Citizen Noise Advisory Committee Advocacy for the Public - Advisory to the Port Portland International Airport (PDX)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **MEETING SUMMARY****May 11, 2017 5:30 PM****Portland International Airport Terminal Building****St. Helen’s “B” Conference Room** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| CNAC Members in Attendance  |
| Bob Braze | Washington County | Present |
| Brian Freeman | City of Gresham | Absent |
| Craig Walker | Clark County | Present |
| Joe Smith | Multnomah County | Present |
| Karen Meyer | At-Large (City of Portland) | Present |
| Kelly Sweeney | City of Portland, CNAC Vice Chair | Present  |
| Laura Young | City of Portland | Present |
| Mark Clark | Fairview/Troutdale/Wood Village, CNAC Chair | Present |
| Ron Schmidt | City of Portland | Present |
| Mike Yee | City of Vancouver | Present |
| Andrew Loescher | At-Large (Clark County) | Absent |
| Mike Finch | At-Large (Multnomah County) | Present |
| Tina Penman | At-Large (Port of Portland) | Present |
| **Staff Members in Attendance** |
| Phil Stenstrom | Port of Portland Noise Program Manager | Present |
| Jerry Gerspach | Port of Portland Noise Management | Present  |
| **Technical Members and Guests in Attendance** |
| Lt. Col. Shamy Paul Shamy  | Oregon Air National Guard | Present |

**Introductions**

Mark Clark, CNAC Chair, began the meeting at 5:48pm by asking those in attendance to introduce themselves. Members in attendance introduced themselves, followed by the following attending members of the public: Erwin Bergman, Martha Johnston, and Gary Kunz.

**Adopting of Minutes**

Mr. Clark asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Joe Smith requested that minutes be sent out sooner and highlighted the following revisions needed to the March meeting minutes:

* Page 5, last line – In the section about a committee member suggesting that we should sit at each table at the summit, “each” should be changed to “different” tables.
* Page 2, last paragraph – Says 100 feet. This distance does not seem to make sense in this context. Wonder if it should be 1000 ft?
* Page 2, second full paragraph – lt says “Col Shamy explained shared LOA is for …” The word “shared” is redundant and should be removed.
* Adding page numbers to notes would be helpful.

After acknowledging the previous revisions, Mr. Smith motioned to adopt the minutes. Mr. Mike Finch seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved.

**Public Comment and Questions**

Mr. Clark asked for any public comment other than that relating to the continuous overhead descent. No public comments were offered.

**ORANG 124 FW Continuous Overhead Descent Approach/Public Comment and Questions**

Lieutenant Colonel Paul Shamy “Opus” provided the following brief review of the continuous overhead descent approach for the committee:

* ORANG started the 6-month trial period to expand the overhead pattern on May 1st.
* The reasons for the expanded pattern is to meet training requirements and to make operations more efficient. The noise benefit of the procedure is due to the higher altitude and the reduced flying time.
* The parameters are the same, and ORANG is tracking to see how much they are using the pattern.
* Currently, 8 of 20 flying opportunities have been overheads. Of the 8 overheads flown, one has been to runway 10 (12.5% usage). This is below what is expected annually.

*Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Joe Smith inquired about previously mentioned flying opportunities and if any had to abort and do a go round for any reason, and if so, how often did Lt. Col. Shamy expect this might occur? Lt. Col. Shamy estimated that might occur approximately 20% of the time. He added that the part of the proposal that had not yet been executed was the closed pattern. He explained that if they were chasing in an emergency situation, they would do a go round and it would be using standard military power settings. He added that it would be at threshold and therefore would be as loud as takeoff. Mr. Smith asked how often that might occur, to which Lt. Col. Shamy estimated about once a month. Mr. Phil Stenstrom added that in addition to an emergency escort, a chase can occur for pilots needing currency, and would also use the closed pattern. Lt. Col. Shamy concurred and added that this situation would likely have the most noise impact.

Mr. Bob Braze inquired whether the term is continuous descent or continuous overhead descent and whether these two things are the same. Lt. Col. Shamy replied that they refer to the same thing in this context.Current procedures require adding power as necessary to maintain safe air speed, but minimal to reduce noise. At 4 miles out the initial entry is at an altitude of 3,500 feet. Mr. Braze inquired about how ORANG could fly at speeds that exceed regulation below 10,000 ft. Lt. Col. Shamy indicated their technical order allows for 300 knots. Mr. Braze shared with the committee that regulations for civilian and military are the same and can allow aircraft to go faster than prescribed airspeeds if required for that particular aircraft to be safe.

