

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Lee Whitaker, July 10

#### **Recommendation**

- ◆ We should consider SafeRoute™ Software Pckg used by UPS because:
  - P3: Ensures consistent aircraft spacing while increasing capacity and efficiency in airspace.
  - P4: CDA trials show potential 30% noise reduction, 3% emission reduction and fuel savings
  - P5: Provides overview of current of on-ground activities at terminals to prevent problems

### Lee Whitaker, July 1

#### **Comments on the Process**

- ◆ With amount of questions/issues raised at last meeting, believes a lot more work to do before presenting proposal to AAB; research has to be done outside committee structure; more discussion will be required by committees
- ◆ Feels like initial concerns put off with promise to address via P150 Study; now feels like citizens are raising these concerns in appropriate format, but still not considered – or heard; bottom line: feels like process is just for show.

#### **Comments**

- ◆ Give priority consideration to existing residential areas over planned developments:
  - Economic developers ignored “effective prior planning/zoning” in High Point and the Cardinal area that had been done as far back as 1973 when they ‘invited’ FedEx to PTIA.

#### **Recommendation**

- ◆ “Must” consider using sparsely populated and undeveloped areas; translates to rezoning and changes in land use; this should be one of the sacrifices that ED, local government, etc. make for the process.
- ◆ Continued - Give priority consideration to existing residential areas over planned developments:
  - High Point made proactive steps in 2003 via Mayor Koontz letter to defer nighttime traffic away from residential areas and was highly publicized; now, all the Johnny-come-lately planners are insisting on the same consideration – not fair.

#### **Recommendation**

- ◆ Because noise from arriving aircraft on 23L and 23R is unavoidable for existing HP communities; they should be ‘spared’ departures on existing 23; rather, runway 23 departures should be rerouted to the South because these communities are much further from the runways.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Lee Whitaker, July 1 - Cont'd

#### Comment

- ◆ Removal of natural noise barriers leaves adjacent residential areas more vulnerable to noise from new 23R departures.
- ◆ To make up for removal of natural barriers, erecting artificial barriers are a must – especially because everyone agrees that greater use of 23R is in the best interest of everyone; however, aware Cardinal folks don't completely agree, but believes they can be convinced.
- ◆ There are several ways to alleviate anticipated FAA concerns about barriers being a flight hazard (see below)

#### Recommendations:

- ◆ Explore new technologies for installing retractable barriers.
- ◆ PTIA purchase easements north of the airport to erect barriers similar to those in Raleigh on I-440 loop to alleviate road traffic noise. Quote: "If NCDOT can do it, so can PTIA"
- ◆ Erect permanent barriers on airport property closer the noise source. If they protrude into protected airspace for the 'rare' usage of 23R for landings, mark as a displaced threshold for landing to adjust aircraft glide path safely above the barrier. (See Chicago Midway, San Jose, Long Beach and Miami runway 9/27 among others)

#### Comment

- ◆ FAA decision for head-to-head operations is good but incomplete.

#### Recommendations:

- ◆ Plans/policies for head-to-head operations from and to the southwest need to be defined more explicitly, considering which parallel runway will be used based on arrival and departure ALONG WITH practicality of turns after take off to avoid the most noise sensitive areas.

#### Comment

- ◆ We (HP citizens most effected by SW operations) expect FedEx's initial concept of operation for 2011 showing 56% of operations off the existing runway and 39% off the new runway that "we are building specifically to meet their operational requirements" to be the **exact reverse**.
- ◆ Sees a conflict with the following statements we've made:
  - "Good planning has allowed minimal residential development to the immediate southwest of the airport along the extended centerline of the new runway 5L/23R" [Mitigation doc intro]
  - Our agreement with: "Several committee members suggested that as many as possible of the FEDEX night operations use Runway 5R/23L [Mitigation doc]"

#### Request

- ◆ Make clear who and how many committee members suggested the above statement and the study zones they represent.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Lee Whitaker, July 1 - Cont'd

#### **Recommendations:**

- ◆ Most operations should be on the new runway. Emphatic paraphrase: We can't take the "easy way out" and leave things the way they are.

