



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

**MEETING MINUTES**  
 March 8, 2018 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 |
| David Stenstrom                            | Clackamas 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 |
| Linda Waller                               | City of Vancouver                           | Present |
| Beth Duvall                                | City of Vancouver                           | Absent  |
| Andrew Loescher                            | At-Large (Clark County)                     | Present |
| Mike Finch                                 | At-Large (Multnomah County)                 | Present |
| Tina Penman                                | At-Large (Port of Portland)                 | Absent  |
| 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 |   |         |
| Col. Sean Sullivan                         | Oregon Air National Guard                   |         |
| Devin Howington                            | Note-taker                                  |         |

There were over 35 community members in attendance.

**Introductions, Chair Mark Clark**

Mr. Mark Clark, CNAC chair, called the meeting to order at 5:35. He welcomed everyone to the meeting. The committee introduced themselves and several members of the community introduced themselves. The meeting was well attended by many community members.

**Adopt Minutes, Chair Mark Clark**

Chair Mark Clark asked for comments on the notes from the previous meeting. There were no comments. Mr. Kelly Sweeney moved to accept the notes, and Mr. Craig Walker seconded that motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **ORANG Overhead Continuous Descent Approach Report, Phil Stenstrom**

Chair Mark introduced Mr. Phil Stenstrom to deliver the Noise Office's report on the OHFDA findings.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom welcomed guests and neighbors and said he was excited to see so many people here. He said this meeting will focus almost entirely on the OHFDA and the trial period and the report.

Mr. Stenstrom said the report was available online and as well as a few hard copies available at the meeting. Mr. Stenstrom said anyone could contact him or Mr. Jerry Gerspach for the report or to give any information. Mr. Stenstrom encouraged people to be in touch with them.

Mr. Stenstrom provided some basic information about the OHFDA (also called the CDOA, but it is the same maneuver). Mr. Stenstrom explained that the OHFDA is a pattern for military aircraft only that is used when they are landing. It is both a training procedure and a good maneuver when they are trying to get planes on the ground.

Mr. Stenstrom explained the history of the maneuver that they use today came from feedback to make a previous maneuver quieter. The one used during the trial period and the maneuver in question is a modified version of that procedure that was tried several years ago.

Mr. Stenstrom explained how the wind affects where and how aircraft have to take off and land and how the seasons shift the runway usage. He said the trial period was mostly during the summer, and so they extended the trial period to get some data on the other flow.

Mr. Stenstrom showed a few graphics on the path of the maneuver. He explained they have 10 permanent noise monitors, and during the trial period they set up two other noise monitors to measure the sound on the ground.

Mr. Stenstrom explained that the scope of this conversation tonight is framed by the five requests made by ORANG for the OHFDA procedure:

1. Who should be able to fly. Currently only ORANG can fly the maneuver. The proposal is that visitors are able to fly OHFDAs. Mr. Stenstrom said the advantage is that it frees up the air space when there are a lot of visiting jets.
2. The authorized runway. It has always be 28L and 28R, and the proposal is 28L, 28R, 10L, & 10R. The runways are known as the 28s when you are coming in from the East, and the runways are known as the 10s when you are coming from the West.
3. The maximum formation size. The proposal is to expand the number of planes in the formation from 2 ships to 4 ships.
4. The pattern hours. Currently the hours are 9am – 5pm, Monday through Friday. The proposal is to allow the OHFDA from sunrise to sunset, 7 days a week.
5. Allow a provision for closed pattern. This provision was added for emergency and pilot landing currency.

Mr. Stenstrom said really what we are talking about tonight is the increased operational efficiency of the military flights. Mr. Stenstrom pointed out that being efficient can make it quieter and shift the noise, and it also saves fuel. The side benefit from saving fuel is that it results in less air emission in the air shed.

Mr. Stenstrom said the OHFDA results in better air quality and he thinks reduced noise as well. Mr. Stenstrom

also said we are narrowly focused on the 5 proposals here today, not the defense posture of the USA or the noise of the takeoffs.

Mr. Stenstrom walked the committee through the noise impacts of each of the items, and the whole framework of the data as agreed upon in previous discussions on the data analysis procedure.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom explained the outreach procedures, and commented that they really tried to do a lot of outreach. He said they started out by publicizing the idea that the trial period would happen and publicized the Noise Group's contacts if anyone had concerns about noise. He said they went to several different neighborhood associations and he explained about the different outreach efforts they did. Mr. Stenstrom mentioned the two flight demonstration days so that community members could see the procedure performed. He said they always had public comment opportunities and got a lot of input there. Finally, Mr. Stenstrom explained that he went out to several homes and observed the procedure from those vantage points.

Mr. Stenstrom said to the community that if any of this was a surprise to you, then we didn't do a good job. Mr. Stenstrom said people could provide input on how to do better to the Noise Group.

Mr. Stenstrom provided the data analysis for the trial period. There were 131 OHFDA events made up of 610 aircraft that flew this pattern. Mr. Stenstrom noted that there were lots of other flights during this time, but this is the number of OHFDAs that we are discussing.

Mr. Stenstrom provided data on the OHFDA vs. the Conventional Approach (a "straight-in," which is a stabilized flight path that comes in steady and constant on a line). Mr. Stenstrom pointed out that the Guard will not disappear but rather will change how they land and land conventionally instead.

Mr. Stenstrom showed that the data from the decibels comparison indicates the OHFDA had higher decibel readings than the straight-ins. Mr. Stenstrom said the noise profile is different between the two approaches: The noise is louder further out during the conventional approach, but louder closer in for the OHFDA approach. He explained the differences in the experiences that people are talking about when they discuss the OHFDA.