Mr. Mike Finch referred to the previously mentioned 20 overhead approaches and inquired whether they were a 2-ship formation. Lt. Col. Shamy clarified that it was 8 overhead approaches flown since they began collecting data on May 1st. He continued saying that there were 20 opportunities to fly the approach, and that the weather dictated 12 to be instrument straight-ins. Lt. Col. Shamy noted that the overhead approach requires 5-mile visibility conditions. He reported that on one day there had been 9 aircraft and another day there had been 4 aircraft. Mr. Finch asked if when they are flying the overhead if it was a 4-ship approach? Lt. Col. Shamy replied that the proposal was for a new 4-ship formation, reminding the group that the previous pattern was for 2-ship with 10 mile spacing to the second 2-ship. He explained that now they will be able to collapse that into a 4-ship pattern. Mr. Joe Smith asked for confirmation that the proposal did not mean an overall increase of aircraft. Lt. Col. Shamy concurred, and added that it was only increasing the ability to run the pattern to runway 10. The larger formation would increase the ground track size because the 3rd and 4th jet will be further downfield prior to making their break. Mr. Mike Finch inquired how many 4-ship patterns had been flown. Lt. Col. Shamy believed that only one has been flown since May 1st. Mr. Finch clarified that he was asking how ORANG was expanding the pattern. Lt. Col. Shamy replied that after trainings and when fuel is low, they rarely are able to bring 4 ships together. Mr. Joe Smith interjected that the difference isn’t more flights or more landings, but the difference in the pattern is the extent to which there is a sound impact, and he explained that there is in fact a longer sound impact.

Mr. Craig Walker asked how much of CDOA is based on noise reduction and how much is for other purposes. Lt. Col. Shamy reported that their pilots are required to do a certain number of overheads per year. Mr. Walker inquired if it was training for going into bases in hostile areas where spiraling down would avoid gunfire. Lt. Col. Shamy agreed saying the purpose of CDOA pattern was to avoid surface threats. Mr. Walker restated his original questions asking whether the purpose was mainly for combat training or for noise reduction. Lt. Col. Shamy explained that efficiency is valued and this pattern allows for ORANG to recover the aircraft more quickly. He continued saying that CDOA first was to meet a training requirement, second was to save time, and due to flying higher and faster had the added benefit of reducing noise.

Mr. Craig Walker inquired about what quantitative noise data was available that compared CDOA versus CDA. Phil Stenstrom reported that in 2008 they had conducted a fly day and recorded about 72 decibels for the flight procedures, which would serve as the benchmark for the trial period. He added that Jerry Gerspach would be conducting noise testing over the summer. Mr. Stenstrom explained that the data was important for assessing the actual noise impact and that if the data reveals decibels significantly higher than the benchmark, then the noise office would not recommend the procedures be adopted. If the noise levels did not exceed the benchmark than the procedures should probably be considered acceptable. Mr. Stenstrom said that the Airport Noise Report recently reported that 72 decibels is the sound-pressure equivalent of a Prius driving by, 25-feet away at a speed of 35 miles per hour. Mr. Walker asked whether this was an assessment period then to see how the CDOA worked. Mr. Stenstrom affirmed, saying this had been a request from the ORANG and the trial period is for data collection and assessing community impacts and responses.

Mr. Craig Walker referred to the illustration of the CDOA brought to the previous committee meeting and asked of the 8 previously mentioned overheads flown what were the runways used. Lt. Col. Shamy shared that they have not used the north runway at all. Of the 8 overheads flown, was one on 10R and 7 were the pattern they had already been using from the east to runway 28. Mr. Smith interjected that was because the east wind has not set in yet. Lt. Col. Shamy agreed with Mr. Smith.

Mr. Bob Braze mentioned that ORANG training requires pilots to stay current on overheads, and asked how often will need re-currency if all pilots are current. Lt. Col. Shamy shared they had not yet had that situation occur, but he would estimate about 6-8 per year. He explained that proficiency in the approach however would require doing more than the minimum and shared that there would probably be about 100 overhead patterns flown per year at a dedicated guard base or active duty military airfield. Mr. Braze inquired if the currency training would happen in conjunction with other training aspects like hot refueling. Lt. Col. Shamy replied that it would not be tied to anything else, just the approach type.

