they are developed and refined over the course of the study. The Committee acknowledged the difficulty in obtaining this data and agreed to have the noise consultant as the focal point for coordination of various agencies and interests involved in the compilation, synthesis and analysis of the needed information.

The committee had an extended discussion on alternative formats for the Steering Committee's public input workshop to be held on April 25, 1989. A motion was adopted to have information stations set up to provide the public opportunities to ask questions and receive answers on specific topics related to the Part 150 program including such things as insulation programs, land use planning or aircraft operations. A second motion was adopted to rescind the first motion and in lieu of that format adopt the format suggested by Chris Eberhard. This format would have up to 200 people meeting in groups of 10 at 20 different tables to discuss issues related to the study.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Minutes

FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport (VNY)

Technical Committee Meeting  
Thursday, June 15, 1989

A regularly scheduled meeting of the VNY Part 150 Technical Committee was convened at 3:00 p.m., Thursday, June 15, 1989 in the Sherman Room of the Airtel Plaza in Van Nuys. The meeting was opened by Committee Chairman Maurice Laham of the Los Angeles Department of Airports (DOA), who then turned over the meeting to Dennis Quilliam.

**ATTENDANCE**

Maurice Laham	Dick Dyer
Tom Conley	David Bleasdel
Deuk Perrin	Susan Eisenbarth
Chuck Zeman	Bob Hayes
Fred Bemis	Dennis Quilliam
Paul Principe	

Committee Members not in attendance:  
Southern California Association of Governments and  
Los Angeles County representatives.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the April 6, 1989 meeting were approved as submitted.

**DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

An Executive Summary entitled, "Highlights of Van Nuys Part 150 Workshop, April 25, 1989" was passed out to all Committee members. Discussion was opened on the issues identified at the workshop and continued to a later meeting date.

**REVIEW OF NEM/NCP CHECKLISTS**

Committee members representing FAA and the State Department of Transportation led a discussion on the use of the Ldn and CNEL noise metrics in Part 150 studies. FAA usually requires the use of Ldn in Part 150 studies, while State noise regulations prescribe the use of the CNEL noise descriptor for State required noise reports. As a FAA-funded project, the VNY Part 150 Study may not be accepted if CNEL is the basis of the NEM/NCP submittal.

**ACTION:** A letter will be sent to Herman Bliss at FAA requesting him to make a decision on which noise metric will be accepted for the VNY Part 150 Study.

#### **BULL CREEK**

Committee members reviewed the four basic land use concept alternatives that have been prepared by P & D Consultants for Bull Creek (Air National Guard) site development. Some were concerned that the nature of the non-aviation development would prevent future conversion back to aviation uses.

**ACTION:** A motion was unanimously passed to have a fifth alternative (All Aviation) analyzed. This matter will be presented to the Steering Committee for further action.

This specific discussion on Bull Creek then led to a general discussion on land use and zoning in the vicinity of VNY; and, the need for a comprehensive, up-to-date VNY Master Plan. One Committee member presented a planning mechanism that distributes traffic by land use category along major transportation corridors or in existing congested areas through a Trip Allocation Program.

The Part 150 Study shall take into consideration such an allocation method when developing alternative land proposals relative to noise mitigation.

#### **FBO/AIRCRAFT SERVICES SURVEY**

Committee members reviewed Draft Survey Questionnaires on the economic impacts of the proposed operational limitation curfew, and on historical and future aircraft operations. As the database provided by the survey questionnaire is essential to this study, Committee members were instructed to determine if the samples, as written, were adequate for data gathering purposes. And, they were also asked to comment on the results of their review and/or consultation with others, and report back to the Committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**ACTION:** Review comments at subsequent meeting, finalize the Survey Questionnaires, then present recommendations to the Steering Committee before conducting the survey.

#### **NEXT MEETING DATE**

Committee members selected Thursday, July 13, 1989 as the date of the next meeting, and agreed to begin the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes

FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM  
Van Nuys Airport (VNY)

Technical Committee Meeting  
Thursday, July 13, 1989

A regularly scheduled meeting of the VNY Part 150 Technical Committee was convened at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, July 13, 1989 in the Mulholland Room of the Airtel Plaza in Van Nuys. The meeting was opened by Dennis Quilliam of the Los Angeles Department of Airports.