Mr. Stenstrom said they have databases for complaints and they are coded specifically for OHFDA complaints.

- 161 complaints that were OHFDA-related.
- 77 of the 161 complaints were from first time callers.
- There was a spike in military complaints in 2017.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom said those aren't all necessarily about the OHFDA because there are some military flights that are not connected to ORANG and they cannot control those, and also several complaints that were about other events but attributed to the OHFDA. Mr. Stenstrom also said the departure noise is so much louder than the landing noise.

Mr. Stenstrom said the two portable noise monitors were put up at Helen's View High School and Meadow Lane.

Mr. Stenstrom showed data on the duration of the 4-ship and the 2-ship formations. The data show that the 4-ship pattern was problematic because there was more noise for longer periods of time.

Mr. Stenstrom said the Noise Office came up with their own recommendations after they analyzed all the data, and briefly mentioned the process the committee used to decide how to analyze the data. Mr. Stenstrom said these were from the Noise Office's point of view based on the data, and the CNAC committee could think differently.

**Noise Office Recommendations:**

1. Do not support ORANG's proposal to include visiting pilots. It resulted in so many more additional noise events from the people impacted.

Mr. Craig Walker asked what the split was between the number of visiting pilots and locals, and Mr. Phil Stenstrom said he did not know the split.

2. Support the use of the expanded runaway, because the noise impacts are about the same as it is on the other end of the runway, and would allow more flexibility for a low impact.

Mr. Joe Smith asked if that was an assumption that the East flow will always be a left hand pattern and Mr. Phil Stenstrom said yes he does use that assumption.

3. Does not support the expansion to 4-ships. The noise impact is too great and the duration is too long. Mr. Stenstrom said it is pretty clear that the formation size at 2-ship is probably the right call.

4. Do not support the extended pattern hours, with caveats. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said this issue was an interesting one. Mr. Stenstrom said they do not support extending the hours, but realistically the noise would not be all that different with shorter hours because of the times the military flies anyway, but they do want to limit noise when reasonable. Mr. Stenstrom said we operate this busy airport and it is really important to be good neighbors and that people should have reasonable expectations, but also that he wanted to give the neighbors more certainty. Mr. Stenstrom said it would be better if the Guard can meet their needs with the current procedures.

Mr. David Stenstrom clarified that the current procedure was to fly the OHEDA Monday through Friday, and Mr. Phil Stenstrom said yes.

5. No recommendation for the Closed Pattern. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said he felt like the Noise Office was not necessarily concerned in this matter because if the guard needs to do this for safety and for emergency situations, then they want the Guard to fly safe.

At this point in the meeting Mr. Phil Stenstrom said he would turn the meeting over to Col. Sean Sullivan.

Some people in attendance had questions before Mr. Stenstrom gave up the floor.

Someone asked what was meant by "left-hand pattern," mentioned earlier in the meeting. Mr. Joe Smith said it means that downwind you make left turns all the way down and that on the east flow you would always be over the river or north of the river on the way down. He said that the assumption with the OHEDA is that you would always make left turns once you started to descend and going downwind. There was discussion about the wind and flying over the river, and Mr. Phil Stenstrom pointed out that ATC is in control of which runway and flow is used and that is based on the direction of the winds.

Someone asked why they chose Meadow Drive as a site for a mobile noise monitoring site, and Mr. Phil Stenstrom said it was a combination of being inside the pattern and had available space for the monitor.

Colonel Sean Sullivan gave a short presentation on the Guard's position on the OHFDA. Col. Sullivan thanked the committee for inviting him to talk and introduced himself. He said he came in place of Lt. Col. Shamy who is currently deployed.

Col. Sullivan said the Guard has some slight updates to their request:

1. They do want to use all four runways.
2. 9am-5pm hours is fine with them instead of sunrise-sunset. They would like Monday- Friday hours and some weekends allowed for drill and flyovers.
3. They want the 4-ship pattern.
4. They want visiting US Air Force pilots to be able to do the OHFDA. Col. Sullivan said visiting F-16s would be nice, but not Navy or foreign partners.

Col. Sullivan shared the data that ORANG gathered during the test period.

Col. Sullivan said the Guard doesn't have access to the microphones, but they examined time spent below 2000 feet which would give some information on the noise impact: 1 minute 10 seconds for the 2-ship pattern, with about 5 to 10 seconds between the ships. He reported the 4-ship pattern indicated that all the planes were below 2000 ft. for about 1 minute and 30 seconds, which means planes are below 2000 ft. for a longer period of time in the 4-ship pattern. Col. Sullivan pointed out, however, that if they are flying 8 aircraft at once, then the total time below the 2000ft will be a little bit less when they have more ships because they can do two 4-ship landings instead of four 2-ship landings which would be spaced out a little longer. He gave some data on the straight in approach too, which was a longer time spent below 2000 ft. than the OHFDA.

Col. Sullivan shared some information on where the planes are with a graphic. Col. Sullivan said that on runway 10 they are primarily over the river.

Col. Sullivan said not doing the Overhead landing does not make the noise of the planes go away completely, and said that the Guard feels like when they do the OHFDA that the even and the noise is for a shorter period of time. Col. Sullivan said that they can become more proficient and be more efficient with the OHFDA. Col. Sullivan said that being able to use all runways would mean that they become more proficient and would allow for additional considerations for safety.

Col. Sullivan said that during the OHFDA they are flying low and slow for a less amount of time and are over populated areas for less time. For the continuous descent landing they come in lower for longer. Col. Sullivan said he knows that the people who are right underneath it don't agree that it is less noise overall, but he said the landing does have less power settings and fewer changes in power and he believes is less noisy overall.