Mr. Kelly Sweeny inquired when ORANG would request an approach. Lt. Col. Shamy replied that it was requested the first day it was open but weather did not permit. Mr. Sweeny posited if the ORANG made the request 100 times on runway 28L last year, how many were granted? Lt. Col. Shamy shared that they don’t typically request unless they know they will be approved, and therefore over the five years they have been making these requests, they usually are permitted.

Mr. Craig Walker inquired where the noise sensors are located. Mr. Phil Stenstrom shared that the testing plan identifies the locations of the sensors, and recognized that including these in the minutes might be helpful. Mr. Walker followed up asking if there was a sensor near Cully. Mr. Stenstrom affirmed there was a sensor near Cully.

Lt. Col. Shamy shared with the committee that they would work with Mr. Stenstrom to arrange for another fly day, preferably on the west side. Additionally, Lt. Col. Noted that the base has tours and people are welcome to come out for those. He shared that such a tour is taking place on May 18th from 8-10:30am if people are interested.

**Public Comment:**

Chairman Clark invited Mr. Erwin Bergman to share his comments. Mr. Bergman located his house on the available map for the group (NE Holman Street). Mr. Bergman shared the following comments regarding the continuous overhead descent approach:

* The map showing the flight tracks is conceptual and does not reflect the real flight tracks. He has observed aircraft over Columbia Boulevard to Simpson Street, covering an area of about ¼ mile in width. The conceptual map indicates the flights are over industrial areas, when he has observed they are actually over residential areas. He is not criticizing the pilots, but requesting the map be corrected.
* The assertion that since there are no objections to the noise caused by the flights there is no problem he believes is an incorrect assertion. He has researched complaint systems and concluded that complaints filed does not relate to the disturbance or unhappiness of the public with the noise. In his research he learned that many people stop calling to file noise complaints after there is no material response to their complaints.
* He reviewed that the changes proposed are to go from 2-aircraft to maximum of 4-aircraft pattern, to increase flight days from Monday-Friday to everyday, to increase flight hours from 9-5pm to 9-sunset. Additionally, the proposal allows for visiting aircraft to use the same routine.
* Mr. Bergman shared that visiting F-16s are noisy and will grossly increase the noise impact. He added that increasing flight hours to include evening hours would be disturbing.
* He noted that Cully has been impacted by the overhead approach since 1992 when the first proposal was made to begin the approach.
* He shared that tests completed by the noise office with noise monitoring identified additional noise in the community that did not experience noise with a straight approach, with measurements between 72 and 80 decibels. In general, the overhead approach had added to overall noise in neighborhoods adjacent to the airport.
* He noted that some of the actual overhead approaches were outside the normal approach.
* He shared that Steve Schreiber, former aviation director at the airport, had indicated that Portland has recommended to the FAA that ORANG not be allowed to fly an overhead approach procedure.
* Data collected showed increase of noise in neighborhoods close to airport. In 1998 ORANG came with new request for patterns. The noise management office conducted tests and shared the procedure would cease if impacted neighborhoods objected. He shared that the Cully neighborhood objected, but CNAC voted to permit the pattern. Mr. Bergman noted that he was the only member who objected. He reported that letters were sent to the City and to legislators, but nothing happened. He explained that the Port had not made good on its statement regarding the cessation of the approach if neighborhoods objected.
* Mr. Bergman reported that the FAA and Airport Futures spent many meetings to verify and try to remediate aircraft routes to keep them away from residential areas. He stated that it is FAA policy to keep aircraft away from residents or communities.
* Mr. Bergman stated that he believed the straight-in approach from the east and west over industrial areas creates a situation where noise is not an issue.
* Mr. Bergman expressed his belief that noise over residential areas is wrong and that he did see any benefit of the overhead approach for neighborhoods. He explained that low-flying aircraft make people uncomfortable.
* Mr. Bergman explained that ambient noise levels in neighborhoods are between 40 and 55 decibels in the daytime. He noted the previously stated equivalencies regarding motorcycle or vehicle noise and evaluated that buildings or other obstructions stop the noise, but that an aircraft’s noise goes a long way and only decreases 5-6 decibels over ¼ of a mile.

In reference to Mr. Bergman’s issue regarding mapping the actual patterns flown, Mr. Craig Walker asked about the ability to generate this information. Jerry Gerspach replied that military or law enforcement aircraft are filtered out of the system per national policy. Mr. Phil Stenstrom added that there is a possibility of asking for an exemption for the trial period, but expressed doubt that this would be granted as prior exemption requests were denied due to national security reasons. Mr. Sweeny expressed that Mr. Erwin’s point on this matter was well taken. Mr. Erwin suggested the information could be generated by a draftsman to illustrate where flights actually occur. Mr. Stenstrom noted that they will work on a depiction of the buffer zone within which planes could be flying.