**ATTENDANCE**

Dick Dyer  
Susan Eisenbarth  
Daryll Mackey for Deuk Perrin  
Paul Principe  
Dennis Quilliam

Committee Members not in Attendance:

David Bleasdel  
Maurice Laham  
Federal Aviation Administration  
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning  
Southern California Association of Governments

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the June 15, 1989 meeting were approved as submitted.

**DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED NOISE MONITORING SYSTEM**

Two alternative maps of the proposed optimum locations for the portable noise monitors to be temporarily installed at and around VNY were considered by members of the Technical Committee. Consensus was reached on eight locations.

**ACTION:** A letter will be sent to Landrum and Brown, the Part 150 Study's Noise Consultant, requesting that the necessary arrangements be made to conduct the noise monitoring program at the approved locations. It was indicated that noise and field monitoring should be conducted during the month of August to take advantage of the higher aircraft operation levels.

**FBO/AIRCRAFT SERVICES SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES REPORT**

Agenda item was continued to a later meeting date.

**PRESENTATION ON LAND USE/ZONING IN AREA SURROUNDING VNY**

Daryll Mackey from the Los Angeles City Planning Department (filling-in for absent Committee member) reported on land use and

zoning in the areas located in the immediate vicinity of VNY. As the areas located adjacent to VNY fall within the boundaries of three different District Plans, changing existing incompatible land uses may require initiating up to three separate Plan amendments and/or zone changes. In response to questions, Mackey said that the noise contours generated by this study could effect changes in the three Plan revisions, but that the Reseda-West Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks District Plan revision was the only one still being revised at this time.

**PRESENTATION ON TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION IN AREA SURROUNDING VNY**

Susan Eisenbarth from the Los Angeles Department of Transportation described the basics of traffic performance at intersections, including interpretations of Levels of Service and Volume to Capacity Ratios. To illustrate these conditions, a table was prepared listing Level of Service projections at 11 intersections serving VNY for the design years 1990 and 1991.

**NEXT MEETING DATE**

Due to absenteeism the date of the next meeting was not scheduled at that time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

## MINUTES

### FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM Van Nuys Airport (VNY)

Technical Committee Meeting  
Thursday, October 5, 1989

A regularly scheduled meeting of the VNY Part 150 Technical Committee was convened at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, October 5, 1989 in the Mulholland Room of the Airtel Plaza in Van Nuys. The meeting was opened by Maurice Laham of the Los Angeles Department of Airports.

#### **ATTENDANCE**

David Bleasdell  
Richard Dyer  
Susan Eisenbarth  
Maurice Laham  
Deuk Perrin  
Howard Yoshioka  
Chuck Zeman

#### Committee Members not in Attendance:

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning  
Southern California Association of Governments

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the July 13, 1989 meeting were approved as submitted.

#### **DISCUSSION ON FIELD AND NOISE MONITORING**

Staff reported that Landrum & Brown, noise consultants, conducted portable noise monitoring at eight sights around VNY from September 13-17, 1989. Field monitoring was done concurrently to correlate aircraft types and level of operations with noise readings. The data will be used to extrapolate annualized levels of operations, identify specific sources and levels of noise in sensitive areas, and to generate the INM for the Part 150 Study.

#### **REVIEW OF PART 150 STUDY SCHEDULE AND CONSULTANTS TASKS**

Technical Committee members generally concurred with the schedule and tasks as proposed. There was some concern that a regional traffic impact analysis may be needed, under an EIR that would be required for any changes to the General Plan or existing zoning.



#### DISCUSSION ON SURVEYS

Members of the Technical Committee discussed three surveys pertinent to the Part 150 Study. They included preliminary drafts of the Community Opinion Survey, Economic Impact Survey of Proposed Curfews and Aircraft Operational Fleet Mix Survey.

**ACTION:** The consulting firm of CommuniQuest was directed to revise the Community Opinion Survey format from a mail-out questionnaire to a telephone survey of 500 calls.

The Economic Impact Survey of the Proposed Curfew will be provided to known independent aircraft operators at VNY, as well as FBO's and aircraft service companies.

The Aircraft Operational Fleet Mix Survey will be revised to add helicopters as a main category of aircraft to be counted.

#### DISCUSSION ON ALTERNATIVE NOISE CONTROL STRATEGIES

Various land use adjustments and aircraft operational controls or restrictions were discussed. A subcontractor to CALTRANS, Division of Aeronautics gave her views on helicopter/heliport problems in urban environments. The Department's Noise Abatement Officer also gave the Technical Committee a briefing on the scope of the helicopter noise monitoring study being undertaken to satisfy one of the conditions of the VNY Variance. Tentative plans were discussed to have aircraft and helicopter industry representatives, including air ambulance services, make presentations to the Technical Committee.