Mr. Craig Walker asked if they were adding power every time they are getting into the oval. Col. Sullivan said that as their proficiency increases their power jacking gets minimized and they are setting their power just once.

## **OHFDA Discussion, Chair Mark Clark**

Chair Mark Clark opened the discussion to committee members.

Mr. Joe Smith said that it is helpful to talk about "sound" rather than "noise". If he understand correctly as far as sound as is concerned, both the duration and the volume of the sound is less total when talking about the OHFDA vs. the straight-in. Col. Sullivan replied that they didn't measure the volume, but rather they measured

the time spent below 2000 ft.

Mr. Joe Smith said he was talking about the difference between the OHODA and the Continuous and asked if the noise was less for the Continuous approach than for the OHODA. Col. Sullivan said that it depends on where you are because the noise is louder closer in and quieter further out.

Mr. David Stenstrom said on Page 10 of the report that they mentioned that OHODA will be discontinued if it cannot be done effectively, and Mr. David Stenstrom asked what the threshold was for discontinuing the maneuver. Col. Sullivan said they have not ever discontinued the maneuver and did not say what exactly that would take.

Mr. Bob Braze asked about the speed of the planes and how they could fly at the speed they would have to achieve to do the maneuver under the letter of agreement with the FAA. Col. Sullivan assured him that they were not in violation of the letter of agreement and did say that they were going about 80 mph faster than if they were coming in under the conventional approach. Mr. Bob Braze said that is a benefit to sound because they need less power to fly at that speed.

Mr. Craig Walker said we are talking about a tradeoff because with the continuous approach they come in lower, but also they are coming in in regions that have been under the flight path for 50 years. Mr. Walker said there may be fewer homes under that approach as opposed to getting more traffic in the neighborhoods south of the airport. Mr. Walker said we need to talk about who it is actually affecting.

Chair Mark Clark asked what would be wrong with doing a 4-ship pattern with 2-ships at one level and 2-ships at another level. Col. Sullivan said they haven't thought about that and would think about that, but that it would add a level of complexity.

Ms. Laura Young asked about proficiency with the maneuver. She said one of the questions they discussed a lot was local pilots vs. visiting pilots and that seems to be based on the idea that the visiting pilots were creating more noise, but she asked if they had data specifically on that issue. Chair Mark Clark said they could not get that data.

Col. Sullivan said that they revised their request to ask for only visiting US Air Force pilots to do the OHODA. Ms. Laura Young asked if they were better at this procedure, and Col. Sullivan said that the Air Force was flying something more similar to this more often.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom said that complaints did not really correlate to visiting periods. Ms. Laura Young clarified that she was asking about noise vs. traveling outside of the pattern.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom said they could not get the flight track data, but that anecdotally the FAA said most flights were pretty close to the actual flight pattern.

Ms. Laura Young said that some concerns were about aircraft flying outside of the normal pattern area, and were those attributed to visiting pilots vs. locals. Mr. Jerry Gerspach said we don't really have that data without the flight tracks, and also the local pilots were flying with the visiting pilots making the noise reports difficult to separate out. Ms. Laura Young asked if there was a way to analyze the data to look at the closed pattern. Mr. Stenstrom said that there were not enough flights to analyze because there were only 6 events. Ms. Young said that in the perception of the community 6 very loud events would occupy their mind. Mr. Stenstrom said he did not recall a discernable pattern for those events.

Mr. Joe Smith asked what percentage of the flight tracks were outside of the pattern area, and Mr. Phil Stenstrom said about 10% were outside, but the central tendency was within .1 of a mile within the proposed tracks.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom asked Mr. Jerry Gerspach if he heard a lot about overflying in the complaints. Mr. Gerspach said he heard some complaints about planes flying south of the pattern, but the real standouts were a couple planes reported to be on Sandy Blvd.

Mr. Bob Braze said that if you know this area then you can do this visual maneuver, and said visitors may not know the ways around the city. Mr. Braze asked if the visitors were ever leading the pattern and how they would know what markers to use, etc. Col. Sullivan said they give them a thorough briefing and set the expectations and that they will do their map study. Col. Sullivan said that for the most part the visiting pilots are on the wing of the local pilots and following them in.

Mr. Joe Smith asked if they had a GPS, and they do, but they are not sure what information that provides with landing.

Mr. Craig Walker asked what is the percent of each type of landing the Guard is looking for between conventional and OHCDA. Col. Sullivan said they are looking to use the OHCDA when the weather supports it, and with a required 3500 ft. cloud ceiling that means it is mostly a summer approach. If the weather and mission supports it that they need to have it as an option. Mr. Craig Walker asked for clarification that it was the preferred option, and Col. Sullivan replied correct.

Mr. Joe Smith asked Col. Sullivan, as you look at the recommendations from the Noise Office, what concerns you the most and how satisfied are you with the recommendations. Col. Sullivan said that's a subjective question and that they will work with the Port on that. Col. Sullivan said that the recommendations come with costs. For example, if they can only come back with 2 ships then they have to take a little extra gas. Col. Sullivan explained that not using the OHCDA as much and with more ships would mean more gas would be used, but he said that the Guard wants to work with the people in this room.

Mr. Mike Finch asked about the direction of the landings as right vs. left, and Col. Sullivan said the picture is what they would always do, and he explained that they are always turning away from the runway.

Mr. Kelly Sweeney asked if one type of landing was easier from a workload perspective for the FAA and the ATCs. Col. Sullivan said the 4-ship OHCDA was easier because it means fewer elements to sequence in.

Ms. Laura Young asked what prevents them from using the north runway as much. Col. Sullivan said and it is that it is shorter and doesn't have cables. The south runway is the preferred runway.

