



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

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Jul. 14, 2016 5:30 PM**  
Portland International Airport Terminal Building  
St. Helen's "B" Conference Room

CNAC Members in Attendance		
Bob Braze	Washington County	Present
Brad Robison	Clackamas County	Absent
Brian Freeman	City of Gresham	Present
Craig Walker	Clark County	Present
Joe Smith	Multnomah County	Present
Karen Meyer	At-Large (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	Absent
Mike Yee	City of Vancouver	Present
Beth Duvall	City of Vancouver	Present
Andrew Loescher	At-Large (Clark County)	Present
Mike Finch	At-Large (Multnomah County)	Present
Tina Penman	At-Large (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		
Maj. Paul Shamy	Oregon Air National Guard	Absent
Sgt. Josh Goldschmidt	Portland Police Bureau – Air Support Unit	Present

**Introductions and Adopt Minutes –**

Mark Clark, CNAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:36pm. The committee members introduced themselves.

**Adopt Minutes**

Chair Clark asked if anyone had any additions or corrections to the May 12th CNAC meeting notes. As there were none, Kelly Sweeney motioned to adopt the minutes and Bob Braze seconded the motion. The minutes were passed unanimously.

**Public Comment and Questions**

Michael Wright introduced himself to the committee, stating that he and his wife had lived on Alameda Terrace for the last eight years. He informed the committee that in the last 12 months, his family had noticed

a significant increase in the cargo feeder planes flying over their neighborhood. He explained that he felt the number of airplanes had increased quite significantly. He noted that he understood that in living near an airport, he would likely hear aircraft, but added that lately it seemed the aircraft were extraordinarily low-flying and very loud. He stated that these episodes occurred primarily in two time windows: about 5:30 until 7:30 in the morning and about 4:30 until 6:30-7:00 in the evening. He reported that they were able to see the aircraft from their house and they seemed to be contractor airplanes flying for FedEx.

Mr. Wright explained that, having read the study the CNAC conducted and adopted in 2008, he had come to the conclusion that some of these pilots were not adhering to the report's principles as carefully as they had been when they was first instituted. He also asked if there had been a significant increase in the number of feeder planes since the study was published eight years ago, noting that the increase in online purchasing had likely had an affect.

Chair Clark asked if Mr. Wright had shared any noise complaints with the Noise Management team.

Mr. Wright responded that he had not. He explained that he had talked to Phil Stenstrom and Jerry Gerspach at the Port of Portland and learned that the CNAC meeting was coming up and had decided to attend the meeting before filing a complaint.

Mr. Sweeney asked if Mr. Wright attended the Alameda Neighborhood Association meetings. Mr. Wright replied that he was unsure about how to join and therefore had not done so yet. Mr. Sweeney offered to help him get involved.

Joe Smith asked where in the Alameda neighborhood Mr. Wright lived. Mr. Wright replied that he lived on NE 32nd Place between NE Bryce and NE Shaver.

Chair Clark asked if Port staff had anything to add.

Mr. Gerspach explained that he felt that there had probably not been an increase in feeder plane activity, but added that he had not counted them recently. Mr. Gerspach stated that the time windows Mr. Wright mentioned coincided with the early morning delivery flush and the evening reloads. He informed the committee that 6:30-7:30 a.m. was probably the busiest hour for all departures.

Mr. Wright noted that it was probably convenient for them from a cost-saving perspective, as all businesses were there on the crossway. He added that if they were disturbing neighborhoods, however, it was likely not good for their business. Mr. Wright asked if the aircraft were flying over Alameda in order to avoid Lloyd Center area buildings.

Mr. Gerspach responded that they were not avoiding those buildings, but instead were likely being squeezed in amongst all the other air traffic, as they were so close to the airport. He explained that the way the traffic controllers directed the aircraft depended on other traffic. He added that general procedure was that every mile the aircraft was away from touchdown at the end of the runway equated to three hundred feet in required altitude. He noted that in Mr. Wright's case, that added up to about 600 ft.

Mr. Wright asked if the Port would be able to identify the flight and notify its pilot if someone noticed that some planes were landing at significantly lower altitudes and made a complaint with a specific time.