**ACTION:** Copies of the VNY Quarterly Noise Report will be provided to all Technical Committee members, showing incompatible land uses within the 65 CNEL.

A report on the status of the BOAC's proposed phase-out of older, noisy aircraft and phase-in of newer, quieter aircraft (especially jets), being prepared by the Department of Airports will be forwarded to the Technical Committee when it is available.

Staff will obtain lists of potential noise regulations from FAA, CALTRANS, and other airports, and begin to compile a list appropriate for VNY for discussion.

#### NEXT MEETING DATE

Pending the preliminary report from the noise consultants, the date of the next meeting was not scheduled.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

## MINUTES

### FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program Van Nuys Airport (VNY)

Technical Committee Meeting  
Thursday, April 12, 1990

A regularly scheduled meeting of the VNY Part 150 Technical Committee was convened on Thursday, April 12, 1990, at 2:00 p.m. in the Mulholland Room of the Airtel Plaza in Van Nuys. The meeting was opened by Maurice Laham of the Los Angeles Department of Airports.

#### Attendance

David Bleasdell  
Richard Dyer  
Maurice Laham  
Deuk Perrin  
Chuck Zeman

#### Also in Attendance

Chris Eberhard  
Bob Jackson  
Tim Merwin  
Don Schultz  
Gerry Silver

#### Committee Members not in Attendance

Mike Armstrong, SCAG  
Jack Edwards, Los Angeles County Planning Department  
Susan Eisenbarth, Los Angeles Department of Transportation  
Howard Yoshioka, FAA

#### Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 5, 1989 were corrected by Mr. Dyer to change the reference to a sub-contractor to CalTrans who is actually a staff member. The amended minutes were approved.

#### Correspondence from Robert Brymer

Mr. Brymer was not in attendance. His correspondence concerning rezoning of residential properties north of the airport was discussed by the committee. Mr. Perrin expressed his opposition to commercial use of the properties. General discussion concluded the proposal should be discussed at a subsequent meeting.

## Discussion of Community Opinion Survey

The Community Opinion Telephone Survey conducted by CommuniQuest in February was discussed. The three banner questions suggested by the consultant were confirmed by the committee as appropriate cross tabulations. These were #1 - Zip codes, #2 - Length of residence, and #7 - Perception of Van Nuys Airport. Two additional banner questions were added by the committee: #3 - Own or rent residence, and #12 - What is the effect of aircraft noise. These questions will be cross tabulated by the consultant and the results returned to the Technical Committee and Steering Committee for review.

## Discussion of Alternative Noise Control Strategies

A list of 20 staff prepared alternative noise control measures was discussed by the committee. Five of the alternatives were chosen from the list plus two added for a total of seven contours to be run by the Noise Consultant using the Integrated Noise Model (INM). The seven alternative scenarios are described as follows:

- 1) The first alternative noise control scenario would modify the existing restrictions on touch and go (repetitive) training operations. Currently touch and go operations are prohibited each day of the week between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., from June 21 to September 15, and between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. from September 16 to June 20. This scenario would extend the restricted hours to 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. on weekdays, and would further prohibit touch and go operations 24 hours a day on weekends and holidays. The restrictions proposed in the alternative would apply all year long. (These conditions were provided in BOAC Resolution No. 16044.)
- 2) The second alternative scenario addresses nighttime operations. Currently no aircraft (except for military, law enforcement, and emergency operations) may depart VNY between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. if their takeoff noise level exceeds 74 dBA. This scenario would prohibit takeoff of all aircraft (once again excluding military, law enforcement, and emergency operations) between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. of every day. (These conditions were contained in a Directive from the Los Angeles City Council.)
- 3) The third scenario would reduce takeoff thrust/power settings, within safety levels, for all jets departing VNY. The modified noise abatement procedures established by the National Business Aircraft Association would be used for this scenario.
- 4) The fourth scenario would allow only Stage III aircraft to operate at VNY after the year 1994.

The remaining three scenarios would be variations on a dBA limit on takeoffs. FAA Advisory Circular 36-3E would be used to determine the effected aircraft.

- 5) The 74 dBA maximum noise limit for takeoffs, that is currently in effect from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., would be extended to apply to takeoffs between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.
- 6) The existing maximum takeoff limit of 74 dBA, from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. would be maintained and an additional maximum takeoff limit of 78 dBA would be established for the remainder of the day from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.
- 7) The maximum takeoff limit of 74 dBA would apply 24 hours a day.