Mr. Craig Walker asked how long it takes to take a cable up, and Col. Sullivan said a matter of seconds.

Mr. Gary Kunz asked about the flight speed when they come in for the landing, and Mr. Bob Braze also wanted to know if they have a waiver if they are going over the speed laid out in the letter of agreement. Col. Sullivan said they do have a waiver below 10K feet and that he will certainly send him that; Col. Sullivan also said they certainly aren't wanting to do anything illegal.

Mr. Bob Braze brought up concerns about near misses in the airspace around the I-5 corridor. Col. Sullivan said he would be willing to talk with him after the meeting about the particulars of the speed and the visual approach if he wanted to discuss those further.

Chair Mark Clark opened the discussion to members of the public.

Ms. Christine Albertson said she is newer to the East Columbia Neighborhood. She asked about the frequency of these drills. She asked if there was a cap on the number of drills they are doing in a day, and if when they talked about the 2-ship or 4-ship formations they meant that only 8 planes were going up in a day.

Col. Sullivan said the maximum in a single flying period is typically 8 planes. He said they will sometimes fly 12-14 planes in a day but that can vary. Col. Sullivan also said that on average they have about 2 or 3 visiting units a year, and then they fly an estimated 14 planes in the morning and up to 12 planes in the afternoon. Col. Sullivan said he can't give a cap that they have set because it depends on lots of things. Col. Sullivan said that typically there are two flying periods in one day: one takes off at 8:45am, and one takes off about noon.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom added that the airport has no authority to put a capacity cap on any flight at any time, and their job is to provide the infrastructure for those flights.

Ms. Christine Albertson clarified she was also asking about the frequency of events. She said with no limit on the number of planes you can send up, then we are exposed to the sound. She said what would stop you from sending up many more planes. Col. Sullivan clarified that he was sharing an example of the data if 8 planes went up but said she was right that if there are 16 airplanes up then planes would be in the air for longer.

A community member asked about the visiting jets. She also said that she tried to get through and get a call back from the Noise Office but she said that didn't happen. She also said the website was down for a couple months, and that other people had trouble getting in touch with the Noise Office as well.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom said that the site issue was brought to his attention, and he was certain the site was not down for a month. Mr. Stenstrom said there was a backlog but that there was not a time when that exceeded 4 business days. The community member wanted her comment noted, and said she felt like her comment should have been in the report.

Mr. Erik Anderson said he lives under the 28 runway. Mr. Anderson said he remembers seeing a formation of 4-ships and it was off track because it was south of him and coming in really low. He said he wanted more control over that kind of thing. Mr. Anderson said that anything that can be done to keep the noise level down would be great. He said he witnessed a kid with his hands over his ears screaming during an event. He said he understands the conventional approach and the fuel issue, but when you are right under the flight path, you really get the effect of the OHEDA pattern. He said he supports cutting back on some of the recommendations, particularly the daytime hours in the summer. Mr. Anderson said there is a lot of activity in the park during that time and people are trying to enjoy the outdoors. He also said he understands the need for drill weekend, but he supports anything to cut back hours.

Mr. Tom Hickey, a community member from Bridgeton, spoke about the noise from turbulence and said that a plane traveling in a straight line makes less turbulence than a banking plane. Col. Sullivan said that the throttle noise is more significant than turbulence noise. Col. Sullivan said it is a steeper approach, and what really causes the noise is the power setting which is less. Mr. Hickey said he lives about a mile west of the runway so he hears the continuous landing all the time, and it is not as offensive as the OHEDA approach. Mr. Hickey also referred to the data showed earlier, and said it meant the OHEDA was really double the amount of noise effect to the individual. Mr. Phil Stenstrom reminded the group that those numbers were averages.



Mr. Andrew Pritchard, a community member from the Cully neighborhood, asked how the Noise Office balances the concerns of the neighborhoods historically affected by the noise and the neighborhoods that have never been affected by noise before. Mr. Pritchard also said he had some amendments to a change.org petition that was mentioned in the report because there was some inaccurate statements about the petition in the report. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said that the Noise Office does not really pick and choose the complaints or weight them based on anything. Mr. Stenstrom spoke about the costs and benefits of having an airport in our city, said that they are aware that some of these patterns have been in place for a very long time. Mr. Stenstrom said that in the context of the Guard's request, that they have been good partners and the airport has a mandate to provide access to them.

A community member said she went to the Helen's View High School fly day. She said she made her concerns known there, and she said she called in and never got a call back, and that she never tried the email system. She said she assumed her input wasn't wanted, and she wonders how many other people were like her.

Mr. Gary Kunz asked if the previous OH pattern and the modified version that was used for the trial period were compared to one another. Col. Sullivan said that in the typical Overhead pattern, the turn was a level turn and the power is up and up again and then finally back down when you're at 1500 ft. Col. Sullivan said they have modified the new OHODA to make it a continuous descent pattern by starting higher and having a gradual descent all the way down and use lower power.

Ms. Martha Johnston, a community member from the East Columbia neighborhood, said she does not give her permission to violate the airspace and she is demanding that this procedure not be approved. Ms. Johnston said she has been injured by this procedure. She reported that one event with 14 planes lasted over a half hour. Ms. Johnston also reported an economic loss of 25-35% of the value, and reiterated her demand not to approve this maneuver.

Mr. Erwin Bergman said he wanted to talk about the movement of noise from a historically impacted area. Mr. Bergman said he has to disagree with Mr. Phil Stenstrom in that the airport has control over noise. Mr. Bergman said the regulations and the environmental desk references state that if you are going to put in operations in an area that has not been previously used and it is less than 3000ft and it is a sensitive area you have to see if your new route doesn't have more impacts, and if it does have more impacts then don't do it. Mr. Bergman said that this does have impacts because it's an area that has not been impacted previously.