#### **Comment**

- ◆ Not happy that the committees haven't seen any mention or use of the routing proposals off all runways that he gave us in March. Why not?
- ◆ Noted dismissal of turns to I-40 Eastbound off of 23L was based on inaccurate population info.
- ◆ He plans to restate his proposals to keep most departure noise away from north HP at next meeting.

#### **Request:**

- ◆ Expects to see many more turning options diagramed at or before the next meeting by staff.

#### **Recommendation:**

- ◆ Runway 23R should be used for most north departures and all west thru south departures, because:
  - Most favorably aligned with less populated areas, including Kernersville development plans
  - North departures can make a continuous climbing right turn to be north of I-40 and probably above 300 feet, east of the I40/Bus40 split - and can be started as early as 100 feet, as is done at Newark, Chicago O'Hare and Albuquerque and similar to Indianapolis tight turns
  - West departures can either follow this same initiate track to the northwest until north of Kernersville development and Dell
  - South departures should turn up to 15 degrees right to avoid the nursing home at the old Sandy Ridge golf course until at or above 4000 ft before turning south and continuing climb on a track to the west of High Point.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Lee Whitaker, July 1 - Cont'd

#### **Recommendation: (Runway 23L)**

- ◆ Runway 23L should be used for north thru southeast departures b/c:
  - N to NE departures can make a continuous climbing left to the northerly heading, staying close to the airport; should be initiated no later than 2 mls from the runway so that most of initial climb is done over 68 and Pdmt Industrial Park. Will minimize impact on Friendly and Market area.
  - Will be few southeast departures which will be the ones that 'truly' approximate the I-40 Corridor: Residents in apt and townhouses west of Guilford College are far less than north High Point when you include Skeet Club and Barrow road which were not included in the population density map; Flight paths for these departures should join the 090-degree radial off the GSO VOR to keep the aircraft south of the apartments and close to Wendover at the intersection with the Urban Loop. Continuing along that radial will take the aircraft over the commercial areas at the Bridford parkway intersection and long Wendover north of I-40.
  - Noted: Bridford and Wendover incorrectly id'd as populated on the pop density map - per Lee, it's all commercial.

#### **Comments (Runway 5R and 5L)**

- ◆ Though FedEx wants it, departures off 5L will take incompatible noise levels over residential areas north of the runway.
- ◆ 5R departures affect densely populated areas only.  
**Recommendations:** Runway 5R should be used only when winds dictate a NE departure flow and an individual aircraft requires NE departure.
  - ◆ A NE flow should dictate single runway operations from 5R, only.
  - ◆ An initial runway heading appears to follow the trace of the UL until a point approx 2 mls from the runway where the UL bears east; Departing aircraft can either continue climbing straight out on a northeasterly heading or turn left approx 90 degrees to intercept the 025 degree radial or continue northwesterly toward Belews Creek Lake. Any departures off of 5L will require an immediate turn to join the departure corridor established for 5R.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Lee Whitaker, July 1 - Cont'd

#### **Comment (Noise Abatement Departure Procedures)**

- ◆ Statements made at last mtg that ICAO A procedure wasn't effective for stage 3 aircraft; but noise contours presented for 727-20 and A300/A310 using power and climb mgt procedure (Fig 8,9,10) didn't reflect a procedure that either of the commercial pilots was familiar with.
- ◆ Thought procedure presented is similar to what's used at Santa Anna only; Lee's found data flying ICAO A and normal departure climb procedures in a DC9-82, reaching 3000 ft above field level in 3.5 to 4 miles with the ICAO A and in 6.5 to 8 miles with the normal climb.

#### **Recommendation**

- ◆ Need to include a standard ICAO A noise abatement departure procedure for departures on runway 5 and it may still help reduce noise exposure for runway 23 departures too.

#### **Comments(Noisiest Aircrafts)**

- ◆ Even though 727-200 officially meets federal standards, understands reluctance to request prohibition against them, but thinks the below may provide loop hole to do so.
- ◆ Below recommendation would solve issues with use of either 23L or 23R.

#### **Recommendation**

- ◆ Implement additional restrictions via Landing Fees based on FAA certificated or estimated noise emission levels or on time of arrival (see March 2 memo) as part of our recommendations.
- ◆ AAB should be 'prodded' to investigate restrictions laid out in FAA's update to the 1976 ANAP that was read to the Federal Register in July 2000 which includes references to legal precedence for restricting noisy aircraft at night --- and which he believes post-dates Part 161.