Chairman Clark thanked Mr. Bergman for his comments and invited Ms. Martha Johnston to share her comments. Ms. Johnston read letters and comments provided by residents that were opposed to this procedure. She also submitted a petition signed by many members of her community in support of blocking additional F15 fly-overs.

At one point Ms. Johnston paused her reading and inquired if the approach was a visual approach, and if it is not satellite driven, what determines the variance in the location of the aircrafts. Lt. Col. Shamy concurred that it was a visual approach and indicated that winds were the primary factor for the variance.

After Ms. Johnston had concluded reading statements, Lt. Col. Shamy expressed that he wanted to make clear that they are not increasing flying. He noted that the comments seemed to indicate that was the case, but he believed that was an exaggeration. Mr. Joe Smith asked if the concern was regarding landing noise. Ms. Johnston affirmed the concern was landing noise and added that they were already impacted by takeoff noise. She explained that the sound is different for takeoffs, as there is a screaming sound when they are coming around until they turn and power up where there is another noise impact.

Ms. Tina Penman shared that she is an audiologist and has studied hearing loss. She empathized with how sound can cause different emotions or feelings and relayed her experience with tinnitus. Ms. Penman expressed that she would caution against comments like those shared by Ms. Johnston regarding hearing loss caused from aircraft noise. She reported that OSHA regulations say hearing loss requires at least 8 hours of continuous noise exposure at 85 decibels or more. Ms. Johnston shared that there has been sustained noise impacts. Ms. Penman pressed asking if that had occurred at 85 decibels or higher for a continuous 8 hours. Ms Johnston shared that she was unsure of that and would love to talk further with Ms. Penman offline.

Mr. Gary Kunz pointed out Hayden Island and his home location and made several points.

* The CDOA maneuver has been done once; the 9 aircraft did not follow the pattern shown on map.
* The East Columbia Neighborhood Association took a vote and we demand that test be stopped.
* North Portland isn’t dumping ground for waste and pollution including noise. We don’t need this.
* Haven’t seen a verifiable test protocol yet. Gathering complete/accurate data for test period isn’t possible – FAA won’t give flight tracks, used to give flight leader and assumed others followed – but this often doesn’t happen. When 9 aircraft came by, they were over me, coming back were north of me, south of me and over me. They don’t all fly in same line just as Erwin mentioned. In Cully meeting he asked Opus that if ORANG had enough training would they quit using CDOAs; Opus said never can get enough training in.
* Maneuver creates an “air show” in my neighborhood. The aircraft are right there; he is not afraid of aircraft, but there is a surprise reaction. The intensity of noise ramps up suddenly, aircraft fly out of sight, noise ramps down quickly. Ramp up/ramp down is surprising/disturbing.
* Have heard that social stress in our society is high. People stressed about traffic, election, etc. People go home to relax, do not need “airshow” over your home. Don’t know anyone who gets stressed out and says go to airshow to unwind. I was naval officer, I support the military, I don’t want to have an airshow over my house. CNAC are reps of the community, not the Port, military, airlines, etc. you’re here to listen to and represent the community.

Mr. Smith asked over what length of time did the 9 CDAs on May 24th occur? Mr. Kunz replied that it was around 10-20 minutes. Lt. Col. Shamy said the he was in the 2nd formation. The first group was 4 ship, followed by a 2 ship, and finally a 3 ship formation. The 4 ship will create the most exposure (more aircraft). I would agree, about 10 minutes.

Mr. Smith asked what the power settings were? Lt. Col. Shamy said that for him it was sub-military power. Compared to our standard approach, it was reduced power in the initial turn, and added power before final turn. It was the first time we flew the approach to 10R so there was some variance. The pattern will end up wider than normal because in the final turn we are flying as close as we can to stall speed. It will take time to tighten the pattern up to be as close to map interpretation as possible. It is reduced power from straight in.

Mr. Smith asked how far from airport and how high are you when you’re lined up for final? Lt. Col. Shamy said they would be 1 mile from the threshold at an altitude of 300 ft.

Ms. Meyer remarked that It seems brash for his organization (East Columbia Neighborhood) to demand an end to the trial period. Are you aware when two sides work out a compromise, the results are usually better than one side trying to win. Mr. Kunz agreed, but said that if we don’t come in here and state our position as such, won’t be heard. Ms. Meyer: a compromise hammered out over time is better.