Chair Mark Clark said that the Portland Airport actually wanted to participate in the Part 150 study and regulation and has chosen to go along with that. Mr. Erwin Bergman said it wasn't the Part 150 that he was referring to, but rather it was the Environmental Desk Reference. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said that he and Mr. Bergman have discussed the reference he was referring to extensively and that they do not agree on the reading of that reference. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said this reference does not apply because this is not an airport action. Mr. Stenstrom said they are complying with all the laws.

Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau spoke about the formations with 2 planes versus 4 planes. Ms. Fuerstenau said the when there are 4 planes, the latter planes have to do a wider turn, and she said she witnesses that and it encroaches on the neighborhood. Col. Sullivan said that shouldn't be happening because they should be slighter further down the runway, and the ground track should be the exact same for planes 3 and 4 as for planes 1 and 2.

Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau read a prepared statement for the committee. She said she's lived here for 39 years, and that when ORANG proposed changing the guidelines that many neighborhood associations were vehemently opposed. Ms. Fuerstenau said she knows training is important. She said she agrees and

appreciates the Port's recommendation not to expand hours or use the 4-ship formation, or allowing all the visitors. Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau said she doesn't agree that adding in the runways is a good idea. She said on page two of the report, that the boundary of the flight is basically Columbia Blvd., and she reported that she saw flights on Prescott or further south of that. Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau said that she insists that you do the formation shown on the map. Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau said regarding the noise levels that it was in the high 70 decibels, which is pretty loud and that really shouldn't be tolerated. Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau said in 2008 they were told that only 20 planes per month would be doing this. She said she was shocked to see the number of flights in later years and that is was many more than they had agreed to in 2008 or that CNAC had agreed to. Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau said 610 planes in 6 months is way too many. She said limiting the number of planes and not having visitors would be helpful. Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau said the Air Force could fly at other bases that are not residential. She said the most obvious answer would be to not fly over residential areas.

Mr. David Stenstrom asked Ms. Kathy Fuerstenau if she was here in 2008 and she said yes. Mr. David Stenstrom asked if her house was underneath the overhead continuous descent approach and she said she shouldn't be under the path at all because her house should be a few blocks outside of the OHFDA path.

Mr. Andrew Pritchard thanked ORANG for protecting the country and said that that allows him to live freely. Mr. Pritchard said that they shouldn't have to keep doing this. He said that the National Guard that is doing something out of convenience, and he said to consider rescinding requests 1, 3, and 4. Mr. Pritchard said the committee is appreciated. Mr. Pritchard asked the committee to reject the request because a vote to pass these is a vote to traumatize community members. Mr. Pritchard asked the committee to please recommend a return to pre-2008 levels, and implored the committee to put themselves in their shoes for a moment. Mr. Pritchard said that you would feel violated as he does if his home is being sacrificed. Mr. Pritchard said that you may assert that OHFDAs are quieter, but only if you do not live underneath the path. Mr. Pritchard said you have a great opportunity to be on the right side of justice and asked the committee members what they would do if their homes were under the flight path.

Chair Mark Clark called for a 15 minute break at this point in the meeting. Mr. Joe Smith left the meeting.

### **Public Comment and Questions, Chair Mark Clark**

Chair Mark Clark opened the meeting up for some public comments.

### **OHFDA Committee Vote, Chair Mark Clark**

Chair Mark brought the meeting back to order at 7:36pm. Chair Clark said that he will allow people to speak that have not spoken yet, but first wanted to allow Mr. Gary Kunz, Chair of the East Columbia Neighborhood Association, to speak because he represents a lot of people here.

Mr. Gary Kunz said he said he was on CNAC eight or nine years ago, and that he wants to represent his community's interests. Mr. Kunz said this maneuver is one of the most divisive of all issues. Mr. Kunz explained he had many letters for different neighborhood associations, including the North Portland neighborhood group, and petitions that all agree this maneuver is not appropriate over a residential setting. Mr. Kunz said he has an email from Delta Management to reiterate their opposition. Mr. Kunz said he had letters from Woodlawn N.A., Piedmont N.A., and Central NE Neighbors, all in agreement in their opposition to the maneuver.

Mr. Gary Kunz said he found the report ambiguous. Mr. Kunz said there are two parts to the maneuver: First is the high speed high altitude approach. Mr. Kunz said that they are turning toward final right over our homes and it is startling to see them pop over the houses all of a sudden. Mr. Kunz said the Overhead is louder than

when aircraft come in one by one. Mr. Kunz said the noise is now in neighborhoods that used to have no noise and now have noise from the banking part of the maneuver. He said some people have mentioned takeoffs, but he reminded people that we are not talking about this. Mr. Kunz also said that there is some air turbulence noise. He said when the aircraft are maybe 500 ft. there is exhaust noise and airframe noise.

Mr. Gary Kunz said the time saved in the approach to the airfield is mostly eaten up by time going through the spiral, but it's little difference. Mr. Kunz said the reduced noise impact for those directly beneath the straight in approach is zero because no one lives there, so the net benefits of the OHCDAs is zero. Mr. Kunz said the higher and louder aircraft send their noise deeper into the community. Mr. Kunz said his organization urges the Port and CNAC to recommend that this maneuver not be allowed over our neighborhoods. Mr. Kunz also said that although they have changed some things, that the latter part of the maneuver is the same as what they did in 2002. Mr. Kunz said the Meadow site was not close to the houses and he wonders if there isn't a difference in what the aircraft are doing. Mr. Gary Kunz said that was his shortened testimony, and he will provide the documents he mentioned to the committee.