#### **Comments (Keeping Arrivals High)**

- ◆ Need to more precisely manage altitudes for instrument approaches

#### **Recommendation**

- ◆ Provide more step-down altitudes on final to meet certain benchmarks for height at various distances from the runway.
- ◆ When air traffic control clears an aircraft, they should provide a minimum altitude to maintain until on final approach and inform the pilot of noise sensitive areas to avoid. Ways to accomplish this:
  - Radio
  - Visual descent and landing procedures
  - Future technology (can also specify descending curvilinear approaches with continuous descending turns)
- ◆ Above means we can specify min altitudes at certain distances from the runway and specific routing for visual arrivals to join the final approach course.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Lee Whitaker, July 1 - Cont'd

#### Comments (New Technologies)

- ◆ RNAV procedures are slated to be implemented in 35 airports in the next 3-5 years and PTIA needs to add its name to the list. RNAV benefits include:
  - ◆ Fuel savings from more direct routing when entering and departing the terminal area.
  - ◆ More precise navigation to comply with noise abatement procedures – cutting the number of pilot to controller radio transmissions in half
  - ◆ Improving traffic flow in and out of terminal area.

#### Recommendation

- ◆ PTIA contact the FAA to begin process for implementing RNAV procedures to our nighttime requirements to handle noise and FEDEX surge operations.

#### Comments (Hub Facility Layout)

- ◆ It would be short-sighted “to the extreme” to not provide entry and exit points, equal to 5R/23L, to the new taxiway joining the east and west runways to and from the sorting facility. This would help distribute departures between the 2 runways.

#### Recommendation

- ◆ Take to PTIAA immediate to modify plan while the dirt is fresh and no concrete’s been poured.

### MFoster, July 2

#### Comments

- ◆ **RE: Lee W.’s email recommendations:**
  - ◆ “They need to do everything exactly as you have it written down. I have visualized everything that you said and compared that to how you and I know it is done everywhere else.”
  - ◆ “It sounds like Mr. Harris may be resistant to doing some of the most important things that need to be done.”
  - ◆ It seems he already knew where he wanted to take this committee.
- ◆ Feels that process is not working and is somewhat of a ‘farce.’ Believes that Andy is not fully addressing suggestions, comments that he should be – and that the best interest of all is not being considered – just PTIAA and FedEx.
- ◆ Has copied High Point City Council on Lee Whitaker’s recommendations.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Scott Gayle, June 30

#### Comments:

- ◆ **RE: Lee Whitaker's email recommendations:**
  - ◆ "I commend Lee for his excellent detailed comments and join with him in requesting that each and every one of his points be seriously considered by the committee and the paid staff."
  - ◆ Believes ideas are getting shut down that can't hurt to be presented to PTIAA who then has the decision to present to FAA. Also, is frustrated, "So what if the FAA turns us down ... You don't ask, you don't get."
  - ◆ Believes advisory committee:
    - Is not happy with the process, its rules or its direction and is "surprised no one has gone to the media."
    - Has had their suggestions ignored.
    - Has no confidence that what's officially on the table at this point will make a dent in the noise.
  - ◆ He's mad and believes the process may be for naught. Issues raised:
    - Changing routes passing over HP can't happen because just shifts from one part of pop to another.
    - Staff hasn't demonstrated correct maps or population densities and decisions are being made on philosophy rather than fact.
    - Etc. Etc.

#### Recommendations:

- ◆ Feels need for another meeting prior to September to see if 'the paid staff' is willing to truly "hear" their recommendations.
- ◆ Agrees with Lee's suggestions; knows we can't have them all, but 'better' get a few.

