APPENDIX G: FINAL PUBLIC HEARING
Portland International Jetport
FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program Update

Public Hearing
13 July 2004

Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc.

In association with:
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
Simat, Helliesen & Eichner, Inc.
What is Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 150?

Two principal technical elements:

- Noise Exposure Map (“NEM”), initially determined in compliance by the FAA, March 1990
- Noise Compatibility Program (“NCP”) approved by the FAA, July 1990

City of Portland has voluntarily elected to update these
Major Project Tasks

- Implement a public involvement program
- Define baseline operations, land use, and noise incompatibilities
- Update existing and 5-year forecast noise exposure maps
- Evaluate current noise abatement program
- Evaluate new operational and land use alternatives
- Recommend new measures
- Submit documentation to FAA for review
Public Participation

- 11 Noise Advisory Committee meetings
  - Airport staff
  - Elected officials
  - Neighborhood Association Representatives
  - FAA Air Traffic Control Tower and Regional Office representatives
  - Consultant team

- Web postings: [www.portlandjetport.org/noise.asp](http://www.portlandjetport.org/noise.asp)
- Public Workshop: May 12, 2003
- Public Hearing: July 13, 2004
Noise Measurements:
10 Locations
Cumulative noise exposure levels (Day-Night Average Sound Levels, DNL) were generally less than FAA guidelines for significant noise impact.

Highest noise exposure levels occurred in Stroudwater Village and at the Maine Youth Center.

The loudest single events occurred in Ferry Village and Willard (S. Portland) and along the Western Prom.

The loudest single events were typically caused by “hushkitted” Federal Express 727 and Northwest DC9-30 aircraft.
Noise Modeling: Activity Levels for 2002 and 2007

Average Daily Operations


Military General Aviation Commercial
Noise Modeling: Radar Data for Jet Departures
Noise Modeling: Radar Data for Jet Arrivals
## Continuing Problems Identified by Noise Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Number of Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Low Flights Over Neighborhoods</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Federal Express Flights</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Times of Arrivals and Departures (10pm-7am)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Old Equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Lack of Formal Noise Abatement Program</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Flights Over Islands and Cape Elizabeth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Short Cuts on Harbor Visual Approach and Departures by Problem Aircraft</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Compliance with Procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Education</td>
<td>Lack of Consequences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Military Operations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Aircraft Profiles (Routes and Altitudes)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Inadequate Fanning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Lack of Use of Harbor Visual Approach During Hours of Darkness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Education</td>
<td>Lack of Public Understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Education</td>
<td>Management Attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Stakeholder Ambivalence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Lack of Control of Airport and Residential Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Economic Issues</td>
<td>Lights on 295</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Economic Issues</td>
<td>Trying to do too many things at Airport (GA, Passenger, Cargo)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Control/Procedures</td>
<td>Lack of Use of Preferential Runway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Education</td>
<td>Evaluation of Complaints</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Delayed Arrivals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Runups – PreFlight and Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Seasonal Use of Airport</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Use of Thrust Reverse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable by Operator/Airlines</td>
<td>Vibration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Building Codes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Downtown Airport (location)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>On Airport Trucking Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Health Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Lack of Criteria to Judge Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Noise Impacts from Unique Topography</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Economic Issues</td>
<td>Funding for Solutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Economic Issues</td>
<td>Impact on Property Values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Economic Issues</td>
<td>Lack of Contract Review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Economic Issues</td>
<td>Lack of Political Control</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Recommendations

Operational measures

For takeoffs from Runway 11:

- FAA should increase use of the CASCO TWO DEPARTURE clearance whenever Portland Tower is operational; clearance should be followed to 3,000 feet MSL

- Jetport staff should publish a voluntary noise abatement departure procedure using GPS waypoints to guide aircraft out the Fore River, similar to the CASCO TWO but more precise

- If and when a flight track monitoring system is acquired (see below), Jetport staff should evaluate radar traces to determine whether modifications to the CASCO TWO or the voluntary departure procedure are warranted
Noise Modeling: Radar Data for Jet Departures

http://www.hmmh.com/
Voluntary Noise Abatement
Procedure for Runway 11

http://www.hmmh.com/
New Recommendations -- Operational Measures, continued

For takeoffs from Runway 11, continued:

- When the FAA moratorium on new FMS procedures is lifted, Jetport staff should request that FAA upgrade the voluntary departure procedure to an FMS/RNAV procedure.

- If and when the new FMS/RNAV procedure is approved, Boston Center should issue the new clearance to all nighttime departures whenever Portland Tower is closed.

