



## **LAX/COMMUNITY NOISE ROUNDTABLE**

Recap of the Regular Meeting  
November 9, 2005

---

### **Roundtable Members Present**

John McTaggart, Chairman Representing LA County Fourth District Supervisor Don Knabe  
Mike Cassidy, Vice Chairman, City of Hermosa Beach  
Dwight Abbott, Mayor Palos Verdes Estates  
Carl Jacobson, Councilman, City of El Segundo  
Steven Napolitano, Deputy, Supervisor Don Knabe, Los Angeles County  
Denny Schneider, Westchester /Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council  
Roy Hefner, LAX Area Advisory Committee  
James O'Neill, City of El Segundo  
Beverly Ackerson, PANIC  
Patricia Tubert, LAWA  
Mike Gurekas, Representing Congressman Dana Rhorabacher  
Edgar Saenz, Representing Congresswoman Maxine Waters  
Barry Davis, FAA  
Walt Gillfillan, Roundtable Facilitator

### **1. Call to order**

Roundtable Chairman John McTaggart called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. in the Samuel Greenberg Boardroom, LAX. Chairman McTaggart welcomed Mike Gurekas back to the Roundtable.

### **2. Discussion of the LAX Noise Variance Decision – Scott Tatro, LAWA Staff**

**(This was agenda item 3. It was taken out of order while waiting for the FAA representative to arrive)**

Mr. Tatro presented the format for the decisions leading to the CALTRANS variance conditions. He noted that the original intent was to use the Roundtable as the sounding board for the development of the conditions. However, the Lennox School District requested a formal hearing that required the designation of intervenors by the State Office of Administrative Hearings. The intervenors were provided an opportunity to negotiate an agreement for CALTRANS to consider as conditions. Mr. Tatro further noted that there were no new features in the final CALTRANS decision and that noise easements were not included in the negotiation, as CALTRANS had no authority to impose that subject as a condition. The following questions/ comments/responses were discussed:

- Do the conditions include control of engine run-ups? - The LAX Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) is continued. It includes engine run-up regulations. The individual airline

operating agreements require compliance with ANMP. There are no penalty provisions in ANMP.

- Are there provisions for reporting non-compliance?

### **3. Discussion of Southern California Airspace Redesign (SCAR) and Various LAX Over-flight Issues - Walter White, FAA**

Mr. White made the presentation with the assistance of Kathryn Higgins of the FAA's Western Pacific Regional Headquarters. He noted that air travel is projected to grow at the 35 airports in the U.S. that accommodate 80% of the air travelers. LAX is not only the principal airport in the Southern California region, but plays an important role in air travel in the U.S. As a result, the FAA is very interested in managing air traffic in a safe and efficient manner. The redesign will consider optimum profile descent, efficient climb and continuous climb/descent profiles.

The elements and current status of the SCAR project are:

- Initial contract with Landrum and Brown for environmental work began on November 7, 2005. That firm will assist the FAA in the administration of the environmental process.
- There will be an extensive public participation program.
- A web site and mailing will be used to keep the public informed
- It is expected that a Notice of Preparation will be issued in the spring or summer of 2006.

During the discussion with Mr. White, the following questions/responses ensued:

- Will the redesign consider the release of old military airspace areas to civilian use? – Yes
- What role will RNAV technology play in the redesign? – There are a number of issues currently being addressed that should resolve some of the limitations on RNAV procedures.
- Will environmental impacts be considered in the redesign? – No, only the improvement of safety and efficiency.
- How successful have airspace design efforts been in other urban areas, SEA, DFW, JFK? – The FAA has learned a great deal from efforts in other areas.
- What kinds of changes are to be considered? - Examples would include the recent changes to south and east bound departures using RNAV (HOLTZ and POPPR). The proposed KWYET departure has been found to not meet current minimum turning radius requirements and may not be implemented.
- Will there be changes to the current Class B airspace definitions? - Only if the redesign requires changes.
- What is the scope of the Landrum and Brown contract? That firm will assist the FAA in administration and management of the EIS process, not in the development of the purpose and the design.
- Will locally elected officials be notified of the important developments of the redesign effort? – Yes
- Is the redesign effort funded? - Funding for the redesign will come from the FAA Flight Plan 2005/2006 program.
- Will the redesign be coordinated and integrated with the SCAG airport regional planning effort? – Yes
- Whose projections for future growth will be used? – The FAA's national growth projections.
- Will topographic effects on noise transmission be considered? - To the extent that the FAA INM model considers topography.
- Will the redesign help reduce noise events caused by large aircraft? – Primarily from power reductions from constant descent and ascent profiles. To a lesser extent for areas closest to LAX.
- Air quality impact should be considered.

Of note for the Roundtable, three of its principal work program items will likely be addressed in the Southern California Airspace Redesign:

- I.2 - Arrivals to the north runways extend eastward during certain time periods cause low over flights of Monterey Park
- III.2 - Take full advantage of the unique opportunity afforded by the ocean for over-water routings of turbo-prop aircraft; Over-flight by turbo-prop aircraft
- VI.3 - Jet departures from LGB flying over the South Bay Communities

#### **4. Roundtable Member Discussion**

The following subjects were presented by Roundtable members:

South Airfield Improvement Project – It was noted that there is a Town Hall meeting scheduled to discuss air quality issues on November 10, 2005.

UC Berkeley – The brochure for the 2006 version of the Airport Noise/Air Quality Symposium was made available to the Roundtable members. It is scheduled for March 5-8, 2006 in Palm Springs, CA.

Egan, MN Noise Report – It was noted that the issue of the Airport Noise Report that reported the Egan study had not been circulated to the members. LAWA staff indicated that copyright provisions prevented that distribution. The Roundtable members moved that the report be evaluated in the context of the new LAX noise monitoring system at the February 8, 2006 meeting of the Noise Subcommittee.

Additional Comments on The Recent Noise Variance for LAX – It was noted that the CALTRANS variances:

- Were not issued in a timely fashion
- With the exception of the sound insulation requirement, were repetitious
- Did not remove the noise easement requirements
- Did not clarify the differences between noise easements and aviation easements
- Should not be depended upon by the communities to reduce noise impacts

#### **6. Comments from the Public**

None

#### **7. Adjournment**

The next regular meeting of the Roundtable will be convened at 7:00 p.m. on January 11, 2006 in the Samuel Greenberg Boardroom, LAX.

A meeting of the Noise Subcommittee will be at 6:00 p.m. on February 8, 2006 if additional time is needed for the NMS siting project. The meeting, if held, will be located in the Samuel Greenberg Boardroom, LAX.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.