

# FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

## RECORD OF APPROVAL RECORD OF APPROVAL Reid Hillview Airport Noise Compatibility Program

### INTRODUCTION

The Reid Hillview Airport (RHV) Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) describes the current and future noncompatible land uses based on the parameters as established in Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 150, *Airport Noise Compatibility Planning*. The noise compatibility program includes 13 recommended noise abatement elements, 9 land use management elements, and 11 program management elements. These measures are summarized in Tables 3-2, 3-3, and 3-4 on pages 17 through 21 of the NCP.

The approvals listed herein include approval of actions that the County of Santa Clara recommends to be taken by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). It should be noted that these approvals indicate only that the actions would, if implemented, be consistent with the purposes of 14 CFR Part 150. The approvals do not constitute decisions to implement the actions, or a commitment by the FAA to provide federal financial assistance for the actions. Later decisions concerning possible implementation of these actions may be subject to applicable environmental or other procedures or requirements.

The recommendations below summarize, as closely as possible, the airport operator's recommendations in the noise compatibility program and are cross-referenced to the program. The statements contained within the summarized recommendations and before the indicated FAA approval, disapproval or other determinations do not represent the opinions or decisions of the FAA.

### NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM MEASURES:

#### A. NOISE ABATEMENT ELEMENTS:

##### 1. Set Preferential Runway use- Arrivals on Runway 31L and Departures on Runway 31R.

**Description:** This is a voluntary measure that recommends that aircraft land on Runway 31L and depart on Runway 31R whenever weather and safety permit. A Letter of Agreement (LOA) has been developed by the County with FAA and with airport user participation to prioritize preferential runway use procedures for Reid Hillview to optimize runway utilization. This element recognizes physical constraints of the airport and the need to maximize departure routes that avoid noise sensitive areas.

The airspace necessary for San Jose International Airport (SJC) operations has been taken into consideration and it is noted that existing SJC arrival/departure routes place constraints on the flow of traffic at Reid Hillview Airport. Implementation of a voluntary runway use program using Runway 31R for takeoffs and Runway 31L for landings along with the "Quiet One" departure procedure (an existing measure at the airport described on page 13 of the NCP) has the potential to shift operations away from a library and school. This procedure would result in a reduction of overflights in noise sensitive areas without a loss in safety or constraint in operations. (NCP Page 39, Table 3-2)

**FAA Action:** Approved as a voluntary measure only, when weather and traffic conditions permit the use of the runways as proposed. This approval does not commit the FAA to make or request an amendment to existing Airport Traffic Control Tower Orders.

## **2. Encourage Use of Minimum Power Settings on Departure.**

**Description:** The County will encourage pilots to reduce power settings on departure within the limits of appropriate safety conditions. The pilot-in-command retains the right to adjust power settings for the aircraft departing Reid Hillview Airport. This measure would provide a decrease in takeoff noise over all noise sensitive areas within the airport environs. (NCP Page 39, Table 3-2, Appendix A)

**FAA Action:** Approved as a voluntary measure only. This approval does not commit the FAA to make or request an amendment to existing Tower Orders. The pilot-in-command retains the responsibility to operate his/her aircraft in a safe manner.

## **3. Encourage Standard Glide Slope Arrival Procedures to Minimize Power on Arrival.**

**Description:** The local noise abatement procedures (described in Appendix A) will be amended to encourage pilots to use minimum power settings for a standard glide path on arrival to RHV. The pilot-in-command retains the right to use reduced power based on traffic and weather conditions. This voluntary provision will be added to the local noise abatement procedures based on the manufacturer's quiet flying procedures for their particular aircraft, procedures that would be used at the discretion of the pilot and consistent with safety. This measure would provide a decrease in noise for pilot training and landing operations over all noise sensitive areas within the airport environs. (NCP Page 40, Table 3-2)

**FAA Action:** Approved as a voluntary measure only. The decision to use this procedure remains with the pilot-in-command of each aircraft operating at Reid Hillview Airport. This approval does not commit the FAA to make or request an amendment to existing Tower Orders.