Following review and approval by the Steering Committee, the seven alternative scenarios would be run by the Noise Consultant, Landrum and Brown. Contingent upon analysis of the results of each scenario, further alternatives or combinations of the alternatives would be run to complete the ten alternatives allotted in the contract with the Noise Consultant.

#### Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

## MINUTES

### FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program Van Nuys Airport (VNY)

Technical Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, February 19, 1991

The regularly scheduled meeting of the VNY Part 150 Technical Committee convened on Tuesday, February 19, 1991, at 2:00 p.m. in the VNY Airport Administration Building, in Van Nuys. The meeting was opened by Maurice Laham of the Los Angeles Department of Airports.

#### Committee Members in Attendance

David Bleasdell  
Richard Dyer  
Maurice Laham  
Chris Larkin (representing Deuk Perrin)  
Howard Yoshioka

#### Also in Attendance

Christa-Maria Engle  
Dennis Quilliam  
Wanda Williams

#### Committee Members not in Attendance

Mike Armstrong, SCAG  
John Huttinger, Los Angeles County Planning Department  
Bahar Pazeshkian, Los Angeles Department of Transportation

#### Approval of Minutes

The minutes of April 12, 1990 were approved as submitted.

#### Replacement of Committee Members

The Committee discussed the replacement of Committee members Susan Eisenbarth (Los Angeles Department of Transportation) and Jack Edwards (Los Angeles County Planning Department) who are no longer employed by their member agencies. The Committee voted to request agency replacement of the two representatives. DOA staff agreed to contact the two agencies regarding new representatives.

### Discussion, Review of Noise Control Scenarios

Dennis Quilliam discussed the information presented to the Technical Committee regarding the seven alternative noise control scenarios previously selected by the Committee. Mr. Quilliam indicated the VNY Steering Committee had recommended review of three additional scenarios, that were returned to the Technical Committee in their agenda packet for their review and comment.

### Discussion of Fleet Mix Forecasts and Assumptions

Mr. Quilliam discussed DOA forecasts prepared to generate the input parameters for modeling noise contours with the INM for the Part 150 Study and the proposed Noise Control Regulation EIR for VNY. Mr. Quilliam indicated that the annual growth rate for jet aircraft is projected to be 8% through 1995 and 7% from 1996 to the year 2000. Other aircraft types are projected to experience a variety of lower percentage growth rates.

Maurice Laham noted that the number of jet aircraft based at VNY could potentially double from 93 to 186, based upon the DOA forecasts.

David Bleasdell stated that from a pilot's perspective, the DOA forecasts appear to be correct.

Dick Dyer stated that the proposed VNY Noise Control Regulation should consider, as an alternative measure, the relocation of larger aircraft (including 727 and DC9 aircraft) from VNY to Ontario or Los Angeles Airport. Mr. Laham indicated that the Noise Regulation will consider the relocation of aircraft, and that DOA forecasts do not anticipate an increase among these aircraft.

Mr. Laham suggested that the Technical Committee select a preferred Noise Control Scenario and make one or more recommendations to the Steering Committee for further consideration. Mr. Laham stated that the Steering Committee appeared to favor Scenario Number 3 which would reduce takeoff thrust/power settings, within safety levels, for all jets departing VNY by implementing modified noise abatement procedures established by the National Business Aircraft Association. Mr. Bleasdell stated that from a pilot's point of view, Scenario Number 3 appeared reasonable. The Committee discussed the remaining scenarios.

Mr. Bleasdell expressed a preference for Scenario Number 9 which would reduce takeoff thrust/power setting, within safety levels, for all departing jet and prohibit all aircraft with takeoff noise levels that exceed 74 dBA between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

Mr. Dyer stated that he felt Scenario Number 7 was infeasible and expressed a preference for implementation of Scenario Number 9. The Committee discussed the scenario and the consensus was to recommend Steering Committee approval of Scenario Number 9.

Howard Yoshioka stated that the Committee should carefully consider Scenario Number 9 to determine if implementation of the measure will either eliminate or restrict any Stage III aircraft operations. Mr. Yoshioka indicated that the FAA will approve a measure only if it does not

unreasonably restrict Stage III operations. Mr. Yoshioka stated that he would prefer to see substitute wording provided in Scenario Number 9 that would emphasize that any Stage III aircraft that attempted to reasonably comply with the scenario could operate at VNY, regardless of noise levels created.