### Jean and Richard Black, June 28

#### Comment:

- ◆ Out of date maps used, including base map for the 8 SEL maps among others. Facts of importance missing:
  - Existing subdivisions and dense residential areas
  - Bryan Blvd
  - Bodies of water: Lake Brandt, Lake Higgins, Oak Hollow Lake

#### Recommendation:

- ◆ Replace each base map that shows current street layouts, current road and major bodies of water.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Jean and Richard Black, June 28

#### **Comment:**

- ◆ When a sizable nighttime hub is inserted into an otherwise daytime operation, the resulting DNL contour isn't accurate. (See provided charts on email)

#### **Recommendation:**

- ◆ Include the 55 DNL contour on Part 150 Contour Maps to provide us the opportunity to anticipate where the SEL's for the nighttime flights will be. Areas where there will be considerable noise intrusion, but no where there can be any mitigation relief.

#### **Request:**

- ◆ PTIA express to FedEx the concerns of intrusion of the 727s at night.

### CD Mathieu, June 28

#### **Comments:**

- ◆ Feels that we've ignored his previous questions by not answering them.
- ◆ Wants PTIAA to encourage FedEx to retire 727s; Feels we need an idea of what FedEx is planning to do with these planes before we can develop a 'legitimate' noise abatement program for 2009.
- ◆ Info provided is incomplete and leaves many questions unanswered.

#### **Questions/Clarifications:**

- ◆ Will PTIA still be eligible for a Part 150 program update before 2014 if the need arises (since we've extended the forecast year?)
- ◆ By selecting 2014, have we 'in any way' limited future FAA help if the need arises as early as 2011? (concerned b/c of the inaccuracy of past predicted noise contours)
- ◆ Can we develop reasonable noise abatement procedures that apply only to FedEx nighttime operations?
- ◆ Noted significant number of departures over western GSO in the draft of FedEx Arrival and Departure Tracks: Will FedEx arrivals occur over the same area?
- ◆ I presume with two runways in place existing departures to the west will move to the new runway and departures to the south and east will remain on the old 5/23?
- ◆ Will arrivals to the old runway (23L) during North flow now occur over Westover Gso? At what altitude are departures now passing over Western Gso?
- ◆ Will the daytime airport traffic pattern ultimately more or less resemble RDU's traffic pattern around its two parallel runways?
- ◆ Are there any 727s departing or arriving at GSO now? If so, how many?
- ◆ I presume the 'routine overnight' landings of 747s related to the Dell have been or will be considered in your noise abatement considerations - Will the 747 aircraft cause low frequency noise problems for those living close to the airport?
- ◆ For measure 2, discussing effects of changes in the length of old runway 5/23, are you concluding that the distal end of the 65 DNL will shift about 1475 ft to the NE while the opposite end will recede about the same distance?

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### CD Mathieu, June 28

Request for Data / Info:

- ◆ Could you provide percentage of FedEx departures and arrivals that correspond to the broad corridors depicted on the existing conditions maps of FedEx arrivals and departures.
- ◆ Could you provide arrival/ departure maps that clearly show potential or proposed corridors that nighttime FedEx flight might use **well before the next meeting?**
- ◆ Please include the percentage and/or numbers of flights for each corridor. It would also be very helpful if the maps show accurate underlying pop densities and the identity of enough major roads so that committee members can more easily evaluate impacts.
- ◆ Please include at least some maps with scales small enough to produce panoramic views of flight paths over communities more distant from the airport than GSO and HP.
- ◆ Please include general info about the altitude that various FedEx fleet planes might achieve on departure at points four to six miles from the airport.
- ◆ Please publish 55 DNL contour

### **Recommendation:**

- ◆ Nighttime approach procedures specific to FedEx need to be developed so that planes do not travel the entire last 20 to 30 miles to PTIA at MSL 2800 to 2900 ft (AGL 1900 to 2000 ft for some). Some pilots have indicated it can be done. Why is such an action considered not feasible?
- ◆ It is imperative that PTIAA establish an effective citizen oversight committee to deal with community noise issues.
- ◆ Wouldn't it be nice if PTIA could be a 'beta test site' for the FAA to try out this noise abatement procedure as it applies to a FedEx hub? (See British Study on Continuous Descent Approach)

### M Foster, June 28

#### **Comments**

- ◆ Captain for American Airlines (Boeing 767 and 757). 1000s of hours on B-727.
- ◆ You can put procedures in effect for what ever hours you desire.
- ◆ You can make special requirements for what ever aircraft you desire.
- ◆ Your only roadblock is the AA to make the recommendation.
- ◆ Mr. Harris works for the AA, you've got to push "I've seen at SO MANY airports"
- ◆ Recommended studying Santa Ana and Long Beach noise websites (said GSO doesn't need this much, but can learn a lot)

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### M Foster, June 28

#### Comments

- ◆ Questions credibility again
- ◆ “Mr. Harris worries me when he makes certain comments that sometimes go unchallenged”.
- ◆ Affirms recommendations by Ron Carter.