## **4. Revise Flight Track for Aircraft Departing Runway 31R (modify the Quiet One departure flight track).**

**Description:** The current noise abatement procedure for aircraft departing Runway 31R includes a voluntary turn of 20 degrees to a heading of 330 degrees at an altitude of 500 feet and after crossing Ocala Avenue (airport westerly boundary). This measure would amend the current practice to advise pilots to fly past the park adjacent to Runways 13R & 13L and make a 25 degree right turn to a heading of 335 degrees; or head towards the Story Road-Capital Expressway intersection which would be a 35 degree right turn to a heading of 345 degrees. This procedure would eliminate over flights to one school. The park and street intersection are readily recognized landmarks to pilots. (NCP Page 40, Table 3-2)

**FAA Action:** No Action Required at this time. This measure relates to flight procedures under Section 47504(b) of 49 U.S.C. Additional analysis and communication between the airport operator, the FAA's Western-Pacific Air Traffic Division and the Airport Traffic Control Tower is required. Analysis and communication should consider the feasibility, aviation safety and efficiency aspects of the proposal, its potential environmental impacts, and demonstrate whether the measure would provide an overall noise benefit. There is presently insufficient information in the NCP documentation to make these determinations.

## **5. Voluntary Limitation on Aircraft Departures to Specific Times.**

**Description:** This measure would limit departures to day and evening hours between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. to reduce noise during the night time hours. This noise restriction would require an agreement of the airport users to implement. The implementation of this voluntary noise abatement procedure would reduce the noise exposure on the community during the most sensitive time of the day and would give the community a time period with less aircraft noise. (NCP Page 43, Table 3-2)

**FAA Action:** Disapproved pending submission of additional information to make an informed analysis. Other than a very general description of this measure, there is no data to describe the precise noise benefits of pilots voluntarily curtailing their aircraft operations during the evening hours. Page 17, section 3.1 indicates that the forecast year 2007 NEM was modeled assuming that this measure was implemented. There should, therefore, be some indication of the measure's potential noise benefits, including the percentage of the time aircraft operators are presumed to cooperate with this proposal, and documentation that consultation with the aircraft operators showed a willingness to carry out this measure on a voluntary basis.

#### **6. Voluntary Limitation on Aircraft Touch-and-Go Operations to Specific Days and Times.**

**Description:** This measure voluntarily limits pilot training activity for touch-and-go operations to specific days and times. These limitations by day and time remove all evening and nighttime touch-and-go operations, and reduce the noise exposure on the community during the more sensitive times of the day and week. (NCP Page 43, Table 3-2).

**FAA Action:** Disapproved pending submission of additional information to make an informed analysis. Other than a general description of this measure, there is no data to describe the precise noise benefits of pilots voluntarily limiting their touch-and-go training. Page 17, section 3.1 indicates that the forecast year 2007 NEM was modeled assuming that this measure was implemented. There should, therefore, be some indication of this measure's potential noise benefits, including the percentage of the time aircraft operators are presumed to cooperate with this proposal, and documentation that consultation with the aircraft operators showed a willingness to carry out this measure on a voluntary basis.

#### **7. Prohibit Intersection Departures.**

**Description:** This proposed noise abatement measure is intended to reduce low altitude overflights over noise sensitive areas when aircraft depart the airport. This measure would require all aircraft to use the entire length of the runway for departures, thereby crossing the airport boundary at a higher altitude and having aircraft configured earlier for noise abatement power settings. (NCP Page 41, Table 3-2).

**FAA Action:** Disapproved for purposes of Part 150 pending submission of additional information to make an informed analysis. There is no analysis to demonstrate the noise benefits of this runway use measure, which appears to be recommended for use on a mandatory basis. The documentation does not indicate whether consultation with the aircraft operators showed a willingness to carry out this measure for noise abatement purposes. For reasons of aviation safety, the decision on how to operate each aircraft using Reid Hillview Airport remains with the pilot-in-command.

#### **8. Restrict Jet Operations to FAR Part 36 Stage 3 Jets.**

**Description:** This measure restricts jet operations to FAR Part 36 Stage 3 jets or jets with “hush kit” modifications certified to meet FAR Part 36 Stage 3 requirements. The purpose of the restriction is to establish a fleet mix of quiet aircraft to reduce the risk of future increase in noise exposure to the surrounding community. (NCP Page 41, Table 3-2).