Ms. Mary Jo Hull said that she lives in East Columbia neighborhood. Ms. Hull briefly described the experience living in East Columbia: She said the windows of her home built in 2005 rattle. Ms. Hull said she has a home-based business and she can't hear and has to stop conversation when they fly overhead. She said this stops her daily process. Ms. Hull said you can measure decibels and provide data, but this is her experience. Ms. Hull said she did not know that there was a test period. Ms. Hull asked why the Port didn't send out letters and ask how the community members are experiencing this. Ms. Hull said not everyone goes to community meetings every month. Ms. Hull said she was not represented in the data and that probably 75% of the people didn't know where to call. Ms. Hull said social media suggests that people didn't know what was going on. Ms. Hull asked why there wasn't talk of compromise of some OHCDAs practice and some conventional landings of coming in along the river.

Mr. Sabolch Horvat, said he was a Cully community member that moved to NE Portland in 2015. Mr. Horvat said it is not that much of a nuisance because they fly over the river. Mr. Horvat said the trial period was bad because he has a lasting effect, like Mr. Andrew Pritchard mentioned. He said he called this Monday and he hasn't gotten a call back, and said that leads to a lack of trust. Mr. Horvat said the number of people increased in the data because they knew about the trial period. Mr. Horvat said a more accurate way to compare was to check how many people called in after the trial period. Chair Mark Clark invited him to stay for the Noise Report later in the meeting.

Ms. Brooke Kavanaugh said she was from the Beaumont-Wilshire neighborhood. Ms. Kavanaugh said the sensation caused by those jets and having to cover her ears is traumatizing. She said tonight she is here on behalf of her friend who lives on Freemont in the 60-blocks. Ms. Kavanaugh said the trial period was so bad that she will have to move. Ms. Kavanaugh asked the committee to follow the recommendations to not support requests 1, 3, and 4.

Dr. Marna Hark she said she was a Cully neighborhood farmer. Dr. Hark said she is trying to run contemplative experiences in a large permaculture environment, and the flyovers caused a large decline in her educational experience. She said she will move and she will fight very hard about this, and this is unacceptable that anyone will have to endure this.

## **Votes on the OHCDAs Procedures**

Chair Mark Clark thanked everyone for their comments. Chair Clark said they have listened and that all of the committee members are all very concerned with their neighborhood issues and that is why they are here. Chair Mark Clark acknowledged that they have changed his opinion and done a good job presenting their case.

Chair Clark said it was time to get to the votes on the 5 issues at hand.

Colonel Sean Sullivan said that ORANG was adapting their letters of agreement. Col. Sullivan said they are now asking that just visiting US Air Force pilots should be allowed to do the OHCDAs.

Mr. Craig Walker asked how many visitors that would be, in numbers of pilots. Col. Sullivan said that it would have been 1/3 of the visitors last year, but that he cannot give a number that is totally accurate year to year.

Ms. Laura Young said that one of the things that has not been covered was that there was a substantial increase in the number of flights from when this was originally proposed. Ms. Laura Young said she doesn't see the increase of the number of flights being addressed in the proposals. Ms. Young said the actual number of events that someone experiences adds to the discomfort. Ms. Young suggested that the committee make an amendment that the number of flights would be the same as they were prior to the test period.

Mr. David Stenstrom said that he does not think the committee can limit the number of flights. Ms. Laura Young said we cannot make them do it, but the committee can suggest it.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom said it is true that we cannot say that anyone cannot land here as a public airport, but that it is also true that we can make a recommendation pertaining to number of OHCDAs. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said that implementing this plan will not increase the total number of flights because that is dependent on other things and that military flights fluctuate. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said that more people will not come because of the OHCDAs and that military flights will vary based on their activity and needs.

Mr. Mike Finch said that based on the numbers he mentioned, we are talking about 15% of all military operations using this maneuver, and Mr. Phil Stenstrom said it was a little more than that. Mr. Phil Stenstrom pointed out that the number of military flights are going to be what they are going to be and we are just talking about the OHCDAs landings as a percentage of those landings.

Mr. Gary Kunz said that percentage that Mr. Stenstrom just mentioned was just during the test period. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said yes, and they'd never measured it before then.

Chair Mark Clark announced that he would like to see a vote from the committee on stopping the OHCDAs completely. Chair Mark Clark said that the committee is looking at the community members' interests and that the committee needs to make sure that they responsive to that.

### **Visiting Pilots Issue**

Mr. Mike Finch clarified with Col. Sullivan that there was only one local squadron of pilots: the 123<sup>rd</sup> Fighter Squadron was the actual flying squadron within the 142<sup>nd</sup> Fighter Wing.

### **Motion:**

Mr. Craig Walker moved that the committee accept ORANG's proposal on Issue Number 1, with the inclusion of the provision that US Air Force will be the only visitors allowed to do the OHCDAs. Ms. Karen Meyer seconded that motion.

Before the vote there was clarification for what was being voted on, because there is now a vote on rejecting the OHCDAs wholly. Ms. Laura Young said that if we agree to ban OHCDAs wholly then each of these issues is

moot.

Chair Mark Clark said that the committee will vote on each issue in order because the vote to ban the OHFDA was not discussed before a few minutes ago. Chair Mark Clark said he did want to call a vote on that at the end because he did not want to ignore the public.

**Vote:**

Chair Mark Clark called a vote for the motion that Mr. Walker made and Ms. Meyer seconded. The motion failed with 3 votes in favor, 7 votes against, and 2 abstentions.

**Motion:**

Mr. Mike Finch moved that they allow the local unit only to fly the OHFDA and Mr. Bob Braze seconded.