- Jetport staff should demand that users of Stage 2 aircraft, as well as Federal Express, Airborne Express, Northwest Airlines, and other users of re-certified or loud Stage 3 aircraft request and accept the CASCO TWO DEPARTURE, or fly the voluntary noise abatement departure at all times.
For takeoffs from Runway 29:

- Jetport staff should publish a voluntary noise abatement departure procedure using GPS waypoints to guide aircraft on runway heading to 5 NM or 3,000 feet MSL whichever comes first

For all re-certified Stage 3 aircraft:

- Jetport staff should work with Portland Tower and operators of re-certified Stage 3 aircraft to
  (a) Maximize use of Runway 29 for takeoff
  (b) If Runway 29 is unavailable for takeoff, maximize the use of Runway 11 for landing
  (c) Avoid use of Runway 18/36 except when the crosswind or tailwind component of the wind exceeds the operating limit for the aircraft

- The need for expedited ground time is not an acceptable reason to use Runway 18/36
New Recommendations – Operational Measures, continued

Preferential Runway Use:

- Modify Portland Tower operating procedure to reflect FAA Headquarters’ less stringent weather conditions for use of preferred runways (20 knot crosswinds, 5 knot tailwinds)
- More flexible crosswind and tailwind limitations would allow greater use of Runway 11 for landing and Runway 29 for takeoff, also potentially reducing traffic on 18/36
- Jetport staff should work with operators of all Stage 2 corporate jets, all re-certified Stage 3 corporate jets, and all aircraft operating between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. to avoid use of Runway 18/36 whenever wind and weather conditions permit
New Recommendations

Land use measure:

- Jetport staff should coordinate efforts with municipalities to reduce incompatible land development through measures that help minimize future impacts. For example:
  
  (a) Encouraging noise notifications on subdivision plans
  
  (b) Encouraging building code revisions
New Recommendations -- Administrative Measures

**Administrative measures:**

- Portland International Jetport should acquire a Flight Track Monitoring System (FTMS).
- Jetport staff should utilize the FTMS to:
  - (a) develop flight corridors to be used for monitoring conformance with operational measures.
  - (b) compute EXP(osure) metric to assess changes in fleet noise.
- Jetport staff should require prior permission for engine run-ups of more than 5 minutes and 70% power and should maintain a log of all requested operations.
- All run-ups are to be conducted at the Runway 11 run-up pad on preferred headings as close to 110° or 345° as feasible.
- Jetport staff should request USAF and USN flying units to curtail practice instrument approaches.
New Recommendations --
Administrative Measures, continued

- Continue meetings with Noise Advisory Committee
- Provide periodic updates of conformance with operational measures using flight track plots and other FTMS data
- Attend period meetings of local homeowner associations
- Publish an annual review of the Noise Compatibility Program’s effectiveness
- Publish a Jeppesen insert for pilots
- Continue to update the Jetport’s web site with noise-related information of interest to the general public
Effects of New Measures on 2007 Forecast Noise Exposure
### Reductions in Noise Exposed Population

#### Portland International Jetport
Population Counts within DNL Increments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DNL 55-60</th>
<th>DNL 60-65</th>
<th>DNL 65-70</th>
<th>DNL above 70</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Conditions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Baseline, terrain adjusted</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Forecast, terrain adjusted</td>
<td>5,699</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>6,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Abatement Measures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 with New NCP, terrain adjusted</td>
<td>5,414</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Improvement:</strong></td>
<td>-285</td>
<td>-393</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-186</td>
<td>-678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Steps

- Take public comments
- Integrate comments into final report
- Complete Noise Exposure Map and Noise Compatibility Program checklists and submit document to FAA for review/approval
- Submit FAA-approved Noise Compatibility Program measures to Portland and South Portland City Council for implementation
Comments?
Noise Modeling:
Radar Data for Propeller Departures
Noise Modeling: Radar Data for Propeller Arrivals
Baseline Noise Exposure: 2002 (red) and 2007 (blue)
Previously-Approved Noise Compatibility Measures

1. Noise Barrier at the Approach end of Runway 18
2. Hush house on the East End of the Airport Property
3. Preferential Use of Runway 29
4. Preferential Arrival Route
5. Runway 11 Preferential Departure Routes
6. Use of FAA Advisory Circulars (AC) 91-53 Noise Abatement Departure Profiles
7. Monitor Proposals for New Scheduled Operations Between 11:30 pm and 6:15 am
8. Noise Abatement Committee Review of Implementation
9. Quantitative Review of Changes in Noise Exposure
10. Re-computation of Contours with Changes in Airport Layout or Operation

11. Minimum Time Interval Between Preparation of New Noise Contours

12. Land Acquisition and Relocation

13. Soundproofing

14. Easement Acquisition

15. Airport Zoning Overlay District

16. Easement Acquisition – As Part of Proposed New Development

17. Real Estate Disclosure

18. Undeveloped Land Acquisition
Identified and Evaluated Alternatives: 2007 Forecast without Early Turns

Only overland areas
Where DNL increases

HIGHEST DNL REDUCTION

HIGHEST DNL INCREASE

-8dB
-7dB
-6dB
-5dB
-4dB
-3dB
-2dB
-1dB
0 dB
+1dB
+2dB
+3dB
+4dB
## Changes in Noise at Specific Points: FedEx Fleet Upgrade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>FedEx A-310s</th>
<th>Change in DNL</th>
<th>DNL for 2007</th>
<th>Maximum SEL for 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>101.1 -0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroudwater</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.2 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Promenade</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>103.9 -0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Village</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>100.2 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaks Island</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>91.7 -0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Williams Park</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>90.6 -0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Elizabeth</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>93.5 -0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtland Court</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>110.7 -0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMPARISON OF DNL AND SEL NOISE METRICS FOR DIFFERENT MITIGATION MEASURES