Mr. Gerspach replied that the Port would schedule research to identify such issues. He clarified that if an aircraft was flying at a different altitude, it did not necessarily mean they were doing anything wrong, as they may have been directed to do so by air traffic controllers. He informed the committee that for departures, staff looked to see that the aircraft were at least 500 ft. in altitude before turning away from the airport (this

noise abatement departure procedure was adopted following the Cargo Feeder Study in 2008). He noted that noise abatement procedures are monitored daily as part of the Fly Quiet monitoring program. Any non-compliance issues are investigated further to determine the reason for the non-compliance. The results are then passed to local FAA staff for review/corrective action.

Mr. Wright noted that monitoring the airplanes was difficult on sight alone.

Chair Clark asked if it was a visual perception or noise issue. Mr. Wright replied that it started with noise and added that when it was really loud, he would go outside to take a look at the aircraft and see how low it was flying.

Mr. Wright explained that he did not expect to solve the issue immediately but wanted to raise the issue and get in on the record in case there was anything that could be done about it.

Mr. Gerspach stated that there was a software program on the Noise Management webpage that allowed viewers to track flights on a map. Mr. Wright replied that he had looked at the tracking feature, but noted that there was a four-hour delay that made it slightly more difficult to use. He added that after a certain point the altitude of the plane was not available.

Bob Braze explained that there was a regulatory process in place if the aircraft were not in compliance. He added that there was also a minimum sector altitude that they were required to fly in surrounding areas. He asked if Mr. Wright lived on the extended center line of the crosswind runway.

Mr. Wright replied that he did not, as he lived farther east closer to the Lloyd Center.

Mr. Braze asked if they were noisier when they were departing or arriving. Mr. Wright responded that he felt they were louder in the evening, as he and his wife were generally not outside in the morning.

Mr. Braze noted that power was generally decreased by 20 to 30 percent when airplanes were arriving as compared to departing.

Mr. Wright added that an airplane landing the previous night had been the loudest he'd ever noticed. Mr. Sweeney noted that his wife had noticed the same.

Mr. Smith stated that aircraft were required to be 1000-1200 ft. in altitude unless they were landing. He guessed that the aircraft above Mr. Wright's house were flying at about 2700 ft. Mr. Wright agreed that would be true for a regular flight, but noted that in his case he lived about 3 miles from the airport, making the situation a little different.

Mr. Smith asked if the aircraft would be landing to the side, noting that he expected they would be coming across the middle of the airport. Sgt. Josh Goldschmidt explained that aircraft had been flying predominately straight out of the west for the last week.

### **ORANG Schedule Updates**

Chair Clark introduced the ORANG Schedule Updates noting that because Maj. Paul Shamy was unable to attend the meeting, Phil Stenstrom would be providing the update.

Mr. Stenstrom reported that there would be no weekend flying in July. He explained that from August 2 to August 12, F-12s would be in town from Tucson leading to double the normal fighter aircraft traffic on a daily basis. He noted that weekend flying would take place on August 6 and 7 at the usual times and added that

ORANG would be flying in Hawaii from August 16 to September 1, meaning their airfield at PDX would be quiet.

Mr. Stenstrom announced that weekend flying would also take place September 10 and 11. He informed the committee that night flying would be taking place on September 6 and 8 with 8 pm takeoffs. Mr. Stenstrom added that F-16s from Tucson would be in town from September 13 to September 29 so increased fighter traffic was to be expected during that time.

Mr. Stenstrom stated that staff was also working with the ORANG to update the military procedures it set with the CNAC years ago. He notified the committee that the document would be a future item for the committee to review.

Kelly Sweeney noted that the ORANG had been practicing continuous descent approaches (CDAs) over the past week and a half and asked if complaints had been raised as a result.

Mr. Stenstrom replied that the Port typically did not receive complaints about such work and explained that ORANG pilots are careful to follow prescribed procedures for CDAs.

### **Portland Police Air Support Unit Update**

Chair Clark introduced Sgt. Josh Goldschmidt, Chief Pilot of the Portland Police Air Support Unit. Sgt. Goldschmidt provided a brief overview of his presentation, noting that he would focus on giving an update on the Air Support Unit while saving time for questions and a discussion on current events.