Chair Mark Clark asked for discussion. Mr. Mike Yee asked why this motion, and Mr. Mike Finch said this motion limits the operations to only the local squadron.

**Vote:**

Chair Mark Clark called the vote, and The motion passed with 9 votes in favor, 1 vote against, and 2 abstentions.

Chair Mark Clark asked if there were any other motions on issue Number 1 and there were none. The committee has voted to allow only the local squadron to fly the OHFDA.

Chair Mark Clark moved to Issue 3 at the request of Mr. Craig Walker to leave Issue 2 until the end.

## **Number of Ships Issue**

Chair Mark Clark opened the floor to a motion on Issue 3, the issue about the number of ships in the formations.

**Motion:**

Mr. Mike Finch moved that the committee limit the formation to 2 ships. Ms. Laura Young seconded the motion.

**Vote:**

Chair Clark called the vote. The motion passed with 11 votes in favor, 1 vote against, and no abstentions.

Chair Mark Clark asked if there were any other motions on that issue since there was one no vote.

Mr. Andrew Loescher said that based on Col. Sullivan's testimony, Mr. Loescher changed his opinion on the 4-ship pattern.

**Motion:**

Mr. Andrew Loescher made a motion to allow the OHFDA with a 4-ship pattern. There was no second for the motion, so it falls to the first vote on this item and only 2 ship patterns will be recommended.

## **Hours Allowed Issue**

Chair Mark Clark went on to Issue 4. Mr. Mike Finch asked how ORANG designates what weekend will be the drill weekend. Col. Sullivan said that it is a published yearly schedule. Col. Sean Sullivan explained that it was his recommendation to allow the one drill weekend a month and then the flexibility that they be allowed to do a ceremonial flyover as needed.

**Motion:**

Mr. Andrew Loescher moved that we accept Issue number 4 as is: that ORANG only operates from 9am-5pm on weekdays (banking hours) and Ms. Karen Meyer seconded that.

**Vote:**

Chair Mark Clark called the vote. The motion passed with 9 yes votes and 3 no votes. There were no abstentions.

Mr. Ron Schmidt clarified that the committee voted for Monday through Friday and no weekends included, and that was answered in the affirmative.

Chair Mark Clark asked if there were other motions because there were several No votes.

**Motion:**

Mr. Mike Finch moved that the committee approve weekday hours 9am-5pm and one additional drill weekend per month to be designated in advance. Mr. Andrew Loescher seconded that motion.

**Vote:**

Chair Mark Clark called the vote. That motion had 8 votes in favor, 3 votes against, and 1 abstention.

Chair Mark Clark announced that because 9 people voted in favor of not allowing weekends and 8 people voted in favor of allowing weekends, so the first motion was adopted.

Ms. Linda Waller said that she was pretty sure that the first vote was to include a weekend and expressed uncertainty about the vote. Linda wasn't clear on the first motion under this issue.

**Motion:**

Mr. Craig Walker moved to allow the one weekend per month according to the drill schedule with the 9am-5pm hours as well. Ms. Karen Meyer seconded that motion.

**Vote:**

The motion passed with 8 votes in favor and 4 votes against. Chair Mark Clark said that based on that vote, the committee will allow OHCDAs on one weekend per month for the designated drill weekend from 9am-5pm will be allowed.

**Closed Pattern Issue**

Chair Mark Clark addressed Issue 5, the provisions for a closed pattern.

Ms. Laura Young asked what 'currency' meant in this context, and Col. Sullivan said that it referred to license currency, and the closed pattern is used for safety for the landing safety partner who is flying in with the pilots that have lapsed with their landing currency, and using the OHCDA would allow them to observe the pilot land

and then loop around and get to the ground as quickly as possible following that.

**Motion:**

Ms. Laura Young moved that we accept the recommendation to allow the closed pattern, and Mr. Andrew Loescher seconded.

**Vote:**

The motion passed with 10 votes in favor, no votes against, and 2 abstentions.

**Authorized Runway Issue**

Chair Clark proceeded to issue 2, regarding runway usage, and asked Col. Sullivan for an explanation of that issue. Col. Sullivan explained that the request is to use all runways for the OHFDA.

Mr. Craig Walker pointed out the runways on the pattern graphic. Ms. Laura Young asked Col. Sullivan to estimate the percentage of flights that they would use the other runways for. Col. Sullivan said that when they are on the 10s it is in the winter, and the cloud cover usually means fewer OHFDAs, which are dependent on the weather.

Ms. Laura Young said that her understanding was that including the 10L and 10R would reduce the noise impact over the neighborhoods and would be spreading the noise a little bit. Mr. Andrew Loescher pointed out that it would increase noise over other neighborhoods. Chair Mark Clark said that adding all the runways would not exactly make the community happy. Col. Sullivan said that weather and winds mostly dictate what runway they use.

Ms. Laura Young said so if we don't do the OHFDA they wouldn't use those runways, and Col. Sullivan replied that they would do the straight-in landings on those runways if necessary if they did not allow the OHFDA.

Chair Mark Clark asked if there was a motion on this issue.

**Motion:**

Ms. Linda Waller moved that CNAC support the addition of 10L and 10R for the OHFDA. There was no second so that motion failed.

**Motion:**

Mr. Andrew Loescher made a motion that the CNAC does not support the addition of either runway, and Mr. Mike Yee seconded that motion.

Ms. Laura Young asked if Cully would still get the noise if the committee approved the use of OHFDA but they do not include runway 10R and 10L.