- **DNL for 2007**
- **Maximum SEL for 2007**
Identified and Evaluated Alternatives: Use of the CASCO TWO Departure

This SID is a noise abatement procedure and applies only to turbojet aircraft and turboprop aircraft capable of 210 knots. All aircraft must be DME equipped.

DEPARTURE ROUTE DESCRIPTION

TAKE-OFF RUNWAY 11: Fly runway heading to I-PWM 2.6 DME, then turn left heading 060° maintain 3000 feet. Expect vectors to filed route or depicted NAVAID. Expect further clearance to requested altitude/flight level 5 minutes after departure.

LOST COMMUNICATIONS: If radio contact not established within 2 minutes after departure, proceed on course and climb to requested altitude or 10,000 feet, whichever is lower.
Observed Minimal Use of Existing Noise Abatement Departure Route
Interim Setbacks on Desirable Alternatives

New FMS/RNAV Procedures:
- FAA moratorium continues indefinitely on new GPS-based published instrument procedures; new procedures can only incorporate GPS navigation if they are voluntary

Federal Express:
- Has indicated that there is insufficient cargo volume to justify changing to a quieter aircraft type

Increased Glide Slope angle:
- FAA has rejected PWM’s request for 3.5 degree glide slope to Runway 29
LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PORTLAND, MAINE

NOTICE TO BIDDERS
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
SERVICES

Sealed bids will be received at the Portland Public Schools, Business Administration Building, 200 Broadway, Portland, Maine 04102 until 2:00 P.M., on Tuesday, June 14, 2004, at which time and place they will be publicly opened and read to bidders.

Additional Asbestos Abatement at the Presumpscot School

A site investigation and an asbestos pre-bid meeting will be held at the Pre-Sumpscot School, 69 Pre-Sumpscot Street, Portland, Maine at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 2, 2004. The meeting will be held at the front entrance. Specifications, drawings and proposal forms will be available and provided at the pre-bid meeting as specified above. The award of the contract is subject to the receipt of the necessary funds and the work cannot start before August 1, 2004.

Additional Information related to this project can be obtained from the Facilities Engineer, Mr. Douglas Sherwood at 207-874-6739 or the Project Designer, Mark P. Collins, Environmental Safety & Hygiene Associates, Inc. at 207-654-2711.

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
PUBLIC NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE
Please take notice that Sabre Corporation, Hawthorne Road, Box 134, South Casco, ME 04077 (Phone: 207-287-2331) intends to file an Air Emission License application with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) pursuant to the provisions of 36 M.R.S.A. Section 590 on or about June 1, 2004. The application is for the renewal of a Part 70 pollution prevention permit for a 250,000 cubic foot storage tank at its facility located at Hawthorne Road in Raymond, ME 04077. The application will be available for review at the Department of Environment Protection (DEP) offices in Augusta, (207) 287-2331 during normal working hours. A copy of the application and supporting documentation will be available at the municipal office in Raymond, ME 04077. Written public comments must be sent to Marla Morris at the Bureau of Air Quality, State House Station #17, Augusta, Maine 04333.

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
PUBLIC NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE
Please take notice that the Maine Workers Compensation Board of Directors has scheduled a hearing to be held on Tuesday, June 1, 2004 at its Central Office in Augusta located in the AMH Complex, ceiling building, Room 170 and a 5:00 p.m. Business Meeting and 7:00 p.m. Public Forum on Tuesday, June 15 at 9a Central office located at One Vaughn Place, North Drive. This schedule is subject to change. For further information, please call 207-794-0796.

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
PORTLAND, MAINE
Notice to Bidders
Sealed bids, addressed to Purchasing Office, Room 103, 158 Congress Street, Portland, Maine 04101, and endorsed on the outside of the envelope with the name of the proposer, Bid Name and Bid number will be received until 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 15, 2004, at which time they will be publicly opened in Room 170, 158 Congress Street.

Provide Heating Oil - Peaks Island
Bid #8504
Proposal forms are available at the Purchasing office and may be requested by calling 207-874-6739 or via e-mail mpg@portlandmaine.gov 1592751

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
PUBLIC NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE
Please take notice that Sabre Corporation, Hawthorne Road, Box 134, South Casco, ME 04077 (Phone: 207-287-2331) intends to file an Air Emission License application with the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) pursuant to the provisions of 36 M.R.S.A. Section 590 on or about June 1, 2004. The application is for the renewal of a Part 70 pollution prevention permit for a 250,000 cubic foot storage tank at its facility located at Hawthorne Road in Raymond, ME 04077. The application will be available for review at the Department of Environment Protection (DEP) offices in Augusta, (207) 287-2331 during normal working hours. A copy of the application and supporting documentation will be available at the municipal office in Raymond, ME 04077. Written public comments must be sent to Marla Morris at the Bureau of Air Quality, State House Station #17, Augusta, Maine 04333.