Sgt. Goldschmidt informed the committee that the mission of the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) was to reduce crime and the fear of crime by working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights, protect property, and promote individual responsibility and community commitment. He explained that the mission of the Air Support Unit was to support the overall mission of the PPB while also helping many surrounding agencies, such as the Water Bureau, Emergency Services, and Bureau of Transportation with their work. He noted that there were about 30-45 units on average that the unit supports.

Sgt. Goldschmidt announced that the focus of the Air Support Unit was safety, efficiency, and effectiveness, and added that the unit strived to meet these characteristics in every one of its assignments. He stated that the Air Support Unit was formed in August 1991 and at its peak included over 20 members. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that, like almost all law enforcement agencies nationwide, the Portland Police Bureau was having a difficult time recruiting people interested in becoming police officers, and the current Air Support staffing reflected that trend. He reported that of the unit's ten officers and deputies, five were pilots and five were tactical flight officers (TFOs). Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that TFOs were required to understand police tactics, terminology, equipment, investigative tactics, and procedures and noted that all of the unit's pilots were selected from the group of TFOs. He added that of the unit's five pilots, three also worked as TFOs when needed.

Sgt. Goldschmidt reported that over the last three years, the unit had averaged 500-800 flight hours per year. He noted that despite having a small staff and a high level of flight hours, he was confident in the unit because every staff member was incredibly proficient in their work. He explained that the Portland Police Bureau budget largely determined the amount of work the Air Support Unit could provide. He stated that for the past 15 years, the Police Bureau had received budget cuts fairly consistently, with the last three years marking the smallest budget he had ever experienced. He informed the committee that to even cover the needed amount of police officers patrolling the streets, half of the officers on any given day were working normally scheduled hours while the other half were being paid overtime. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that this was due in part to a large amount of retiring officers leaving the force with an insufficient amount of incoming police officers to

replace them. He noted that for the first time in years, the budget for the current year had improved and added that this would allow the bureau more funding to afford time-intensive investigations.

Sgt. Goldschmidt informed the committee that the majority of the Air Support Unit's flights were investigative in nature. He explained that the unit received its assignments by pager, often from sergeants requesting support at a certain time on a particular day. He noted that these officers would request a flight crew for a set time period and he would coordinate with his team to meet the need. He added that the Air Support Unit also scheduled prearranged patrol flights that were meant to help patrol officers on the street take police calls.

Sgt. Goldschmidt announced that the unit operated two aircraft. He explained that both airplanes included cameras that hung from the side of the aircraft and allowed operators to see the ground from high distances. Sgt. Goldschmidt demonstrated where the pilot was positioned in the aircraft. He explained that the pilot used a monitor in the front of the aircraft to determine where the camera was focused.

Sgt. Goldschmidt provided an overview of the Air Support Unit's various missions, including investigative support, aerial photography, traffic enforcement, transport, marijuana eradication, search and rescue, pursuit intervention, block searches, radio calls, fire support, critical infrastructure, and tactical team support. He noted that the unit scanned multiple dispatch networks.

Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that providing damage assessments from the air was one of the Air Support Unit's most important responsibilities. He stated that for officers, citizens, and suspects, the unit's aircraft was a tool for safety. He noted that if the unit could help the officers address a tactical situation in such a way where the officers have greater control, the situation could be managed so that officers were better equipped to avoid danger and the amount of force and risk posed to the suspect was limited.

Sgt. Goldschmidt shared two examples demonstrating how the unit helped accomplish these goals. The first example focused on a block search that the Air Support Unit participated in.

Sgt. Goldschmidt then provided a second example. He shared a photograph from footage of the incident and identified three officers approaching the end of a dead end street. He explained that shots had been fired on the block and the officers were attempting to locate the suspects. He noted that the two officers in front had their guns in hand, adding that this was not unusual when officers were attempting to clear a potentially dangerous area. Sgt. Goldschmidt stated that the Air Support Unit had flown above the area to help the officers on the ground locate the suspects. He explained that the TFO had found a vehicle and noticed its window was down, as the glass would reflect infrared energy. He informed the committee that the camera could locate individuals using this same infrared reading. He noted that the infrared in the car indicated that there was an individual sitting in the back seat. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that the TFO had notified the officers that there was an individual in the car and the officers were able to approach carefully. Once they were there, a subject stepped out of the car, and explained that he believed he was the intended target of the shots being fired and as a result had hid on the floorboard of the vehicle.

Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that if the officers had not been informed ahead of time of the man's location, they may have been startled by his presence on the floorboard of the vehicle and reacted strongly. He noted that because the Air Support Unit had identified the man, the officers were able to approach the situation with a better understanding of the circumstances. He stated that from a safety standpoint, the Air Support Unit had prevented the possibility of a negative encounter between an innocent individual and the police.

Sgt. Goldschmidt informed the committee that in policing, it was important to consider not only the probability of such an encounter happening, but also the possibility. He explained that outlier events did occur, though rarely, and it was important for police officers to be cognizant of this possibility. Sgt.

Goldschmidt noted that he reviewed the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) annual report on the year's general aviation accidents to ensure that his crew was trained not to make the same mistakes.

Sgt. Goldschmidt then shared a couple of recent significant events from the Police Bureau. The first was a gun found during a traffic stop. He noted that officers had stopped a car for traffic violations and found an open container of alcohol as well as a hand gun in the center console. The other incident related to an exchange of gunfire between vehicles. Sgt. Goldschmidt informed the committee that multiple gun casings had been found over a two-block area near the original call location. He noted that no one had been hit and the two suspects' vehicles were located by officers after one had crashed and caught fire. Sgt. Goldschmidt added that the Air Support Unit had been flying while the incident occurred and stated that officers found shell casings covering a quarter-mile area. He explained that the unit had received numerous noise complaints from an individual living in the area, but noted that such incidents were a prime example of why it was important that the unit fly overhead.

Sgt. Goldschmidt then commented on the dangers posed to police officers. He reported that 97 police officers had been killed in the line of duty nationwide since 2012 and 130 killed in 2015. He explained that almost 40 of these deaths were from gunfire, with two additional as the result of accidental discharges. He announced that being feloniously shot and killed was the most common way officers were killed in the line of duty. Sgt. Goldschmidt noted that with already 28 police officer gunshot deaths in 2016, the year was on course to double the 39 deaths from the year before. He noted that this marked an alarming statistic, and added that there had been times in previous years when vehicle accidents exceeded the number of officers killed by firearms. Sgt. Goldschmidt emphasized that during his missions it was very important to him to consider how to keep his fellow officers on the ground from being killed.

Chair Clark noted that only one police officer had been killed in an aircraft accident in 2015, adding that it may be safer for him in the air. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that because so few of the nation's police officers were in the air, the actual ratio of those aircraft officers killed in action was much higher than it first seemed. He noted that in the City of Portland, only ten officers were involved in aviation out of 800-900 officers citywide. He reported that in reviewing officer deaths related to aviation over the last ten years, it was actually one of the most risky jobs.

Mr. Braze asked if the Air Support Unit flew under public use. Sgt. Goldschmidt responded that when operating the aircraft and beginning a law enforcement mission, the aircraft was flying under public use. He added that the unit's two planes were also certified under Part 91 of the Federal Aviation Regulations meaning that the Police Bureau could sell the aircraft to another owner as all of its modifications had FAA supplemental certificates and field approvals.

Chair Clark asked for clarification about the certifications. Sgt. Goldschmidt replied that there were rules about what the unit could and could not do. He explained that the Police Bureau was technically allowed to fly equipment that was not even legally an aircraft, such as a military surplus helicopter, that did not require a FAA certificate. He noted that often when the military was finished with such equipment, it was shared with law enforcement as part of the military's surplus program. He stated that because such aircraft did not require FAA certification, an individual would not need a pilot's license to operate it. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that this was meant to accommodate for military pilots who had never applied for a FAA pilot's license. Sgt. Goldschmidt clarified that such instances were not particularly common in law enforcement, though they technically could occur. Sgt. Goldschmidt noted that the unit was also allowed to make as many modifications to its aircraft as it would like, but added that they were careful about such modifications as insurance companies would be less likely to insure their aircraft if they were modified too much.