**Break**

**Continued Discussion**

Mr. Clark: Opus – do you have a simulator to do this? Opus: not really, you have gear down/flaps, low power, not far from stalling. If we pull back on power the aircraft would stall. The more we fly the pattern the better it will be and better we will be at it. If we fly once per year, the variance will be high and we will be wider than if we had more training.

Mr. Walker: Opus – how often do you anticipate more than 2 ships: the typical schedule is 6 turn 6. On May 4th we added aircraft to generate an upgrade for pilot who is trying to get 4 ship flight lead status.

Mr. Walker: Do you have ground coordination that can control the number of ships at a given period of time? Opus: Suppose we have 20 aircraft with the training F-18s visiting and we want pilots to fly CDOAs. If I have 4 ship formations, then Air Traffic Control is able to increase efficiency getting commercial aircraft in.

Mr. Smith: You can only land to the east with gorge winds. Opus: correct. Mr. Smith: so not often between now and October. Opus: yes – CDOAs to runway 10 will be the exception and not the rule during the summer.

Mr. Sweeney: could you come in at 5,000 feet and still make the CDOA work? Opus: yes, he will go back to see why 3,000 feet was established. Mr. Sweeney: Could you fly higher and break higher? Opus: Then you’re talking about sink rates in the final turn and that if we’re too slow or lose an engine it will stall the aircraft. It wouldn’t be difficult to be higher on the initial turn but would be about 1700 for final turn because you need muscle memory for the final turn. Did it around 2,000 feet and was able to use less power but we wouldn’t want less experienced pilots doing that.

Mr. Braze: the turn to final is critical. Opus: yes, it can be faster or higher, but reduces the margin for error if you have a safety or approach problem. Mr. Smith: could you fly faster/higher and extend the pattern? Opus: or make it tighter. Don’t have a lot of variation there but could fly rest of it higher. Might make it easier to make final turn power down.

Mr. Clark: when making turns, you’re blind to where you are at, is that right? Opus: We can see pretty well everywhere with our canopy.

Mr. Walker: on the final turn do you have to add power? Opus: most guys will have to add power until they increase proficiency. Most of time you will hear power addition.

Mr. Bergman: that is the most bothersome –when get to the base leg they kick up power and it is most disturbing. Opus: I will pass that on. Is may be possible to fly and not generate that part of it.

Ms. Meyer: Did the FAA create the pattern? Opus: No, I think ORANG drafted it and they approved.

Mr. Walker: what would you do in lieu of this, training in other places? Opus: We’re required to have an 18-month instrument check ride, have to get overhead on that too, typically in Tacoma, Eugene, Redmond for a strange-field approach. That’s once a year, otherwise we’re going out to do tactical training. To use fuel to go to Redmond, Eugene, etc. means that we’re not using fuel for training. We were not getting requirements met before. Mr. Smith: Did you fly to Klamath Falls for training before? Opus: Yes, Klamath or McCord or other military base, although McCord is also surrounded by residences.

Mr. Clark: Their preference is for training near home – in case of real thing can do at home, and service aircraft. Opus: It is also more efficient for gas to do it here.

Mr. Braze: This is a visual maneuver so if you don’t practice here it’s more dangerous. You’re going fast; the aircraft is close to a stall.

Ron Schmidt: comment on resident from Hayden Island – is observant person with military background. For some reason he felt that the purpose of a CDA was to reduce noise. I explained to Marty the CDA is intended to give pilots training for military field situations. There might be a noise reduction side benefit. I hope that what we put out to community is not that this is noise reduction exercise, but is a military exercise that we hope won’t impact the community.

Mark Clark: when good at it, it should reduce noise because get tighter, less impact on community.

**FAA Noise Model Comparison**

Due to the expansion of the previous agenda item, this item was deferred to another meeting.

**Bi-Monthly Complaint Report – Jerry Gerspach**

The Port staff member shared the following bi-monthly complaint report numbers:

Total Complaints for Reporting Period: 297

Number of Individuals Submitting Complaints: 36

Complaints attributed to PDX/other operations: 286

Number of Individuals Submitting Complaints: 31

The Port staff member shared the following trends and patterns:

* Passenger Jet arrivals
* Cargo feeder A/D
* Law enforcement

Complaints by neighborhood:

* Highest number of noise complaints by neighborhood for this reporting period: Wilkes, Roseway and East Minnehaha.