Mr. Mike Finch said that the thing that dictates the runway usage is wind and that adding the runways 10L and 10R will not decrease the OHFDAs on the 28. There was discussion about whether adding runways would increase or decrease traffic and OHFDAs. Col. Sean Sullivan clarified that if they don't approve the extension to the 10L and 10R runways that all the landings on the 10 flows will be straight-in landings.

**Vote:**

Chair Mark Clark called the vote on Mr. Loeschers' motion not authorizing the extension to the 10L and 10R

runways. There was a tie with 6 votes in favor and 6 votes opposed.

Chair Mark Clark asked if there was another motion on this issue.

**Motion:**

Mr. Craig Walker moved that we add 10L to the approved list and not approve the usage of 10R. Mr. Kelly Sweeney seconded the motion.

Mr. Ron Schmidt asked Col. Sullivan if they would use that runway and what their preference was for runways. Col. Sullivan said it was hard to say their exact usage of the runway because they don't have control over the runway they are assigned. Col. Sullivan said their preferences is to use 10R and if they had the authority to use it in place then they would use it.

Ms. Laura Young asked why they are excluding just one of the runways.

Mr. Craig Walker said that it is low hanging fruit because it was over the river, and there was discussion about the pattern and direction of the landings. Ms. Laura Young asked about the height of the planes on each of the runways, and Col. Sullivan said that the 3-dimensional pattern is the same on each side, so they are not lower on one side or the other.

Ms. Karen Meyer left at 8:43pm prior to the voting.

**Vote:**

Chair Mark Clark called a vote on Mr. Walker's motion to add the OHFDA to runway 10L in addition to the 28L and 28R. The motion passed with 9 votes in favor and 2 votes in opposition, and no abstentions.

**Allowance of OHFDA**

Chair Mark Clark said we had made it through the scheduled issues and now was opening it up to the question of voting on the allowance of OHFDAs.

**Motion:**

Ms. Laura Young made the motion to disallow the use of the OHFDA landing procedure altogether. Mr. Ron Schmidt seconded the motion.

Mr. Andrew Loescher asked for Col. Sullivan to give the elevator speech on the reason to continue to use the OHFDA. Col. Sullivan said it was safest, most efficient way to get on the ground and it has applications here and in .

A committee member asked if Col. Sullivan had any middle ground to discuss on the CDOA. Col. Sullivan said that he feels as though what has been discussed tonight already is a middle ground in his mind.

Mr. Mike Yee asked about other semi-local sites to do the OHFDA rather than here. Col. Sullivan said that it would take more research, would not be a quick fix, and would have some challenges.

Mr. Craig Walker said that currently the committee has decided that they are not recommending the use of 10R for the OHFDA, but brought up that the committee viewed the landings on 10R for testing purposes. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said that it is their preferred runway because it is closer to their base.



Col. Sullivan mentioned that they do have to do these landings at some point, and to do anything anywhere else still requires them to come back here to land.

Ms. Laura Young asked if there was some way to limit the number of OHCDAs. Col. Sullivan said this committee could make whatever recommendations they want.

Mr. Craig Walker asked where all of these recommendations go from here.

Mr. Phil Stenstrom said CNAC's role is to be advisory to the Port and all of these recommendations will come in as advice to the Port. Then it is up to the Guard and the discretion of the Guard to decide what will meet their needs. Mr. Phil Stenstrom said that they will factor the committee's recommendations very seriously into their decision.

**Vote:**

Chair Mark Clark called the vote on Ms. Laura Young's motion to do away with the OHFDA altogether. The motion failed with 3 votes in favor, 7 votes in oppositions, and one abstention.

Mr. Andrew Loescher asked for clarification on the primary runway where the OHFDA has been used thus far, Mr. Phil Stenstrom said and it was 28L.

Mr. Andrew Loescher asked why it wasn't 10R and, Col. Sullivan responded that it was because the North runway is shorter and without cables.

Mr. Ron Schmidt asked about doing an OHFDA in a different direction that would put the plane over the airport, and Col. Sullivan said they couldn't do a different direction because flying over other runway would shut down the whole airport.

Mr. Ron Schmidt made a suggestion to do the flight pattern on 28L but have the pattern go over the river, and Col. Sullivan responded that they can't do that either.

Mr. Andrew Loescher said that he understands the operational needs of ORANG and he said they have been very responsive.

**Motion:**

Mr. Andrew Loescher moved that they allow the OHFDA on just the 28L runway and decrease the number of flights by 25% from the 2017 trial annualized numbers. There was no second on his motion so it failed.

**Motion:**

Ms. Laura Young moved that ORANG return to pre-trial numbers of OHCDAs.

Mr. Kelley Sweeney said that the problem is the number is not quantifiable, and there was discussion about how to phrase a "reduction" in flights that was operationalized and clear. Ms. Laura Young agreed and said that she feels like the committee is in agreement about some sort of compromise on a reduction in number of flights, but conceded withdrew her motion.

Col. Sullivan said that most of the motions that have been passed have out procedures basically back to pre-trial procedures. There were no more motions on the OHFDA.

## **Adjourn, Chair Mark Clark**

Chair Mark Clark said that he proposes that we hold off on the bi-monthly complaint report and the remaining agenda items, and asked if anyone wanted to stay for those remaining items.

Mr. David Stenstrom said we should table issues until next meeting.

Ms. Laura Young motioned to adjourn and Mr. Ron Schmidt seconded that motion, there were no nays, and the meeting was adjourned.

### **Next Meeting:**

May 10, 2018 / 5.30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.  
[http://www.portofportland.com/PDX\\_Home.aspx](http://www.portofportland.com/PDX_Home.aspx)

Portland International Airport Terminal Building  
St. Helen's "A" Conference Room  
7100 NE Airport Way, Portland (Located at PDX)