Sgt. Goldschmidt informed the committee that the unit helped make the Portland Police Bureau become more efficient by allowing officers on the ground to shrink their perimeters and locate suspects more quickly. He

noted that in 60-70% of its calls, the Air Support Unit team were the first officers on the scene. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that the Air Support Unit also had the ability to accomplish things the Police Bureau wouldn't otherwise be able to do and helped leverage the effectiveness of the overall agency. He shared one example of a motorcycle chase, where an individual raced down the highway at 140 miles an hour. He noted that the Air Support Unit had been able to follow the motorcycle until the individual finally parked and officers were able to arrest him at the scene.

Sgt. Goldschmidt reported that the Police Bureau's Gang Enforcement Team (GET) was the unit's number one client. He noted that the Gang Violence Response Team (GVRT) was activated to respond to violent gang accidents, including assaults, shootings, and stabbings. He announced that as of last month, the GVRT had responded to 72 shootings in Portland, with 127 victims, 24 hit by gunfire, and one person killed. Sgt. Goldschmidt informed the committee that 626 shell casings had been recovered from shooting incidents so far, and clarified that this was only a portion of the overall shell casings likely out there.

Sgt. Goldschmidt shared an image identifying the potential range of handgun shots from shooting calls in Portland from June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2012. He noted that the graphics covered almost the entire city.

Sgt. Goldschmidt noted that most of the noise complaints the Air Support Unit received occurred between 8pm and 4am, and explained that these were the busiest times for the unit as it helped the GVRT with its cases. Sgt. Goldschmidt stated that the unit's responsibilities in such cases varied and included surveillance and sometimes actively searching for suspects.

Sgt. Goldschmidt admitted that the Air Support Unit's aircraft generated a fair amount of noise, but emphasized that its work was critical to the safety and livability of the city. He noted that on some calls, the unit needed to fly below 2000 ft. in order to have a crisp and clear infrared image for as it searched. He informed the committee that the unit was thoughtful about the altitudes it selected, and noted that higher altitudes were generally safer for the crew and better for air traffic. He explained that call needs, air traffic, weather, and noise all factored into the unit's decision-making process.

Sgt. Goldschmidt stated that the aircraft's flight paths were dependent on its assignments and driven by investigations and patrol. He explained that when the unit was not responding to calls, it was careful to eliminate its noise signature as much as possible. He added that the unit had a "fly friendly" crew training at least once a year.

Sgt. Goldschmidt reported that when community members made complaints about the Air Support Unit to the Port's Noise Management team, Port staff were able to collect their contact information and addresses. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that every two years, Mr. Gerspach provided the unit with a spreadsheet outlining all of the complaints. He noted that this information was sent to the Police Bureau's crime analyst who used it to create a density map. He informed the committee that the map detailed multiple calls in particular areas as well as high-frequency complainers. Sgt. Goldschmidt stated that the noise areas had shifted somewhat and varied based on traffic patterns. He noted that while on patrol, the unit loitered around the city in certain patterns that were designed to keep the aircraft over areas that already experienced a higher ambient noise level, such as freeways or busy thoroughfares.

Chair Clark asked if the unit ever flew over the City of Gresham. Sgt. Goldschmidt replied that it was very rare. He noted that the unit worked on so many calls in the east precinct that it felt it was in the area often enough. He added that a large portion of the region's gang activity had moved to the East Portland/Gresham area in recent years.

Sgt. Goldschmidt added that when the Air Support Unit received noise complaints that had bypassed the Port's Noise Management team, by arriving at the Mayor's Office or Internal Affairs Division, he made sure to

refer them to the Port. He explained that this was because the Noise Management team's statistics were needed to accurately understand trends. He noted that in general people making complaints were very understanding and appreciated the Air Support Unit's work.

Sgt. Goldschmidt then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Stenstrom noted that the presentation had exceeded its allotted time and proposed that the committee move on with the rest of the agenda. He suggested returning to the Air Support Unit presentation at the end of the meeting.