The Committee discussed Mr. Yoshioka's substitute language and agreed to leave the scenario language as originally written. However, the Committee also agreed that efforts should be made to ensure that specific aircraft are not eliminated or restricted by implementation of the measure.

#### Discussion of Ad Hoc Van Nuys Airport Noise Working Group (Ad Hoc Noise Group) Recommendations

Mr. Laham indicated that the Ad Hoc Noise Group (formed in response to the proposed VNY Noise Regulation) had voted to recommend the following measures; improved runway signage, raised glide slope, installation of a noise monitoring/aircraft tracking system that will identify the jet aircraft "N" number, the aircraft owner, the pilot, the estimated noise on departure using the FAR Part 36 noise departure procedures, the estimated noise abatement departure profiles, and actual noise level of aircraft upon departure.

Mr. Dyer stated that the Ad Hoc Noise Group's recommendation to raise the glide slope to 4° had previously been reviewed for similar airports and determined to be a potential safety hazard. Mr. Dyer also stated that use of a noise monitoring/aircraft tracking system for VNY would address a majority of the problems occurring at VNY.

Mr. Bleasdell stated that he agreed with the Ad Hoc Noise Group's recommendation for new signage and that at least six new signs that can be easily read during both daytime and nighttime operations are needed for VNY.

Mr. Laham indicated that he was not fully convinced of the legality/impact of the Ad Hoc Noise Group's recommendation to require the Airport Administrator to compile and disseminate information to pilots regarding utilization of friendly flying procedures.

Mr. Bleasdell agreed and indicated that it would be more meaningful if the pilots were required to learn about friendly flying procedures from aircraft flight manuals or from FBO operators based at VNY.

#### Discussion of Helicopter Report

Mr. Laham discussed a preliminary helicopter study prepared by CommuniQuest.

Mr. Bleasdell stated that helicopter activity at VNY appears to be the greatest annoyance for residents, that Los Angeles City Police, Fire and emergency helicopters are the greatest source of helicopter noise and that attempts should be made to provide public sector compliance with existing and proposed noise control regulations.

Mr. Laham requested Committee members to identify other areas/issues that should be included in the recommendation to the Steering Committee. The Committee discussed several issues.

Mr. Laham stated that the Committee should give special consideration to rezoning/replanning surrounding incompatible land uses located within the 65 CNEL contour area. The Committee discussed how this should be coordinated with the City of Los Angeles Planning Department.

The Committee consensus was to authorized staff to prepare a draft outline of NCP programs/issues that will include discussion of the following:

1. Recommendation that the Steering Committee adopt Scenario Number 9 as the preferred noise control alternative.
2. Planning/Rezoning - Replan and rezone the impacted areas within the projected 65 CNEL as appropriate with commercial or industrial uses to make them compatible.
3. Conversions - Establish a program and incentives for the conversion and redevelopment of incompatible property to provide uses identified as compatible under State Noise Regulations.
4. Acoustic Treatments and Aviation Easements - Undertake validation and establish eligibility criteria for an acoustical treatment and/or insulation program for housing within the projected target 65 CNEL.
5. Purchase Assurance - Establish a program and eligibility criteria to offer homeowners an opportunity, on a voluntary basis, to move out of the impacted 65 CNEL through the sale of impacted property.
6. Preliminary recommendations to mitigate noise from helicopter operations.

Mr. Laham indicated DOA staff would forward the outline to Committee members prior to the next scheduled Technical Committee meeting.

#### Adjournment

The Committee adjourned at 4:05 p.m.



# MINUTES

## FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program Van Nuys Airport (VNY)

### Technical Committee Meeting Tuesday, July 16, 1991

The regularly scheduled meeting of the VNY Part 150 Technical Committee convened on Tuesday, July 16, 1991, at 2:00 p.m. in the Van Nuys Airport Administration Building, in Van Nuys. The meeting was opened by Maurice Laham of the Los Angeles Department of Airports.

#### Committee Members in Attendance

David Bleasdell  
Richard Dyer  
Maurice Laham, Chairman

#### Committee Members Not in Attendance

Deuk Perrin  
Howard Yoshioka  
Mike Armstrong  
John Huttinger  
Bahan Pazeshkian

#### Also in Attendance

Betsy Eskridge  
Dennis Quilliam  
Wanda Williams

#### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of February 19, 1991 were approved as submitted.

