

AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY PANEL (ANAP)

1<sup>st</sup> Quarter, March 2, 2005

6:00 P.M.

**FINAL**

MEMBERS PRESENT

City of Sparks Citizen	Dr. Larry Kleinworth, Chair and Outgoing Vice-Chair
City of Sparks Citizen	Mike Railey, Outgoing Chair
General Aviation	Don Berman
Washoe County Citizen	Terrie Camenisch
Air Cargo	Ron Delgado
Air Traffic Control	Kirk Howell
Washoe County Planning	Sharon Kvas
General Aviation	Bob Larkin, Outgoing
Airport Board of Trustees	Larry Martin
Washoe County Citizen	Craig Paulsen
Air National Guard	Lt. Col. Mitch Sperling
City of Reno Citizen	Charles Ulm

MEMBERS ABSENT

City of Sparks Planning	Neil Krutz, Vice-Chair
Sparks Chamber of Commerce	David Ginsburg
City of Sparks Citizen	Karen Johnston
City of Reno Citizen (Stead)	Arbie Neal
Airlines	Tom Prescott
Washoe County Citizen	Patrick Reardon
City of Reno Planning	Beverly Straub
City of Reno Citizen	Vacant
Fixed Base Operator	Vacant
Reno/Sparks Chamber	Vacant

ALSO PRESENT

AAWC	Dean Schultz, A.A.E., Manager of Airport Planning & Environmental Services
	Andy Solsvig, Planner II
	Lissa Butterfield, Administrative Assistant II

CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Airport Noise Advisory Panel (ANAP) met at the Airport Authority Administrative Offices, Reno/Tahoe International Airport, Reno, Nevada.

Chairman Railey called the meeting to order.

The Panel approved the minutes from the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter meeting of December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

## PRESENTATION BY CHAIRMAN RAILEY

Chairman Railey honored and thanked former Panel members, Doug Melson and Bob Larkin, for their dedicated service and commitment.

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Dr. Larry Kleinworth was elected Chairman of ANAP by unanimous vote. Chairman Kleinworth thanked Mr. Railey for his two years of excellent service as Chair. Neil Krutz was elected Vice-Chair of ANAP by unanimous vote.

## CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL AVIATION REPRESENTATIVE TO THE PANEL

Mr. Larkin introduced Mr. Berman as a steward of General Aviation who has been active in the aviation community since 1968. He is a certified flight instructor, an aircraft owner based in Reno, the owner of a ground-based aviation school and a member of the Aircraft Owners' & Pilots' Association (AOPA). He brings many years of experience with noise, aviation interaction with the airport and the concerns of close proximity residents. Mr. Berman thanked Mr. Larkin for the introduction and expressed his desire to join the Panel. The Panel confirmed Mr. Berman as the new general aviation representative.

## QUARTERLY REPORTS

### 4<sup>th</sup> QUARTER NOISE COMPLAINTS & CARGO ACTIVITY

Mr. Solsvig presented the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter noise complaint report for October, November and December of 2004. The total number of noise complaints for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter was 49. This is down 54% from the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2003 which had 90 complaints. Noise complaints have been gradually decreasing over the past four years. The complaints for 2004 totaled 237, while 2003's totaled 478.

The largest percentage of noise complaints came from the South Hills area with 11 complaints at 23%. Virginia Foothills had 9 complaints at 18%.

The total average daily airline operations for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter were 174. 84% of these operations occurred during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. - 10:00 p.m.). Of the 49 total noise complaints, 65% referred to flights that occurred during the daytime hours. The nighttime complaint percentage was 35%. There was a 4% increase in the nighttime complaint percentage.

Mr. Solsvig reported that cargo flight operations remained the same as the previous quarter. The ratio of complaints to number of operations is highest between 12:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m. and 3:00 a.m. to 5:00 a.m.

## FLIGHT SCHEDULE CHANGES

Mr. Solsvig detailed the following flight schedule changes:

- October – 87 daily departures – no changes.
- November – 85 daily departures – American Airlines discontinued one flight to Chicago, Northwest Airlines temporarily cancelled one flight to Minneapolis.
- December – 90 daily departures – Aloha Airlines added two direct flights, one to Burbank-Maui and one to San Diego-Maui, Delta Air Lines added a non-stop flight to Atlanta, Continental Airlines added a non-stop flight to Newark on Saturdays only, Northwest added one flight to Minneapolis.
- January – 90 daily departures – no changes.
- February – 92 daily departures – Aloha Airlines discontinued a direct flight to Burbank-Maui, United Airlines added three daily departures, two to San Francisco and one to Los Angeles.