### Ron Carter, June 28

#### Comments

- ◆ Citizens committee working with study and the AA to set up proper arrival and departure routes will diminish noise issues.
- ◆ Can do, but will have to push FAA
- ◆ There are no reasons that power setting and take offs and various turns, close in and at different mileage points, and keeping a/c higher on arrivals with turns to intercept approaches can be implemented.
- ◆ We have to make the AA take us seriously.

### M Foster, June 28 (to Jean Black)

#### Comments:

- ◆ Mr. Harris is supposed to submit any of the committee’s ideas that they want submitted.
- ◆ He states again he’s ‘suspicious’ of Andy’s comments
- ◆ Restrictions on 727s is sometimes included in notes of procedural charts of airports all over the world.
- ◆ Comment on noise contours, lines, curves: All of those lines will be different IF you impose the proper noise abatement climbs and turns and takeoff power settings.

### M Foster, June 28 (to Jean Black) - Cont’d

#### Recommendations:

- ◆ Don’t limit procedures and restrictions to FedEx. Others will come after and will probably be using 727s and old DC9s – and possibly even the Lear 25.
- ◆ “Trust but verify” Andy’s comments
- ◆ May want to consider a public rally ( to citizens committee)
- ◆ Get creative with the approach procedures: For example non-precision VOR used at JFK
- ◆ “The secret on takeoff is altitude early, over the right path, followed by a specific power reduction down the flight path at a higher altitude. – they won’t believe you until they see it – and tell “them” you will be testing these.

#### Requests:

- ◆ (Admits he may have missed, but) Would like to see some of the Noise Abatement takeoff procedures already in effect.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

Day Atkins, June 27

### Comment (Arrival Descent Profile)

- ◆ We haven't explored some 'meaningful measures' that could be of substantial benefit to the community: If FedEx were to keep their jets higher until closer to the airport and then proceed with a sharper descent profile, the result could be substantially reduced noise impact to the homes in the descent corridor.
- ◆ She understands that a "Special Approach" could be designed for only FedEx that would have a sharply higher descent angle than the current 3 degrees, possibly 4 degrees (would greatly impact homes a few miles from the approach end of 5)
- ◆ Mentions the pros and cons of a Special Approach
  - Pros
    - Expense to FedEx
    - Special training for FedEx pilots
    - Request waiver from FAA to use higher degree descent
    - Would have slightly higher minimums
  - Cons
    - No more additional workload for the pilot at night (programmed)
    - Greatly reduce noise
    - WAAS approaches makes this easy to design and implement

### Comment (Sound Barriers)

#### Questions:

- ◆ Should we rule out the recommendation for a noise barrier at the FedEx ramp site? (See email for details of why)
- ◆ Given the population density and nominal \$ involved, doesn't it make sense to reconsider the recommendation to construct a noise wall in that location?

### Jeff Hatling, June 28

#### Comments

- ◆ Shifting flight lines based on existing residence without a strong consideration of adopted land use plans and development patterns would be detrimental to the surrounding communities (Kirstner and Norby state similar concerns)
- ◆ Town of Kernersville requests that changing the flight lines NOT BE CONSIDERED.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Jean Black, June 27

#### Comments

- ◆ Agrees with Andy's rec's for installing and operating an Aircraft Noise and Operations Monitoring System. – but want clarity on what would be included.
- ◆ Citizens want noise monitors now to confirm noise levels now and help prepare for what's to come.

#### Questions:

- ◆ How can the Part 150 minimize/reduce the nighttime noise for neighbors NE and SW of the airport?
- ◆ Why is the P150 study map not being used as the base map for all noise contours? (outdated maps being used)
- ◆ Can't we see if the FAA would approve a request for exceptions, if they won't approve our suggestions?