Noise alerts

* Early Morning FCC Check Flight 3/19/2017
* Temporary Runway Closure 4/3/2017
* Crosswind Runway In Use 4/7/2017
* Temporary Runway Closure 4/24/2017
* OANG, Special Landings Trial Period 4/28/2017

*Questions/Comments:*

Laura Young: What were Blackhawk helicopters doing in Cully?

Phil: Army guard (from Warrenton, VA) was scheduled to do this training at the coast but the weather at coast was too bad, so they conducted the training here.

**CAC Liaison Report – Joe Smith**

Lots of discussion on CDA, one of members of CAC who lives on Hayden Island had fixation on noise of go-arounds that would be caused by the CDA. That is why today I asked about go-arounds. I tried to explain there would be no difference in go-arounds caused by CDAs because when a landing is aborted it could be CDA or conventional, and the fact that it almost never happens.

Mr. Bergman also made a point about a study regarding people giving up with complaining because no one pays attention to them. I continue to believe that is not accurate for Portland, because Jerry explains/listens and most of the time they are satisfied.

**Noise Manager’s Update – Phil Stenstrom**

Spent a lot of time on continuous overhead over last few months, glad CNAC decided to get additional input from the community at tonight’s meeting. Met with ECNA twice with Gary Kunz and with Martha Johnson. Jerry did a dive deep for hour on understanding airspace with Martha prior to the meeting. Jerry was in E. Columbia delivering materials when the first CDOA was performed and he had a noise meter (not calibrated), but the measured sound levels were too high in general. We attribute to it being early in test and we received some complaints from people that don’t normally call in. Kelly also observed the same from his house. As Opus explained we expect they’ll get better or it won’t work to continue.

We attended the Cully Association of Neighbors meeting on Tuesday night. Answered questions/explained what occurring. We plan to have a fly day to experience the CDOA, but needs to be on a weekend to fit people’s schedules, and it’s not likely there will be a good flow day to 10R until we get consistent east winds, usually around October towards the end of the trial period.

Had planning retreat with action items. Have a new CNAC member with Clackamas that is going through process. Beth Duvall (City of Vancouver) resigned. Heard there may be someone of interest from Vancouver now.

Meeting Summaries – We will process CNAC meeting summaries faster so it doesn’t take so long to get out. Trying to get them out within a week and ask for corrections to speed up process – this means the notes will be in rougher form, however.

Danny Garcia will serve as acting noise manager for the July CNAC meeting.

Questions/comments:

Mr. Smith: Concern that we’ve heard from concerned people, we need to talk about it. Anytime there is a dispute or someone upset, the more we can narrow to measurable questions of fact the better we are. I’m hoping we can make strong pitch to DOD to allow for radar tracks to be able to really address what Erwin is talking about. The actual size of a sound is measurable. I would hope we get sensors for that so we can actually measure versus relying on impressions.

Mr. Clark to Phil Stenstrom: do we need to write a letter to FAA? Mr. Stenstrom: Could help bolster request. Mr. Finch: the alternative is to recommend to not do these procedures, so it would behoove them to allow it. Mr. Walker: agree with Joe Smith, we need objective data and onsite visits. Motion that committee advise noise staff to approach DOD to request data. Seconded by Ron Schmidt. All agree.

Mr. Walker: I asked Opus about flipping tracks to the other side. If on 28 L instead of loop to south, what if they loop to the north? I know it’s an ATC question, but wanted to get that out there as alternative. It could be a tremendous solution. Mr. Stenstrom: Opus was not opposed to making the turn but ATC is not likely to approve, and it would put ORANG farther from base. Would really confine everything well, but the conflict with traffic on the north runway is an issue. Mr. Schmidt: traffic on north runway is on the ground right? Mr. Smith: It’s on approach or takeoff.

Mr. Braze: The letter of agreement was signed – has anyone asked if the Air Traffic Control manager can come to CNAC so we can pose questions? Mr. Stenstrom: we asked, but he hasn’t been able to make it yet; he was open to coming.

Ms. Johnson: who are they talking about and what is their level? FAA? Mr. Braze: yes, the control tower is run by FAA.

**Adjourn - 8:05pm**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Next Meeting:** | July 13, 2017 / 5.30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. http://www.portofportland.com/PDX\_Home.aspxPortland International Airport Terminal BuildingSt. Helen’s “B” Conference Room7100 NE Airport Way, Portland (Located at PDX) |  |