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
PUBLIC NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE
Please take notice that Congress Renovations, Inc. and The BDN Group, Inc., 100 Congress Street, Suite 200, Portland, ME 04101 intends to file an Air Emission License application with the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) pursuant to the provisions of 36 M.R.S.A. Section 590 on or about June 1, 2004. The application is for normal boiler operation at the Monument Square, Portland, ME. According to Department regulations, interested parties must be publicly notified, written comments invited, and if justified, an opportunity for public hearing given. A request for a public hearing or for the Board of Environmental Protection to assume jurisdiction must be received by the Department in writing no later than 20 days after the application is accepted by the Department as complete for processing. The application and supporting documentation will be available for review at the Bureau of Air Quality, State House Station #17, Augusta, ME 04333.

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
NOTICE OF ASBESTOS ABATEMENT

The Maine Workers Compensation Board of Directors has scheduled a hearing to be held on Tuesday, June 1, 2004 at its Central Office in Augusta located in the AMH Complex, ceiling building, Room 170 and a 5:00 p.m. Business Meeting and 7:00 p.m. Public Forum on Tuesday, June 15 at 9a Central office located at One Vaughn Place, North Drive. This schedule is subject to change. For further information, please call 207-794-0796.

LEGAL ADVERTISEMENT
PUBLIC NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE
Please take notice that Congress Renovations, Inc. and The BDN Group, Inc., 100 Congress Street, Suite 200, Portland, ME, intends to file an Air Emission License application with the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) pursuant to the provisions of 36 M.R.S.A. Section 590 on or about June 1, 2004. The application is for normal boiler operation at Monument Square, Portland, ME. According to Department regulations, interested parties must be publicly notified, written comments invited, and if justified, an opportunity for public hearing given. A request for a public hearing or for the Board of Environmental Protection to assume jurisdiction must be received by the Department in writing no later than 20 days after the application is accepted by the Department as complete for processing. The application and supporting documentation will be available for review at the Bureau of Air Quality, State House Station #17, Augusta, ME 04333.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olivia P. Silk</td>
<td>1187 Westbrook St, Portland, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Heath</td>
<td>Assoc. 260 Waterhouse Ave, SE Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ainsworth</td>
<td>12 Garrison St, Portland 04102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Armstrong</td>
<td>Cape Elizabeth, 5 Ironclad Rd, C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold A. Clough</td>
<td>5707 Forest Rd, Cape Elizabeth, ME 04121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Bowdreau</td>
<td>953 Sawyer St, So. Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Beacher</td>
<td>SP City Council, 135-9 Highland Ave, S. Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Boudreau</td>
<td>So. Portland, 353 Sawyer St, So. Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rosenbauer</td>
<td>United Express, <a href="mailto:michael.rosenbauer@airwis.com">michael.rosenbauer@airwis.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Anderson</td>
<td>Cape Elizabeth, 45 Forest Rd, C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela V. Anderson</td>
<td>Cape Elizabeth, 45 Forest Rd, C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseann McConnell</td>
<td>PORTLAND, 18 Kent St, Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Chandler</td>
<td>Portland, 18 Kent St, Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Bernard</td>
<td>13 Lassell St, Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Moran</td>
<td><a href="mailto:seahawker01@netscape.net">seahawker01@netscape.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Williams</td>
<td>Neighbor of Airport, 8 S Mechanicove St, Portland 04102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Bevan</td>
<td>Willard Black, <a href="mailto:hbevan@fjm-law.com">hbevan@fjm-law.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Raymond</td>
<td>Stroudwater, wraymond4mainenews.com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Walter N. Rubeney  | Stroudwater, "" ""
| Constance Bloomfield| WEST END, cbleomfi@mainenews.com |
| William McFarland  | Portland/West End, mcfar-w@
<p>| Gayle McNiel       | News 8 WMTW, <a href="mailto:gmcnuel@wmtw.com">gmcnuel@wmtw.com</a> |
| Candy Smith        | News 8 WMTW, <a href="mailto:csmile@wmtw.com">csmile@wmtw.com</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Ferguson</td>
<td>15 Bay Road, South Portland, ME</td>
<td>04050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Ferguson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Lynch</td>
<td>1 Cliff St., South Portland, ME</td>
<td>04102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie K. Harris</td>
<td>So. Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:harris@maine.rr.com">harris@maine.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Schoof</td>
<td>Parkside Neighborhood, SCS <a href="mailto:Media@aol.com">Media@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
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Paul Ferguson from the Loveitt's Field Homeowners' Association in South Portland: We've noticed the remarkable success of using the river route particularly on inbound flights under VFR conditions, and you've indicated here that the voluntary departure routes are well on their way towards at least presentation. Do you have any estimate as to when that may become an FAA-approved route?

