

**I noticed a specific carrier regularly flies the noisiest jet, the 727. What can be done to force or encourage airlines to replace those more noisy jets?**

The MAC realizes that older hush-kitted aircraft (DC-9 and Boeing 727) produce more noise impact on the airport's neighbors than the quieter, newly manufactured Stage 3 aircraft. However it is important to note that hush-kitted aircraft are Stage 3 compliant and meet all required federal noise criteria. As such, MAC does not have the authority to restrict the use of such aircraft. Realizing the effect aircraft type has on the noise exposure at MSP, the MAC has proposed a noise abatement measure in the 2004 Part 150 Update to investigate, develop and implement measures and/or incentives to encourage airlines to use manufactured Stage 3 aircraft. Successful implementation of this measure could reduce the noise impacts associated with hush-kitted aircraft operations at MSP. In addition, as airlines that operate at MSP continue to update their aircraft fleets, quieter aircraft technology will continue to become more prevalent at MSP.

**Why can other airports place operational restrictions on airlines while MSP cannot?**

Because MSP is a public use facility, which uses federal aviation dollars for improvements and development, federal policy supersedes local authority with respect to access and use of the facility. Availability of federal monies for airport expenses are subject to grant assurance provisions. Under those provisions the facility must provide access free of arbitrary and capricious restrictions. Because MAC uses federally funded dollars to develop and maintain the facility, the Federal Government (FAA) reserves the right of refusal relative to proposed operationally restrictive policies, if those policies conflict with determined FAA guidelines.

However, some airports such as San Diego and John/Wayne Orange County, implemented operational restrictions based on noise before the passing of the Aviation Noise and Capacity Act of 1990, and therefore those restrictions were grandfathered in and are allowed under federal guidelines.

**Where can I see the updated noise contour map?**

The updated noise contour map is available online at the following address:  
<http://www.macnoise.com/contourfind/index.jsp>.

**The RMT that is mapped at 49th and Oakland is actually at 48th and Park Ave.**

RMT # 4 is located in the alleyway between 49th and 48th Street and Oakland and Park Avenue. For simplification purposes, the monitor is listed as being located on 49th Street and Oakland Avenue South. If you look closely at the RMT map in the Monthly Technical Advisors Report, the red dot representing the actual placement of the monitor is correctly located.

**What is the procedure for being able to speak at the NOC meetings?**

A public comment period is added to the end of each NOC meeting. Speakers are limited to three minutes and must be sponsored by two members of the committee. A request to speak can be made by contacting your community NOC representative, Council Member Scott Benson, Minneapolis.

In addition, written comments can be submitted to the NOC by completing a NOC public input form, available online at the following address:  
[www.macnoise.com/pdf\\_files/noc/input\\_form.pdf](http://www.macnoise.com/pdf_files/noc/input_form.pdf).

### **Can the airport use noise barriers, such as berms, around the airport to reduce noise impacts?**

Many airports choose to erect noise barriers to help attenuate ground level noise from the operation of an airport. Such barriers usually consist of vegetation or an earth barrier around the perimeter of the airport.

Realizing the potential for possibly reducing noise impact from taxiing and takeoff operations in close proximity to MSP runways, the MAC proposed a land use measure in the 2004 Part 150 Update to investigate and possibly create sound barriers and/or buffers at MSP.

### **Have the noise contour lines changed since they were published in September?**

The MAC published the Draft Part 150 Update with the updated Noise Exposure Maps (noise contours) and the updated Noise Compatibility Program in August 2004. A public hearing on the draft document was held on September 7, 2004 and the comment period on the document closed on September 14, 2004.

The Commission approved the document in November 2004 and authorized staff to submit the document to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The document has been submitted and the contour lines have not changed since it was published.

### **Airport noise is getting worse, not better, as was promised years ago.**

The number of operations at MSP are climbing above pre 9/11 levels. However, with the increase in the number of operations, we are also seeing increased use of quieter technology aircraft and regional jets that produce less noise. It is forecasted that by the year 2007 the total number of operations at MSP will exceed 582,000 with a continuation in the increased use of quieter aircraft.