## **Break**

### **Starbase STEM Update**

Phil Stenstrom introduced the STARBASE presentation. He informed the committee that the STARBASE program has a long list of partner schools and operated out of two different sites in Oregon. He noted that the program included a lot of complexity and expressed excitement at being able to support Starbase in its work. He then welcomed Denise Kortes, STARBASE Director, to the committee.

Ms. Kortes thanked the committee for having her. She explained that the program provided 25 hours of educational support to each 5th grade child who participated. She informed the committee that the program was only available to Title 1 schools, where students were underrepresented in STEM fields. She noted that these students typically do not frequently experience science and math in their lives, and as a result do not imagine themselves working in such fields. She stated that the students participated in the program for five days and added that 400 local students had participated in the last year.

Ms. Kortes reported that in non-Title 1 schools, students often had better opportunities to explore science and math, as they could afford to participate in extracurricular programs after school. She explained that Title 1 schools provided limited funding for the program that usually covered students' meals. She noted that at a typical Title 1 school, 68% of students were on assisted meals. Ms. Kortes stated that because of these circumstances, the program was strongly appreciated and highly sought after. She explained that many of the participants had never been outside of their own neighborhoods and never interacted with technology. Some 70% of the students are English as a second language (ESL) learners.

Ms. Kortes informed the committee that the hands-on STARBASE program allowed these students to see hangars, build planes and bottle rockets, see an air base, and learn computer and design.

She then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Yee asked if all of the Title 1 schools were located on the east side. Ms. Kortes replied that for Portland Public Schools, she received a list of the most at-risk schools and invited them to participate. She added that she also invited schools from Reynolds, Canby, and Beaverton School Districts, as long as they were Title 1 qualified. Ms. Kortes explained that she only had enough capacity to invite 56 classes, noting that there were 172 Title 1 classes within a 30-minute drive from STARBASE.

Mr. Stenstrom asked if STARBASE would be expanded to the Vancouver area. Ms. Kortes replied that Fort Vancouver had expressed a strong interest in supporting the program, but explained that the funders had not allowed them to cross the river. She stated that she was working to have the National Guard there sponsor the program and emphasized that most of the expansion challenges were related to funding. She added that there were 32 Title 1 schools located nearby Fort Vancouver.

Mr. Stenstrom asked if Ms. Kortes anticipated any changes to the program in the upcoming year and if the program would still include items on noise management. Ms. Kortes replied that it would.

Mr. Braze noted some challenges related to state-organized initiatives such as the Talent and Gifted program and Ms. Kortes agreed.

Mr. Braze asked if the program received any support from the state. Ms. Kortes replied that it did not. She noted that all kids could benefit from the program, but added that it was focused on reaching the students that could not afford traditional after-school programs.

Mr. Braze asked why the program focused on 5th grade students. Ms. Kortes replied that when the program was developed 20 years ago, the creator chose to focus on 5th grade students because studies showed that by the time students were in the 6th grade they began enjoying data less and became more interested in fantasy. She added that studies also showed that the people who were most content and successful in life had determined what they wanted to do by the time they were in the 5th grade.

Mr. Sweeney asked how long the program had been running and if there was any evidence to show that it helped participants in the long term. Ms. Kortes reported that the program had been running from 22 years. She explained that she was not legally allowed to follow students' success, but noted that she had had many participants come back and tell her they were working in engineering or aviation. She added that in comparing the years that schools did and did not participate in the STARBASE program, they found that their students performed better on science testing during STARBASE years.

Chair Clark noted that he was impressed by how the students could write legibly in the letters Ms. Kortes shared. Ms. Kortes replied that many of the students participating in the program were reading and writing at a 2nd grade level, as many of them were transient or ESL.

The committee thanked Denise Kortes for her presentation.

### **CAC Liaison Report**

Joe Smith, CNAC's CAC liaison, provided the following updates from the June 22 PDX CAC meeting:

Mr. Smith reported that the previously proposed plan to move Alaska Airlines to the north side of the airport and United Airlines to the south had changed, potentially affecting what the committees would discuss at upcoming meetings.

Mr. Smith announced that the trend of more passengers flying in fewer aircraft continued. He informed the committee that for the fourth year in a row, PDX Airport was declared the best airport in the country by Travel+Leisure magazine.