Constance Bloomfield from the West End: I have a question about the 2007 projections. I was surprised that in fact they only approximated what the 2001 pre-9/11 flights were in number of average daily flights, and I don't understand that given all the expansion that's been going on at the airport with runways, parking lots, roadways, everything else. It seems to me that you're setting up for a lot more flights, so maybe you could answer that.

Harold Lough, representing part of Gorham and part of Scarborough in the Maine Legislature: I received some calls from constituents in Gorham today, and they were concerned about what's written in the paper with respect to the westerly takeoffs going over the Gorham area and less populated areas of Gorham. And as you know, there are fewer and fewer of these less-populated areas anywhere to the west. And the concerns that we have is that there will be an
increase in traffic and an increase in noise, and I’m looking for some assurance on behalf of those constituents that there will be noise abatement. And if there is an increase in traffic, there will be programs that will keep the noise down at least to the level it is now or lower.

Pat Bernard, Westgate Area: May I just bring up something that when you were talking that struck me funny? Since 9/11 you don’t know who flies around in the air around us?

But if he has it [software], why waste tax money? Why don’t you just share it?

It just seemed like a strange comment when you made that. But what really brought me here is, I have to say that since 1990 living out by Westgate, the noise levels have improved. And what I was concerned of with the increased traffic and stuff is that you were going to start spreading out the noise, but it looks you’re keeping it compressed. What I’d like to know is are you doing something about the time of the noisy events. It seems like it’s louder at night. These run-ups that you’re talking about, are you going to do something about restricting the times of days they can do that? And is it noisier at night because they shut off the tower, and these jets have to come in a different way than they are coming in during the day?
But some cities prevent trucks from coming into their communities during the daytime, why wouldn’t we be able to do the same thing?

Can we request an extra person to keep the tower open longer if it’s going to keep it quieter?

Donna Williams: I also live near Westgate.

However, I live over by Capiscic Pond, and I’m not quite clear after listening to the presentation as to what the impact is going to be on my neighborhood. I understood what you said about Gorham and areas further to the west, and the planes will be at a higher elevation, but what about those areas west of the airport close to the airport. As the crow flies, I am right next door, so I’m interested in these changes you’re proposing and what impact they’re going to have on my neighborhood.

So there will be less noise in my neighborhood you think?

Steven Scharf: I live the Parkside neighborhood, which isn’t really affected by all of this, but I just wanted to make a couple of comments about some things you said. The first comment is the charge that pays for all of this is a tax on the passengers, so it is a tax and that is paid with tax dollars. I think the airport administration should remember that, that it is a tax, and that it’s not just your
money to play with. Separately, you made a comment, as part of your presentation, you talked about land use and that you spoke to the planning offices of the various communities around Portland and asked them about modifying their zoning to accommodate the airport. And I find that sort of specious even for you to think that - these are mature, developed communities, and I don’t quite understand what you thought they would be able to. Are you suggesting that the Western Prom be torn down and turned into fields? And - but, that’s what you implied, and I just want more explanation as to what you thought land use-wise should happen around the airport. And also understanding that the airport actually doesn’t pay any taxes to either Portland or South Portland, because they are a government-owned property, and if we were to sell it to a private corporation and let a private corporation run the airport, then they would actually pay taxes to the local communities. That tax could come out of the passenger facility charge, but I’m being told that that can’t happen. But it’s just an idea that I’ve thrown out there.

David Silk: I live in Stroudwater. A couple of comments on the land use issue. I think it would be helpful as part of your long-term planning and looking at funding requests if one of the things you do is include some money to perhaps put together model provisions that you’d like the
planners to incorporate in their zoning provisions, because
my sense is unless you do something like that, something like
that won’t get off the ball. And also include some money for
abatement procedures if you are dealing with areas that – the
term has been used – that generally the noise levels meet the
FAA guidelines. I assume there is exceptions to that,
because of using the word ‘generally.’ And one of the
questions I have is where does the existing noise level
exceed the FAA guidelines, and under the present FAA
guidelines, will it continue to exceed those guidelines with
what you’ve proposed? I’ve got a couple of other comments as
well. I also would like to know a bit more about what
voluntary means. In our neighborhood, FedEx has been
notoriously – just has not complied with any voluntary
measures to date. I understand that 80 percent of the noise
complaints generated approximately are due to FedEx
operations. My neighbors can go out at 7:30 every night,
even if the wind is blowing in the wrong direction, you can
hear FedEx come in. You say ‘hear comes FedEx’ twice a day.
It doesn’t matter what the weather condition is, and my
understanding in the last 10 years, FedEx has essentially
thumbed their noses at everyone who has tried to get them to
be responsible and deal with the issue. And I would like to
know what makes you think FedEx is going to actually change
their tune, and that goes to the heart of what voluntary is.
Another comment is I understand that the former National Airport in D.C., which is the Reagan Airport now, while it may be open 24/7 it has significant flight restrictions on commercial operations at night. I don’t know what the actual timeframe is, but I think there are airports – I’m not saying Portland is going to go in that direction – but I think there are situations. We have an urban airport where there are some limitations imposed due to the conditions at night. I don’t know whether that’s because voluntary efforts of ensuring compliance with commercial operators didn’t get anywhere or what happened there. But it may be just political, it happened to be D.C., and people in Georgetown wanted to make sure they could sleep at night. But a couple of other comments as well.