Maurice Laham opened the discussion by requesting Agenda Item #3 be considered before items # 1 and #2. Mr. Laham reminded the Committee members that Item #3 was previously discussed during a meeting.

## Discussion of a Performance Based Aircraft Noise Abatement Procedure

Dick Dyer stated that land uses surrounding the airport need to be consistent.

Mr. Laham indicated that a noise monitoring system could be instrumental at VNY if basic aircraft information was being required. Mr. Laham stated that basic assumptions could be made from information obtained using this system. Mr. Laham suggested Committee input regarding the development of a noise contour model for observance of a performance based alternative at VNY.

Mr. Dyer indicated that Scenario 9 from the Part 150 Contour Maps created for use in the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) was modeled using an actual set of aircraft operational and land use criteria.

Mr. Laham stated that although a contour was produced using this model, Scenario 9 assumes all jets will fly in the same general direction, at a similar altitude, and could be compared using other similar characteristics. A performance based measure at VNY would require different aircraft flight paths and observance of different aircraft operations, Mr. Laham indicated.

David Bleasdell stated that he felt a noise monitoring system similar to the system reviewed during the January Part 150 Steering Committee meeting would address most of the homeowner concerns. Mr. Bleasdell indicated that a dictaphone would provide real time of events. The "N" numbers could be obtained from the FAA tower tape.

Mr. Dyer stated that it should not be difficult to implement a reliable "N" number system. Mr. Dyer indicated FAA cooperation should be requested regarding identification of aircraft.

Mr. Laham indicated ANOMS could be used to identify aircraft overlooked by using the "N" number system.

Mr. Bleasdell indicated that pilot communications should be given priority by the noise abatement officer. Mr. Bleasdell stated that as the word gets out regarding the new procedures, voluntary pilot cooperation should occur.

Mr. Dyer indicated that assumptions should not be made regarding noise levels occurring from implementation of a performance based measure until actual testing occurs for individual aircraft and that it may be difficult to predict the outcome of such a measure. Mr. Dyer added that further information may be needed to allow full support of the measure by Committee members.

Mr. Bleasdell stated that the airport located at Savannah, Georgia has conducted individual aircraft testing using performance criteria and that the results of that testing could be applied to many types of aircraft at VNY.

Mr. Laham stressed that testing information and results need to be provided for all aircraft based at VNY.

Mr. Bleasdell stated that this information should be available from all manufacturers and that staff should investigate the availability of obtaining this information. He also indicated the NBAA has written procedures that are recognized by pilot and aviation groups.

Mr. Dyer stated that it is important to apply an "approved" procedure that can be recognized by pilots and other aviation groups.

### Discussion of Land Use/Noise Compatibility Program

Dennis Quilliam presented a description of the information contained in the Agenda Packet for this meeting of the Technical Committee regarding Land Use Maps prepared by DOA staff.

Mr. Laham stated that the input of City Planning was an important factor in rezoning properties around VNY and that he had requested the delay of the agenda item to allow additional arrival time for Deuk Perrin, the City Planning representative. Mr. Laham added that he believed the proposed rezoning of areas surrounding VNY should extend beyond the 65 CNEL boundary line and that the land use maps prepared by staff should be revised to reflect this.

Mr. Dyer agreed with Mr. Laham and added that the rezone areas should extend out to geographic landmarks or other physical boundaries that could be easily identified by City planners.

Mr. Quilliam indicated that Mr. Perrin had earlier said he would attend this meeting. Mr. Quilliam requested Committee direction regarding the location of rezone areas and physical boundaries.

Mr. Bleasdell suggested the following areas:

The area bounded by Gault Street on the north, the airport on the east, Victory Boulevard on the south, and the prolongation of DeCelis Place from Vanowen to Haynes and Gerald Avenue from Haynes to Victory on the west.

The area bounded by Valerio Street on the north, the airport to the west, Woodley Avenue to the east, and Victory Boulevard to the south.

The frontage north of Roscoe Boulevard from the airport to Woodley Avenue and from Chase Street to Roscoe.

Mr. Laham concurred with Mr. Bleasdel's suggestion and indicated that the Committee recommendations provided during the meeting would be refined by staff in writing and transmitted by fax to all Committee members. There was further discussion on the NCP including reference to the relationship between tenant association communication with pilots and the role of the proposed noise abatement officer. It was agreed to not make any changes on this item in the NCP.

The Committee members present agreed to support the land use rezoning and performance based recommendations .

### **Adjournment**

The Committee adjourned at 3:45 p.m.