Mr. Solsvig also noted some trend changes. The number of regional jet aircraft operations has increased, and all of American Airlines' flights are Boeing 757 aircraft.

## SOUND INSULATION PROGRAM – PHASES 11, 12, 13 & 13

Mr. Solsvig provided an update on the residential sound insulation program. Phases 11 and 12 are substantially complete. Homeowner survey results are available.

Phase 13 floor plan meetings have been completed and contractor and window bids were advertised. On March 15, the AAWC will hold a pre-bid meeting for interested contractors with a tour of homes in Phase 13. Bids will be opened in late March and early April.

The Phase 14 homeowner meeting was held on January 20, 2005. Architect measurement appointments are in process.

## UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS OF THE PERMANENT NOISE MONITORING SYSTEM INSTALLATION

Mr. Solsvig announced the selection of an acoustical consultant for the project: Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc. (HMMH). HMMH will be the acoustical consultant in the selection of sites, preparation of specifications and oversight of installing the appropriate equipment for a permanent noise monitoring system. Advertising took place in January. The selection committee consisted of Andy Solsvig, Dean Schultz, Arbie Neal, the Manager of Engineering and two members of the AAWC Board of Trustees. Overwhelmingly HMMH was selected by the committee members in all categories. AAWC staff will negotiate the scope of work and fee in March with the goal of gaining Board approval in April. Estimated time frame of this project is sixteen months from approval. Quarterly updates will be provided at the ANAP meetings. Should Panel members wish to see the four submitted proposals from HMMH, Veneklasen Associates, Mestre Greve Associates and Brown-Buntin Associates and/or the committee results, they should see Mr. Solsvig.

Ms. Camenisch requested additional information on the deciding factors. Mr. Solsvig explained that the six categories evaluated by the committee were: description of the project team and organizational structure, individual qualifications including past experience over the last five years,

description of project development approach, specialized experience and equipment required, past projects of similar complexity and type and the present workload of the staff to work on the project. He confirmed that HMMH led each of the six categories on each evaluation. Mr. Schultz added that HMMH had completed more installations of new systems around the country than any of the other three companies. Follow-up calls to five airports resulted in positive comments from each of those airports. In the last five years, HMMH has worked on 10-12 similar projects nationwide.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

#### AIRPORT AUTHORITY STAFF ITEMS

Ms. Butterfield distributed copies of the Homeowner Post-Construction Survey results for the third part of Phase 11 (11C) and Phase 12. Both Phases were completed on November 19, 2004. Phase 11 C had 27 homes and Phase 12 had 234 homes.

Surveys were mailed out to approximately 27 homeowners and tenants who either lived in or owned properties at the start or by the end of the Phase 11C and 263 homeowners and tenants who either lived in or owned properties at the start or by the end of Phase 12. Cumulative results were provided for Phase 11 to include 11 A, 11 B and 11C. Because Phase 11 C netted only 13 responses, one survey represented approximately 7.7% of the responses. The response rate for Phase 11 C was 48%, while the cumulative response rate for all of Phase 11 was 50% with 170 of 343 surveys being returned. For Phase 12, 121 of 263 surveys were returned at a rate of 46%.

One of the key categories is the overall satisfaction rate regarding the results. In Phase 11 C, 92.3% were satisfied compared to all of Phase 11 where 96.5% were satisfied. For Phase 12, 90.1% were satisfied overall. The second important category is whether or not the homeowners thought the program was a good idea after all the work was completed. In Phase 11 C, 100% thought the program was a good idea in retrospect, while in all of Phase 11, 97% thought it was a good idea. In Phase 12, 96.7% thought it was a good idea in retrospect. The third important category is whether or not they would recommend this program to their neighbors. In Phase 11 C, 92.3% would recommend the program to their neighbors, while overall in Phase 11, 98.3% would recommend the program. In Phase 12, even though the responses regarding overall satisfaction were lower than in Phase 11, the percentage of homeowners who would recommend the sound insulation program to their neighbors was the highest at 99.2%.

There was one problem rating. One of the questions in the survey asked the homeowners to comment on any problem the homeowners may have had with any of the contractors' or subcontractors' results or performance. Because of the wording, the question encourages a high number of yes responses even if the problem was minor and was resolved. Internally the AAWC has discussed changing the language of the question. In Phase 11 C, 15.4% or two homeowners had at least one problem. Overall in Phase 11, 26.8% had at least one problem and in Phase 12, the percentage jumped to 33.9%. The main reason for this increase was probably the result of a Phase 12 specific issue regarding the initial shipment of screens. The screens arrived flawed, were then installed and then after the problem was identified, had to be removed, the windows re-measured

and then new screens installed. Approximately 30-40% of the homes received flawed screens before the problem was identified.