The last question was just on the flight track monitoring system. I think it’s imperative that you find a way to fund that and have it, because I’ve made calls and the people in Stroudwater Village – I spoke to Tom Ainsworth who had to leave. We’ve made many calls, and either the line is not being manned, or you say maybe we’ll do the best we can. No complaints with you all, but ... It’s very difficult, and to me, if you’re going to have a voluntary compliance system, there has to some method of accountability. And unless you can identify what I use the word ‘culprits’ where again, we all understand weather conditions and that the captain of the
ship has to make the call of what's safe for the passengers.
No doubt about that, but we all can know of instances where
we look up and know the wind is out of the northwest, and
you're wondering why they're using the short runway at 7:00
at night. There doesn't appear to be any reason for it, and
when you call, you never get a meaningful response. So those
are the comments and questions. I'm sorry I threw them all
out at once.

Jean Heath: I represent the Willard Neighborhood
Association at the Noise Committee meetings for about the
past four years, so I know how much hard work has gone into
this, and I am optimistic about the changes that are going to
be made, especially with this software that will make the
airlines accountable. The concern I have since I was on the
Committee before 9/11 is that the summer of 2000 and 2001 are
pretty much the noise level and the operation level that was
reached in those two years are what motivated this study in
the first place. And then 9/11 happened and everything
changed. And all the regional jets started coming in and it
got a lot quieter. Now I see the airlines are starting to
regain their footing, and you project that operations will
start to come back to the levels that it was before, and I
think that what our neighborhood is concerned with is that
when those levels come back, are those jets going to come
back too? Or is regional jets now the way the airlines are
going to be doing business?

Julia Brown: I live in the West End, and at the
outset I apologize. I have not been involved in this issue
at all, and I know that people have been for a long time, so
forgive my ignorance on some of these questions. And I also
missed the first half of your presentation for which I
apologize. But as I understand it, is it fair to say that
part of what's being proposed here is to funnel a greater
percentage of the inbound and outbound traffic along the Fore
River and out over the harbor?

I appreciate that, but I mean, I think it's safe to say
that a larger percent of the traffic will now be using that
Casco 2 ... no?

And on the projections on the future impacts, and I
confess I didn't entirely follow this table, but are you
assuming that there's going to be greater compliance with
pilots staying over the water? What are your sort of
assumptions going forward in terms of looking at noise
impacts in the future?

No, I appreciate that. What I was trying to get at is
what are your assumptions in the report in terms of noise
level expectations? For example, in 2007 what are you
assuming with respect to percentage compliance with staying
over the water as opposed to the early left-hand turn?

Thanks. That's helpful.

Wade McFarland: Also West End. I'm told by my
travel agent - and I travel most heavily in and out of
Portland Jetport, so I'm a heavy user. But actually one of
the questions I've got is really (inaudible) on this, and
that is that flight pattern could actually direct a bit more
noise into Portland proper without some altitude guidelines.
And you really didn't talk about what the expectations for
particularly the flight path vertically. Because as you
mentioned, in the West End we're not under planes, we're
practically right off their wing tips, and the engine noise
comes pretty much sideways at the West End. The next
question I am reflecting is concerning how much more of this
noise actually (inaudible) is going to just move from South
Portland to Portland. I think a lot of the questions have
said implicitly, are you moving noise really into our
neighborhood, either Gorham or South Portland or in Portland
itself, so maybe you could address that.

Peter Anderson from Cape Elizabeth: I came here
thinking that my issue, which is the dispersion, as you call
it, is sort of an ancillary issue. But I think it really
gets to the heart of the matter, because as this woman
pointed out, you use the term voluntary quite a bit. It seems like - first of all, I'm shocked that you don't have in fact the software to know which planes are going where when. And I would say let us know how we can help you get it, because I'm all for it. But that brings down the point to one thing, which is once you have the software, it sure sounds like you don't have any recourse to keep those planes where you want them, unless the FAA can speak to that. But it sounds like it's more about FAA and pilot control as to where those planes go, and perhaps you can let us know how we can help address that issue as well to see that there is more local control, or as you use the term 'mandatory access provisions' for the airport. Because all the sound comes down to where the planes are, and if you can't keep the planes where you're projecting them or want them, the pilots are turning early and you have no recourse to that to keep the sound levels where you project them to be in your study.