### **The ground noise in my neighborhood is unbearable.**

Ground noise impact is a topic of discussion on a national level presently. The FAA is in the process of conducting research and evaluation into low-frequency noise impacts. It is possible that these efforts could in the future help address this issue at airports around the country.

### **A propeller plane takes off every day early in the morning and is quite loud. I think it is too low.**

Propeller aircraft operations are common at MSP and are primarily used by the regional carriers. Although the number of total operations at MSP is projected to increase, the number of Saab 340 operations (common turboprop aircraft), are projected to decline from 167 operations per day in 2002 to 99 operations per day in 2007.

Also it is important to note that aircraft arriving and departing MSP are under constant surveillance by the FAA control tower. The aircraft remain within required altitude and separation parameters as prescribed by the FAA. These patterns are predicated on safety of flight and the smooth and expeditious flow of air traffic in and out of the airport.

**People are moving out and unwanted people are moving in. The noise is forcing people out of the neighborhood.**

The MAC has participated in a Federal Part 150 program since the late 1980's and has implemented one of the most comprehensive and aggressive sound mitigation programs in the country. The Office of the Legislative Auditor stated in their January 2003 report that "The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) has implemented one of the most extensive noise mitigation programs among U.S. airports." To that end, the MAC has invested approximately \$360 million in homes and schools around the airport making them more compatible with airport noise while preserving and improving the neighborhoods.

**The MAC should insulate homes in my neighborhood. I spent my own money to have my windows caulked, but the vibration from the airplanes cracked it all.**

Mitigation programs at major airports, such as MSP, are often contentious issues. In any mitigation program a boundary has to be developed. Subsequently, homes on one side of the boundary will be eligible while homes on the other side of that boundary are not. This does not suggest that the noise stops on the other side of that boundary or that aircraft will not fly over areas that are not covered by the program. To develop the boundaries of mitigation programs at MSP, the MAC uses the federally developed and federally approved Integrated Noise Model (INM), which is the industry standard for determining predicted noise impacts around the vicinity of an airport.

Realizing the effects of airport noise, the MAC has proposed a mitigation program that goes beyond the federal eligibility standard of 65 DNL and offers improvements to eligible homes out to the 60 DNL. Unfortunately, your residence located at 5545 45th Avenue South, Minneapolis, is outside of the 2007 60 DNL contour and is not eligible for future mitigation.

**You should have nameplates so we know whom you are if we arrive late.**

Before you arrived at the meeting all MAC staff members were introduced to those in attendance. At the next meeting we will make sure to have nameplates.

**The number of flights and the noise impacts are much worse than prior to 9/11.**

The number of operations at MSP are climbing above pre 9/11 levels. However, with the increase in the number of operations, we are also seeing increased use of quieter technology aircraft and regional jets that produce less noise than older technology aircraft. It is forecasted

that by the year 2007 the total number of operations at MSP will exceed 582,000 and continued increase in the use of quieter aircraft.

**I am very concerned about night flights. I need to have 8 hours of sleep. I can't use earplugs, but you should provide earplugs to every household in the area in Minneapolis.**

I would like to assure you that the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) is committed to reducing the noise impacts around MSP. Consistent with that initiative, MAC has and will continue to be sensitive to the residents surrounding MSP.

By way of background, I would like to begin with some information relative to the operation of a public use airport and the realities of federal policy. Because MSP is a public use facility, which uses federal aviation dollars for improvements and development, federal policy supersedes local authority with respect to access and use of the facility. Availability of federal monies for airport expenses are subject to grant assurance provisions. Under those provisions the facility must provide access free of arbitrary and capricious restrictions. Because MAC uses federally funded dollars to develop and maintain the facility, the Federal Government (FAA) reserves the right of refusal relative to proposed operationally restrictive policies, if those policies conflict with determined FAA guidelines. The mentioned guidelines center around the capricious and discriminatory operation of an airport and the impact it poses on the smooth and orderly flow of interstate commerce. This makes it virtually impossible for airport operators to impose mandatory use or access restrictions at an airport. This includes restrictions relative to nighttime operations.