**FAA Action: Disapproved.** This measure is not consistent with the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 47521 et. seq and its implementing regulations found at 14 CFR Parts 91 and 161. Should the County wish to pursue this measure, it must first comply with 14 CFR Part 161, including completing an evaluation of the noise benefits, economic impacts, and an extensive consultation and comment period. The airport sponsor also must demonstrate that restricting access to the airport by all jet aircraft other than Stage 3 is not in violation of its grant agreement with the Federal government, including the County’s assurance to provide reasonable, not unjustly discriminatory access to the airport. Page 17, section 3.1 indicates that the forecast year 2007 NEM was modeled assuming that this measure was implemented. There should, therefore, also be some indication of potential noise benefits.

#### **9. Prohibit Formation Arrivals and Departures.**

**Description:** The existing Noise Abatement Procedures at the airport would be amended to restrict aircraft operations to single arrivals and departures to keep aircraft noise closer to the airport and not spread out over a larger airspace. This measure reduces the noise exposure on the community adjacent to the airport and nearby noise sensitive. (NCP Page 41, Table 3-2)

**FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150 pending submission of additional information to make an informed analysis.** There is no analysis to demonstrate the noise benefits of this aircraft operational procedure, which appears to be recommended as a mandatory measure. Additional information also will need to be provided to demonstrate that this proposal would not violate airport sponsor grant assurances, including the County’s assurance to provide reasonable, not unjustly discriminatory access to the airport to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical uses.

#### **10. Prohibit Simulated Emergencies.**

**Description:** This measure would prohibit flight training activity for simulated in-flight emergencies within the airport traffic pattern, during departure or arrival operations. The County would prohibit this type of training in order to encourage pilots to follow noise abatement procedures and avoid noise sensitive areas during practice, approaches and departures in a safe manner within identified noise sensitive receivers in the adjacent community. (NCP Page 42, Table 3-2).

**FAA Action: Disapproved.** Emergency training maneuvers are necessary to ensure safety and adequate pilot training to comply with the applicable Federal Aviation Regulations governing pilot certification and aircraft operations.

#### **11. Prohibit Low-Level Fly-bys Except for Emergency Requirements.**

**Description:** This measure prohibits making low-level passes at the airport and flying below established minimum altitudes except for emergencies. This restriction would reduce noise exposure on the community adjacent to the airport and encourage pilots to follow established noise abatement procedures. (NCP Page 42, Table, 3-2).

**FAA Action: Disapproved.** Fourteen CFR Part 91.119 specifies minimum safe altitudes for fixed and rotor wing aircraft except when necessary for take off and landing operations. A Part 150 study is not the appropriate forum for reporting or correcting pilot operations that are not in accordance with Part 91 requirements. For noise reduction or prevention, which is consistent with Part 150 purposes, there are separate measures in this NCP that requests pilots to follow noise abatement procedures (see above, at Noise Abatement Measures 1, 2 and 3).

## **12. Encourage Pilots to Modify Aircraft to Decrease Noise Emissions.**

**Description:** The County will encourage pilots to make modifications to aircraft using known technology to reduce noise emissions of the airplanes operating at Reid Hillview Airport. The modifications include propeller replacement, introduction of aircraft vortex generators, aircraft engine mufflers, or noise silencers. The replacement of single-bladed propellers with three or four bladed propellers, installation of vortex generators to reduce aircraft stall speed and shorten takeoff distances would be encouraged. The County would provide information to pilots on new technology. (NCP Page 44, Table 3-2)

**FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150.** This measure cannot be approved because it is outside the scope of the Part 150 regulation and is not eligible for Airport Improvement Program noise set-aside Federal aid. This disapproval does not prohibit an airport operator from encouraging pilots to take advantage of new hush kit technology that could reduce aircraft source noise.

## **13. Create New engine Run-up area for Twin-Engine Aircraft. (Designate the compass rose as the site for maintenance run-ups)**

**Description:** The County will restrict twin-engine run-ups for maintenance work to the compass rose located on the southeast portion of the airport. The designated area would facilitate a reduction in ground run-up noise for the community to the north and east of the airport. Existing airport structures would shield the community to the east from noise and places maintenance operations further from the noise sensitive areas. (NCP Page 44, Table 3-2)

**FAA Action: Approved as a voluntary measure only.** The location of the compass rose would move maintenance operations away from noise sensitive schools and residences located adjacent to airport property.