So for instance, when you look at those maps from a distance you can see the red and the blue strips where most of the approaches and departures take place. When you get up close you see there are actually quite a few tracks that are not on those approach and departure lines. So I guess my question is those pilots that are taking those tracks are the ones that are probably causing a lot of the problems and are the phone calls that are made to the Jetport, many of which
are not answered. But when we call when you have your
software and you can call up the tail number and say that was
FedEx or that was US Air or Northwest, what recourse do you
have to make them comply with the approach or departure you
want them to take?

I have personally called the Jetport several times
having large jet aircraft pass directly over my house in Cape
Elizabeth, which is far south of that instrument approach.
They were so low I could see the rivets on the sheet metal.
They were below 1,000 feet. Both (arriving and departing).

Obviously I can't tell you the exact altitude, but what
I would tell you is that it is extremely close to the point
where I can make out individual panels on the - it was
extremely low. My windows were shaking. I don't want to
make this a personal issue. I think there is a broader issue
here, which is whether it's flying over Cape Elizabeth or
over the Western Prom or turning early while taking off to
the west. The point is where the planes are. Are they where
you want them? And more importantly, with regards to the
study, are they where you're projecting they're going to be
when you take your sound pressure readings? You had talked
about - I think a compliance rate of 30 percent was used for
your study, which is a low number for a goal, but my point is
why can't it be higher? Is there a way that we could ensure
that you have higher compliance?
Anne Pringle: I have been on this Committee representing the Western Prom Neighborhood Association. I’ve lived in my house for 30 years. I served on the City Council for four years and dealt with noise issues for a long time. And I want to say that this has been a very frustrating experience in many ways, but a learning experience, and I’m going to go out on a limb and say that I personally feel that even though some of these procedures are voluntary, we’re going to try to move them toward mandatory with the assistance of John Silva of the FAA. We’ve been very fortunate, and I’ve been impressed that John has been at, I think, almost every one of our meetings, and I consider him now an ally of this community in dealing with our problem. Jeff Bourque is our new assistant manager, and it’s like night and day, his attitude toward helping us resolve this problem. I think speaking for myself and I think some others on the Committee, we really felt we were being stonewalled and, you know, sort of put off in what our concerns were. And we have a new Tower Manager, Doug Booth, who has, I think, put in a lot more energy to be more directive to the pilots and how we want them to follow routes. We were told in our research that this tower previously had been very pilot-friendly, oh you want to go that way, okay, and I don’t believe Doug is allowing that anymore, and I think we’re
going to see the results of that. So I’ll go out on a limb
and I’ll say that because of what we’ve generated in working
with these three guys, and Bob Miller, who’s been our very
able consultant, that we are going to make progress on this.
And now that I’ve gone out on a limb, gentlemen, I’m sure
you’re going to work very hard to make sure we make the
progress.

It takes vigilance, and this flight-tracking system is
absolutely essential. We have got to get that purchase made,
and our organization is going to be meeting tomorrow night.
We’re going to hopefully agree to send a letter to the City
Council asking them to move this forward quickly. I do want
to thank two other gentlemen. One is now-Mayor Smith, who
was the Chair of this Committee until he assumed the office
of Mayor, and Councilor Cohen who has been his able
successor. And as somebody has said previously, almost
immediately when he heard the FedEx concerns and problems
wrote a very firm letter to FedEx, and we are finally getting
something more out of FedEx than we got before, which was a
total brushoff. And they are a number one culprit who has
absolutely got to be brought under control, and I’m hoping
again with this stellar cast of partners that we’re going to
make progress. So thank you.

Edchen Ferguson, Loveitt’s Field, South Portland: I
also have been attending all of the meetings as we have gone forward over the past two, three years. I will have to say, Anne, that I found the airport personnel very responsive, the ones that have left and been replaced. I found them responsive, and the people in our neighborhoods found them responsive. We live on the very dark green ... no further over to the east ... thank you. I think what you are referring to when you refer to the lines coming around Cape Elizabeth is the fanning, and the fanning took place after the last study. And that has been a tremendous help to us in our neighborhood, because before the last study, everything went on that green line, and we got it all. Now we find a lot of flights that are fanned. They're fanned very carefully so that you don't have any dark green areas going over Cape Elizabeth, but you do have some flights that go over Cape Elizabeth. So I think that's what he was referring to.

We all hope so [that the fanning will continue] in my neighborhood.