Although federal policy virtually prohibits mandatory restrictions at airports, MAC is adamant about providing as much noise reduction as possible around MSP. In pursuit of that goal, since 1992 the MAC has spent over \$360 million dollars on airport noise related mitigation and acquisition programs. Additionally, MAC has evaluated and implemented several procedures and programs to reduce noise from an operational perspective and implemented information dissemination elements to ensure people receive the information they are looking for regarding the operation of the airport and noise impacts.

**The noise impacts all facets of life.**

The MAC realizes the impact airport operations have on residents around MSP. As such, MAC has pursued several significant initiatives to reduce noise impacts and continues to work towards noise reduction within the constraints of federal regulations, such as those mentioned above.

**Aircraft are flying lower and lower. Why can't I get altitude information like other airports provide? I think the airlines are flying lower because they save fuel that way.**

Aircraft arriving and departing MSP are under constant surveillance by the FAA control tower. The aircraft remain within required altitude and separation parameters as prescribed by the FAA. These patterns are predicated on safety of flight and the smooth and expeditious flow of air traffic in and out of the airport, not fuel consumption rates. Regarding your request for altitude information please see the following response to your data request.

**You must force the airplanes to be updated to the latest noise technology. You can do things. You are not doing the best you can. You are the mediator. Only lawsuits seem to force you. You are driving me out of town.**

The MAC realizes that older hush-kitted aircraft (DC-9 and Boeing 727) produce more noise impact on the airport's neighbors than the quieter, newly manufactured Stage 3 aircraft. However it is important to note that hush-kitted aircraft are Stage 3 compliant and meet all required federal noise criteria. As such, MAC does not have the authority to restrict the use of such aircraft. Realizing the effect aircraft type has on the noise exposure at MSP, the MAC has proposed a noise abatement measure in the 2004 Part 150 Update to investigate, develop and implement measures and/or incentives to encourage airlines to use manufactured Stage 3 aircraft. Successful implementation of this measure could reduce the noise impacts associated with hush-kitted aircraft operations at MSP. In addition, as airlines that operate at MSP continue to update their aircraft fleets, quieter aircraft technology will continue to become more prevalent at MSP.

Your comments and concerns have been incorporated in a memorandum to MAC Commissioners and MSP Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) Noise Oversight Committee (NOC) members. The memorandum summarizes the input received at the January 25, 2005 Public Input Meeting.

In addition to the above comments you also submitted a NOC input form at the meeting on January 25th. As is standard practice, that form has been forwarded to all members of the NOC. The requests you submitted via the NOC input form and associated information follows:

**Please Provide Altitude Data:** [Attachment 1](#) to this letter provides a summary of aircraft altitude information in the vicinity of 3232 Bryant Avenue South in Minneapolis. In the past you have expressed frustration with the ability to obtain specific aircraft altitude data over your house. We have been instructed by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to be very sparing with such information. As you may have read in the January 26, 2005 editions of the Star Tribune, Pioneer Press, Wall Street Journal, and other various news sources, the Rand Corporation recently published a study evaluating the threat of shoulder fired rockets and U.S. jet vulnerabilities. These discussions are the catalyst for our measured distribution of the type of information you have requested. I can assure you it is not an intentional withholding of information or unresponsiveness to your requests.

**Please Justify Locations of MAC Monitoring:** The locations of the 39 noise monitoring towers around MSP are based on aircraft flight paths and equipment capabilities. Locations of these monitoring stations have been established relative to the mentioned variables in consultation with the cities in which they are located. [Attachment 2](#) provides background relative to the location process utilized for siting the last ten towers that were added to the system. The philosophy is consistent with that employed relative to all sites located around the airport.

**Please Disclose Residences of MAC Committee Members:** MAC cannot release the home addresses of MAC commissioners because that information is treated as "private" or not public information under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Section 13.43, although the home addresses of MAC commissioners may be public information at other state

offices or agencies. If you would like to send correspondence to MAC Commissioners, please use the address on this letterhead.