Mr. Smith noted that there had been a lot of discussion at the meeting related to a resolution proposed asking the Port to urge its subcontractors to pay a living wage. He explained that many of the subcontractors' employees did not earn a living wage and were experiencing difficulties paying for necessities such as housing, childcare, and health insurance. Mr. Smith reported that the majority of the committee had supported the resolution. He noted that this had also led to a discussion about the committee's Collaboration Principles.

Mr. Smith informed the committee that the Portland Tribune had recently published an op-ed article written by PDX CAC member Tony DeFalco that focused on the issue, citing the CAC's resolution. He encouraged the committee to read it.

Mr. Smith explained that the PDX CAC would not meet again until October and as a result he would not have an update at CNAC's September meeting.

Chair Clark asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Braze asked if the committee passed anything. Mr. Smith replied that they passed the resolution asking the Port to support living wages.

### **Bi-Monthly Complaint Report**

Jerry Gerspach explained that noise complaints in the period since the last CNAC meeting had stayed very close to past averages. He noted that the total complaints for the Portland, Hillsboro, and Troutdale airports totaled 164 complaints from 86 individuals. He stated that PDX operations were responsible for 138 complaints by 72 individuals.

Mr. Gerspach informed the committee that there was one standout in the previous couple of months in terms of patterns and trends. He explained that PDX had switched primarily to a west flow pattern and as a result, the Noise Management team had received more complaints from residents living on Hayden Island and in West Vancouver. He added that anytime the airport traffic pattern moved from east flow to west flow, new residents who had moved into the affected areas before the change began to complain more frequently.

Mr. Gerspach reported that the five-year average at the current time of year was 66 noise complaints, noting that recent complaints stayed close to that average. He added that during this period he had also not received many complaints relating to law enforcement air operations.

Mr. Gerspach announced that out of 72 callers and 138 complaints, 80 complaints remained after removing the top three most frequent individuals. He explained that the most frequent complainer made up 37 complaints from the period, equaling 27% of the total. He noted that the third most frequent caller had made nine complaints focused on law enforcement and Life Flight operations.

Mr. Gerspach provided the committee with a chart demonstrating the top ten neighborhoods making complaints. He stated that with the top three complainers removed, the top three neighborhoods did not make the list. Mr. Gerspach also shared a map showing where complaints originated, noting that they came from all over the metro area.

Mr. Gerspach explained that in the last period, there had been only two noise alerts posted. He stated that the military had been scheduled to perform training operations but noted that he had not received any complaints.

### **Noise Symposium 2016 Brief**

Committee members Andrew Loescher and Mike Finch provided a briefing on the 2016 Aviation Noise and Air Quality Symposium.

Mr. Loescher noted that the symposium had been very interesting to him as someone fairly new to the noise mitigation field. He stated that he had learned a lot and hoped to present some of the most interesting information to the committee.

Mr. Loescher reported that a significant discussion at the symposium had focused on Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport's implementation of its performance-based navigation (PBN) system. He explained that when the system had been implemented, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) had given the airport the opportunity to propose its own flight path, and the airport decided not to. He stated that the FAA had

approached airports using the ARNAV system and asked for feedback, and PDX was seen as an example of ARNAC success, as it was proactive with providing such input.

Mr. Mike Finch informed the committee that because Sky Harbor Airport had decided not to provide input, the FAA had designed its own flight path. Mr. Finch explained that the airport's old departure path moved down Salt River heading west before turning north. He noted that everything in that area was industrial making it a good fit for a departure corridor. Mr. Finch stated that with the new PBN procedures, flights were now taking off and immediately heading north, right over the city's downtown renovation area. He explained that the city had recently spent billions of dollars renovating its old town, and the new departures paths flew right over it. Mr. Finch reported that the City of Phoenix had filed a lawsuit against the FAA, adding that the hope was that the FAA would reevaluate its procedures

Mr. Loescher added that because the city hadn't provided direction, the FAA had chosen the shorter route across downtown and over high-end homes in downtown Phoenix, leading to a large rise in noise complaints. He reported that noise complaints had risen from a few hundred a month to well over 2,500. Mr. Finch noted that the situation in Phoenix was likely the most hotly debated and discussed topic at the symposium.