#### Requests / Recommendations:

- ◆ AA should ask FedEx to eliminate 727-200 aircraft. (quotes N&R article saying FedEx likes to please its neighbors)
- ◆ Adopt a 55 DNL Contour in the Part 150 for PTIA as the threshold for compatible use: She includes reminders that the FAA said a 55 DNL can be published – AND that 55 DNL is recommended by the EPA, WHO and ANSI as acceptable noise for land use planning. Adds that RDU used 55 DNL after they were successfully sued by citizens.
- ◆ Adopt a measure to have property eligible for acquisition where DNL exceeds 65dB (to include FAA grants?)
- ◆ Sales assistance outside and/or below the 65 DNL be offered and funded by the AA.
- ◆ AA fund extended noise mitigation by insulating some residences outside and/or below the 65 DNL (E.g. Indianapolis, Detroit, among others)
- ◆ PTIA needs to be ready to evaluate and maybe implement CDA when it becomes available. Should be stated in the P150.
- ◆ Noise Office, with noise officer.

### Fran Ostasiewski, June 27

#### Comment

- ◆ Believe obligation is to reduce harm to existing developments – not new ones.
- ◆ Felt June meeting was beginning of some constructive work

#### Recommendation:

- ◆ Another meeting prior to September so that the committee has time to better understand the options presented, full discuss the options and present what we believe is best.

## Committee Comments & Recommendations

### Mark Kirstner, June 24

#### Comments:

- ◆ I cannot support changes in the flight path because fewer existing homes are in the newly proposed flight path.
- ◆ I feel that it is perfectly reasonable to restrict aircraft operation as long as it does not decrease the efficiency of airport operations. Specific restrictions on larger ac related to landing procedures or specific restrictions on FEDEX related to primarily taking off and landing to the SE seem reasonable.
- ◆ Believe more consideration should be given to expanding soundproofing efforts beyond what is required by the FAA (maybe 60 DNL) --- continues airport's long history of good neighbor relations.
- ◆ Constructing sound barriers, changing flight paths, changing or varying runway usage or establishing flight procedures that favor one neighborhood over another are not reasonable and do not meet communitywide goals; instead, focus on land use goals that compliment PTIA and mitigating future noise impact over already impacted areas.

### Paul Norby, June 21

#### Comments:

- ◆ I would be concerned about any effort to transfer the noise impacts from one subset of pop to another. (Specific: rerouting 727s down I-40 into Forsyth Co)
- ◆ Knowing the above was limited to 727s and maximum contours and only 25% of the 727 traffic, I believe it was a reasonable effort to disperse – but curious about what happens with the other 75% and what that would look like.

#### Recommendations

- ◆ Agree with Lee Whitaker's suggestion to look into GPS based technology as was done in Atlanta
- ◆ Agree with Jeff Hatling that in planning, one looks at future pop as seriously as present pops.

### Ronald Carter, June 20

#### Comments

- ◆ We can fine tune the departures with any of the turns, close in or further out , but these low slow arrivals must be put on the table now.
- ◆ Can't believe that Andy doesn't know where the FedEx structure is being built.

#### Recommendation

- ◆ We must make sure to keep aircraft at least 6000 feet til intercepting the approach path. The allowable 2800msl, which is 1900 feet up to 18 mls from the airport won't be acceptable.
- ◆ Would like the new runway to be the choice for arrivals and departures.

## **Committee Comments & Recommendations**

### **Lucy Smith, June 16**

#### **Comments**

- ◆ Not happy that Andy is making 'assumptions' about what the FAA will and won't accept
- ◆ DNLs are a farce.
- ◆ Current residents concerns should take priority over future residents

#### **Questions:**

- ◆ If noise measurements don't include simultaneous operations (which will happen)-- How can we make predictions on who would get assistance when there is no reality to the measurements?
- ◆ Are our comments from meetings and emails given to the FAA? Why aren't meeting transcripts or recordings being made?

### **Harrison Turner, June 15**

#### **Question:**

- ◆ How many 727s expected to fly in 2009 and beyond?
- ◆ What percentage of the fleet are 727s?

### **Lucy Smith, June 13**

#### **Questions:**

Why couldn't a joint meeting be arranged?