Unidentified speaker: I've commented before on the remarkable progress that you've made, particularly with the river exits and the river entrances, and we more than appreciate that. It's made a significant difference to us. I did want to make one comment about the military planes. It seems to me those happen, what is it 400 or some odd flights
a year, and you’re projecting it to be the same. I see no
real reason to send letters to the Air Force or the Navy to
reduce or to have them change any needs for training.
Training for the military, as far as I’m concerned as a
former Air Force officer, is vital, and it should continue to
be so. If the Portland Airport is one where they found
training is beneficial for their Air Reserve or their weekend
training, and that’s usually when most of it happens, then I
think that’s certainly appropriate. I’ve seen the KC-97’s go
over and the P-2V’s. Usually they come over the ILS direct
in approach. Usually they do it during clear weather when
the river route is used by the commercial pilots, and it’s
strictly for the use of training for touch-and-go’s, and I
think that should be continued if the Air Force and the Navy
think that it is appropriate. I don’t think a letter to
either one of the services is necessary. Thank you.

Robert Hains: 20-odd years West End resident, and
I’ve discovered that I’m on the north approach to the north-
south now, so I have a question. Is any of the noise study
also being done and abatement being done on the north-south
runway as well as the east-west runway? First question.
I realize that. Many of your smaller jets and your prop
jet commercials come north to south, it appears. Hardly any
takeoffs to the north, so it seems. Comments or questions.
It looks like your approach control is very tight in looking at your mapping. Maybe it's because of fanning, but it looks like there is absolutely no departure control in Portland once an aircraft lifts off, because they fan everywhere and some are very tight to the end of the runway when they make their initial turn. And I know other people have asked the question from a little different standpoint, but will some of that be tightened up? You had a visual where you had a point out in the river and then a point out at the mouth of the river that you lit upon. Yes, that one. You implied that they would be straight out until they hit the first turn point, which would be just west of the Casco Bay Bridge. Is that going to be a fairly hard and fast rule, because it will change some of the fanning on the map if it is? And you can't please everybody, but it may make some difference.

I'll make this comment. From when I lived in the West End, I was three streets off the river - Commercial Street, the top of the hill was Danforth Street, and my backyard overlooked Danforth Street though I was the third street in. And airplane noise, I got very used to it because there's so much of it that's just background, or did not seem that bad. Now as you get closer to the Western Prom, it gets tighter. There are occasions when somebody will break off the normal flight path, and this gentleman was referring to a plane 1,000 feet above you, almost seems accurate, because windows
will shake and doors will rattle. And I can remember one
night many years ago when somebody got out over the spine of
the peninsula ... well, maybe even prior to FedEx. But I think
WCSH was still up on the top floor of the hotel. There was
an evening talk show, and the fellow hit the floor because he
thought something was coming through the roof. So it does
happen on occasion, and I realize that you guys try to keep
them fairly tight, but will there be some more departure
control than appears to be taking place now? Thank you.

Because your second point on the jet would only be what
8,000 feet by the time you get out there or higher?
The higher they are, the less the noise.

Why can't they be climbing out? What is the reason a
ceiling of 3,000 feet on a takeoff from a ...

If you don't have any conflicting traffic here like they
do in some areas where departure control is very tightly
controlled, this is approach. The higher they are the less
the impact of the noise, especially if they're still at 110
percent of power at takeoff.

David Silk: This is just kind of a hypothetical
question. If we're here ten years from now, and you have a
commercial carrier like FedEx, but it might be FedEx, who has
over ten years basically said our pilots get to choose. And
you have this software system installed, and it's clear that
weather conditions that most people would say didn’t dictate
that they had to choose that particular runway, at what
point, if any point, can the FAA help out to — voluntarily or
through some mechanism — say, hey look, it’s important that
all things being equal we see some effort to comply with the
noise abatement procedure that’s been implemented. And if
you see a routine pattern where for no apparent reason
justifiable to weather reason or whatever, that the carrier
is routinely not making an effort to comply with voluntary
standards, can the FAA do anything with respect to that
particular entity? That’s my question. So, if in ten years
from now we look at this, is there anything that can be done
if you have that information?

My assumption is that it’s before they make the
clearance. My understanding is that if FedEx is coming in
they can choose which runway they want to take, and once they
make the choice they have to obviously comply with the
clearance standards. I understand that. I’m going back to
when they make the choice.

My point is that there has been a track record, at least
in my neighborhood’s view, that with respect to FedEx, they
don’t care. And so I understand that most pilots, I think,
would react the way you did, but at least the track record,
and maybe it’s going to change and I know you’ve written a
letter, and I can guarantee that there were many letters
written ...

And I’m hopeful. My understanding is in the past FedEx has said they would comply and haven’t, so it’s not a question that you haven’t done what you should have done. My sense is that there was a study done in 1990 that identified these concerns, and that over the years FedEx has made certain representations. They’ve said certain things, and the reality is that it just hasn’t happened. So maybe it is at the pilot level, I understand. My question is, and I understand the answer to the question from an FAA perspective—there’s nothing we can do about it, it’s not a traffic issue, it’s not a safety issue. It’s more of a local issue if you have an issue on long-term leases or things like that with FedEx. And at some point if they don’t want to be a good tenant or something like that, then you have something ...

(inaudible).

My point is that it just seems absurd if you have someone who is routinely … (inaudible).
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