## **B. LAND USE MANAGEMENT ELEMENTS:**

### **1. Fair Disclosure Policy: would enhance ability of potential property purchasers to make informed decision.**

**Description:** This measure would require the disclosure of aircraft noise level information during residential sales transactions through a California Real Estate disclosure form. Existing residential properties within the 2002 CNEL 60 contour and greater contours shown on Figure 6.2 of the NCP or the airport impact boundary developed by the County would be included. The area includes 615 residences that the County administration will work with the California Department of Real Estate to highlight disclosure forms to include information concerning airport noise. The County will work with the Legislature to secure supporting legislation. (NCP Page 74, Table 3-3 and 6-8).

**FAA Action: Approved.** Establishing a policy to incorporate aircraft noise information in residential sales documents is approved as being consistent with the purposes of Part 150. Potential homebuyers would be given the opportunity for an informed decision regarding airport-related noise impacts. FAA's policy is that new noise sensitive land uses should be prevented from developing around airports or, in cases where prevention is not feasible, they should be rendered compatible with noise exposure levels through measures such as sound insulation during construction. Federal Register April 3, 1998 (63 FR 16409, 16411-16412). Part 150 provides that, where the community determines that residential or school uses must be allowed in the 65 DNL db contour, measures to achieve outdoor to indoor noise level reductions (NLR) of at least 25 dB and 30 dB should be incorporated into building codes. 14 C.F.R. Part 150, Table 1. Where the airport sponsor has no authority to control local land use decisions and it would therefore not be feasible for the airport sponsor to prevent noncompatible development, this preventive measure qualifies for approval under Part 150. This approval does not extend to any contemplated construction of new noncompatible land uses that would not include mitigation at the time of construction to reduce aviation noise impacts in living areas or otherwise provide preventive mitigation techniques. The FAA's policy published in the Federal Register April 3, 1998 (Volume 63, Number 64), states that the FAA will not approve Federal funding to mitigate noise-sensitive land uses constructed after October 1, 1998. This measure is considered to be within the authority of the City of San Jose and County of Santa Clara. The Federal Government has no control over local land use planning.

**2. Guaranteed Purchase: would provide opportunities for noise sensitive residents to relocate while maintaining the stability of the neighborhood.**

**Description:** This measure would involve the establishment of a County program that guarantees noise-impacted property owners that the County will purchase eligible homes at fair market value in the event the homeowner is not able to sell the home. This measure includes 7 homes within the CNEL 65 contour and 79 mobile homes within the CNEL 60 contour. It includes mobile homes within the CNEL 60 contour because the airport sponsor has, consistent with the standards adopted by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for airports in the county of Santa Clara, selected the CNEL 60 dB contour as locally significant for certain land uses, including mobile homes. NCP page 14, Section 2.2 and Figure 2.1. This measure recognizes the current FAA policy for noise that limits remedial noise compatibility funding to areas in the CNEL 65 contour or greater area. It is noted that sound insulation for mobile homes is not a practicable measure and is not eligible for federal funding for sound insulation. (NCP Page 76, Table 3-3 and 6-11).

**FAA Action: Approved in part; Disapproved in part for purposes of Part 150.** This measure is approved as to homes within the CNEL 65 contour. Approval for mitigation within the DNL 65 dB would allow to County to apply for federal funding for those properties that meet the requirements for noise insulation or property acquisition, subject to availability of federal funding. Even if mobile homes were practicable measures eligible for funding, Section 189 of Public Law 108-176, Vision 100-Century Of Aviation Reauthorization Act, December 12, 2003, specifically prohibits FAA approval of Part 150 program measures that call for Federal funding to mitigate aircraft noise below DNL 65 (through Fiscal Year 2007). This disapproval for purposes of Part 150 for areas outside the CNEL 65 dB noise contour does not prohibit the airport sponsor from pursuing other avenues for funding mitigation in that area. This measure is considered to be within the authority of the County of Santa Clara. The Federal Government has no control over local land use planning.

**3. General Planning: would provide policy guidance for amendments in the City of San Jose 2020 General Plan to incorporate recommendations for preventing or mitigating**

**unwanted noise and incorporating land use recommendations of the ALUC Plan.**

**Description:** This measure provides policy guidance for amendments in the city of San Jose 2020 General Plan to incorporate the land use recommendations of the ALUC Plan. The undeveloped areas surrounding airports in the city of San Jose would be covered by recommendations to prevent or mitigate noise impacts by establishing planning elements that define compatible land use and benefits of aircraft noise compatibility policies. (NCP Page 78, Table 3-3, 6-14).

