



LAX/COMMUNITY NOISE ROUNDTABLE Flight Track Data And Noise Subcommittees

Recap of Meeting
August 27, 2003

1. Call to order

Roundtable Chairman John McTaggart at 6:15 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the City of Hermosa Beach

2. Review/Consideration and Comment on the Aircraft Noise Elements of the LAX Master Plan Alternative D and the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS

Points discussed concerning procedure:

- Walt Gillfillan noted again that there was a direct conflict of interest for the LAWA staff if they were to participate in this work of the Roundtable and its subcommittees. As a result, LAWA staff that was present in the audience would not be taking part in the Roundtable's deliberations on this matter.
- As noted at the previous meetings on the Master Plan Alternative D, Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS, Walter Gillfillan indicated that his role is to provide information to the Roundtable and its subcommittees during their review and to provide a written recap of the subcommittee meetings relative to their review. Finalization of the Roundtable's written comments on the Draft EIR/EIS will be the sole responsibility of the Roundtable members.
- It was agreed that the Flight Track Data and Noise Subcommittees will report the status of their findings to date at to the full Roundtable membership on September 10.
- It was confirmed that there is an extension of the original review dates from 45 days to 120 days or until November 7, 2003.

General comments Regarding Noise Metrics and Baseline Years :

- The use of single event noise metrics introduces information not previously available to the communities.
- A consultant at a recent hearing provided information on the FICAN suggestions. The EIR should also look at the World Health Organization information as well.
- A concern that the A-380 single event noise information is not included
- It appears that the beach communities will not be found to be impacted by based on the metrics used and the thresholds of significance that were used.
- It is important to note that there is a difference between increases in noise exposure and the shifting of noise from one community to another.
- The use of 78 MAP as a limiting factor in the future growth of LAX is not enforceable
- The use of deed restrictions instead of the number gates may be a way to limit growth.

- There is no discussion of operations limits at 78 MAP. For example, the original EIR discussed the use of capacity at Palmdale and other airports.
- The design of facilities at the Manchester Square development can accommodate more than 78 MAP
- Using the thresholds of significance allows incremental future increases in noise exposure, each time an EIR or Part 150 Study is done.
- Additional operations will spread the flight tracks over more communities in the future.

Specific Actions Taken By The Subcommittees:

1. The 94 SEL noise level that was selected for the threshold of significance for sleep interference is too high according to the World Health Organization
2. The CNEL noise contour should be modified to reflect changes in runway usage during construction
3. Has the noise effects of irregular terrain been considered when constructing the CNEL noise contours?
4. There is insufficient discussion of the effects on airspace, airport, access and environmental capacities after 78 MAP is exceeded.
5. There is an assumption that the results of the Part 161 Study will be implemented to form a mitigation action. This not likely to happen.
6. Why were studies on the effect of noise not considered?

3. Subcommittee Members and Public Comments (provided above)

4. Adjournment

The next meeting of the joint Subcommittees will be at 6:00 p.m. on September 17. The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.