Ms. Butterfield addressed a request from a Panel member at a previous meeting that the Quarterly Noise Complaint Report be included on the ANAP website. When the staff proceeded with that request this quarter, a concern was raised regarding whether or not the specific addresses of the homeowner complaints should be posted online. The staff chose to explain this reservation to the Panel and ask for a decision on whether or not we should proceed. Mr. Railey asked if the information could be posted by general area and Mr. Schultz responded that the PowerPoint presentation, currently available on the website, includes the complaint information by area in a pie chart. The Panel decided that the PowerPoint information is sufficient.

Mr. Schultz reported that Executive Director Krys Bart attended a conference in late February for the American Association of Airport Executives. One of the main topics of discussion was President Bush's budget plan which includes a very large cut to the Airport Improvement Plan (AIP). Out of the 57 programs identified for cuts, the AIP was the fifth largest with approximately \$650 million for grant-funded projects being lost. This will impact the noise grant-funded projects. Ms. Kvas requested percentage information. Mr. Schultz responded that since \$3.6 billion was appropriated for the AIP last year, \$650 million is approximately 18% of the total. Staff is lobbying the Congressional Delegation to continue support. The AIP is a user-funded program with grants that are based on funds collected from taxes on tickets, oil, tire and aviation products and cargo-weight. The concern is that some of these monies are being used to off-set the general fund deficit and not being put back into the program that generates them.

Mr. Schultz updated the Panel on the noise abatement coordinator hiring process. The first attempt to attract a replacement was unsuccessful. None of the candidates had experience or qualifications in doing airport noise related work. The position was re-advertised with a higher salary range and the result was twenty-two applications with many qualified candidates. Phone interviews were conducted with nine candidates, four of which have been invited for face-to-face interviews on March 3, 2005. Subsequent to the interviews, an offer was made and accepted by the preferred candidate.

Mr. Schultz reported on some news from the recently hired air cargo manager, Brian Pratte. He has been meeting frequently with the various air cargo operators and has reported that Federal Express has some upcoming changes to their fleet mix. The first change, while not the change the Panel wanted, is still an improvement. The 727-100 that arrives at 05:50 and departs at 07:00 will be replaced with an Airbus 310. The more problematic 727-100 will be replaced within the next six months with a 727-200.

In response to a question regarding a comment on the Phase 11 C survey results, Mr. Schultz commented that the staff has met with that homeowner several times. The homeowner wants every single window be removed and replaced with brand new ones. The window manufacturer, the contractor, the architect and airport staff have visited the home and no defects have been found to the level indicated. The airport has offered to clean up the smaller items but not the complete replacement of the windows. The homeowner has not yet responded to the latest offer. The windows currently installed are triple-paned acoustical vinyl windows with a six inch frame and approximately four inches of air between two of the panes. These comments are taken very

seriously. When there is a negative comment, the staff follows up and attempts to resolve the problem. The airport keeps a 10% retainage which is not paid to the contractor until all problems are resolved. This particular home may end up in litigation.

### MEMBER ITEMS

Chairman Kleinworth welcomed Ron Delgado, the new representative for air cargo, from United Parcel Service.

Chairman Kleinworth asked if the FAA proposal to close the tower from midnight to 0600 was a budget cut item. Mr. Howell responded that fifty cities are being evaluated for tower closings. He believes that the FAA is not yet committed to the closing and is still in the process of deciding. The airport itself will not be closed if the tower closes but certain air carriers may choose not to fly into an airport without an operating tower. If the tower is closed, the radar information on the valley floor cannot be sent to another facility. Closing the tower will cause the loss of radar coverage below 10,000 feet in this area. In addition, there are several regularly scheduled flights during the proposed closure period. Mr. Schultz added that the airport opposes the closing and has contacted the Congressional Delegation. Also, there are several general aviation airports and the National Guard base which use the tower, and the mountainous terrain presents challenges to all aircraft. Mr. Martin added that the FAA has proposed closing the tower before and nothing happened.

Ms. Camenisch requested additional information on the ILS. Mr. Howell reported that the reasons for the ILS failures this past winter have been fixed. Regardless of past failures, new equipment will go in this year. Previous failures were because heavy wet snow froze the localizer along Peckham, power supplies to the glide-slope antenna failed, or the generator failed. Mr. Schultz added that the latest report he received indicated that the new equipment would be installed by the Fall of 2005. In the interim, during any expected storm, an FAA technician will now be on site to help with any problems.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further questions or business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.