Mr. Sweeney asked if airport representatives had been in attendance at the meeting and made any comments. Mr. Finch responded that they blamed the FAA.

Mr. Loescher stated that he felt the situation helped him better understand the value of his role as a CNAC member. He explained that Sky Harbor Airport did not have a noise advisory committee and noted that he felt this played a role in how the situation had progressed.

Mr. Finch added that throughout the symposium, PDX Airport was shared as an example of a success story.

Mr. Finch also shared the following lessons learned about noise complaints:

- noise complaints do not always necessarily come from those living closest to an airport
- while overall noise levels have dropped largely due to quieter technology, sensitivity to noise has risen
- the Next Generation Air Transportation System and other PBN systems concentrate noise events over specific routes, leading to fewer people being impacted but a higher event frequency for those living under such routes
- people's perceptions can be skewed; for example, one complainer claimed that an arriving aircraft flew over her house at 1000 ft.

### **Noise Manager's Update**

Phil Stenstrom announced that Daren Griffin, General Manager of Airport Operations at the Port of Portland, would be attending the September meeting to provide a PDX update. He asked if there was anyone that would not be able to attend the meeting. Craig Walker notified the committee that he would need to miss it.

Mr. Stenstrom also encouraged the committee to watch the NASA video he had sent out before the meeting over email.

### **Portland Police Air Support Unit Update Continued**

Sgt. Josh Goldschmidt continued his presentation on the Portland Police Air Support Unit and asked if the committee had any questions.

Kelly Sweeney asked if it would be possible to do a ride along with the Air Support Unit. Sgt. Goldschmidt replied that public use laws stated that only required crew members could be in the aircraft. He added that the Air Support Unit was hiring and encouraged those interested to apply.

Mr. Smith asked if the Air Traffic Unit had experienced any problems with drones. Sgt. Goldschmidt replied that staff was paying attention to the situation but had not experienced many issues thus far.

Mr. Smith asked if the Air Traffic Unit used low power for noise and fuel savings when it patrolled at 4000 ft. in altitude. Sgt. Goldschmidt responded affirmatively.

Craig Walker asked how long the team was able to stay in the air. Sgt. Goldschmidt responded that four hours was the typical maximum, depending somewhat on how much the pilot and TFO weighed. He noted that there were some rare exceptions, explaining that in 2013 during a presidential visit his crew was up in the air for seven hours.

Bob Braze asked about duty time and fatigue, noting that when he was in charge of a major airline during his ten years with the FAA, crew fatigue was a major issue. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that when he became the Police Bureau's Chief Pilot four years ago, his number one priority was to address fatigue. He informed the committee that the Air Traffic Support Unit had a written policy that stated that air crew members could not be assigned to a mission for more than a 12-hour period and could not be in the air flying an airplane for more than 10 hours within that period. He stated that crew members were also required to be back on the ground within 18 hours of waking up from a full night's sleep. Sgt. Goldschmidt explained that numerous studies based on performance skills tests showed that fatigued people's performances on the tests paralleled those of people who had been drinking. He stated that at about 18 hours of being awake, people perform very similarly to those who have a .08 blood alcohol content (the legal limit for driving).

Sgt. Goldschmidt noted that it was very rare for his crew members to work 18 hours. He informed the committee that this was also influenced by the pace of the workload for Air Support Unit crew members. He explained that with airline pilots, two main periods required an elevated workload: departing and arriving. He stated that with the Air Traffic Support Unit, their workload was elevated for takeoff and arrival as well, but also often during numerous instances in between, as the aircraft needed to change altitudes frequently depending on its mission, unless it was loitering. He added that because of this, crew members were often exhausted by the end of a four hour flight. He informed the committee that understandings about crew fatigue had improved immensely in recent years.

The committee thanks Sgt. Goldschmidt for his time.

**Adjourn - 8:01pm**

**Next Meeting:**

September 8, 2016 / 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 "B" Conference Room  
7100 NE Airport Way, Portland (Located at PDX)

*Meeting notes humbly submitted by Nellie Papsdorf.*