**FAA Action: Approved.** The land use recommendations of the ALUC are consistent with Table 1, 14 C.F.R. Part 150 except that mobile homes would be prohibited within the CNEL 60 contour.

**4. Soundproofing Existing Development: would establish noise insulation program to ensure acceptable interior noise levels for existing single-family residences within the 2002 CNEL 65 dB(A) and greater contours. As many as seven dwellings could be eligible.**

**Description:** This measure recommends that the homes located within the CNEL 65 dB contour or greater to be made eligible for sound insulation. The County would implement a sound insulation program to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dB(A) through appropriate construction techniques. Based on the future forecast of airport activity the homes within the 65 CNEL contour area would still remain exposed to airport noise. (NCP Page 80, Table 3-3, 6-16).

**FAA Action: Approved.** This measure provides mitigation for existing development. The FAA's policy published in the Federal Register April 3, 1998 (Volume 63, Number 64), states that the FAA will not approve Federal funding to mitigate noise-sensitive land uses constructed after October 1, 1998.

**5. Soundproofing Existing Development: This measure would establish a noise insulation program to ensure acceptable interior noise levels for existing single-family residences within the 2002 CNEL 60-65 dB(A) contour area. Timing would be after completion of noise insulation for residences in the CNEL 65 dB(A) or greater contour areas and may be contingent upon the availability of federal funds.**

**Description:** This measure recommends that the homes located within the 60-65 CNEL contour area to be eligible for sound insulation. The County would implement a sound insulation program to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dB(A) through appropriate construction techniques. This measure would be limited to existing residences, schools, and libraries within the 2002 CNEL 60-65 contour in accordance with the ALUC plan. There are an estimated 529 single-family homes with a population of 3,023 within the area. The future forecast for the CNEL 60-65 contour is not expected to change. (NCP Page 81, Table 3-3, 6-17).

**FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150.** This measure is not consistent with the ALUC standard adopted by the airport sponsor. Under those standards, residents in the CNEL 60 contour do not require noise insulation. See NCP page 14, Section 2.2 and Figure 2.1. In addition, Section 189 of Public Law 108-176, Vision 100-Century Of Aviation Reauthorization Act, December 12, 2003, specifically prohibits FAA approval of Part 150 program measures that call for Federal funding to mitigate aircraft noise below DNL 65 (through Fiscal Year 2007). Disapproval under Part 150 does not prohibit the airport sponsor from investigating other sources of funding to achieve interior noise level reduction goals.

The FAA's policy published in the Federal Register April 3, 1998 (Volume 63, Number 64), states that the FAA will not approve Federal funding to mitigate noise-sensitive land uses constructed after October 1, 1998.

**6. Sound Buffers/Barriers: could provide noise level reduction for residential areas immediately adjacent to Reid Hillview Airport.**

**Description:** This measure recommends construction of sound barrier walls and/or noise berms and open space to reduce noise from airport ground operations. The areas at the airport boundary adjacent to residential development along the western and northern property line would be the focus of a detailed study and acoustical design. The County would conduct a study to determine noise benefits, feasibility, and costs. (NCP page 82, Table 3-3, 6-18)

**FAA Action: Approved in part, for study; disapproved in part, for construction, pending the submission of additional information.** There is presently insufficient information to determine the noise benefits of sound barriers or berms. This information should be determined during the study process. At this time, the FAA also cannot determine whether there is sufficient noise benefit to approve construction of a barrier or berm, or determine the feasibility of the proposed location.

**7. Planning Commission Review: would provide policy guidance for consideration of all types of proposed development within the 2002 CNEL 60 dB(A) and greater contour.**

**Description:** This measure would provide policy guidance for consideration of all types of proposed development within the 2002 CNEL 60 dB and greater contours. The area within the existing 2002 CNEL 60 dB and greater contours shown in figure 6.2 of the NCP would be subject to the policy guidance. The County Airport Administration/City of San Jose would be responsible for adopting an ordinance to establishing requirements and procedures for the Planning Commission's building and permit review to ensure no noncompatible development within designated noise impacted zones. (NCP Page 84, Table 3-3, 6-21).

**FAA Action: Approved.** Under the ALUC standards adopted by the airport sponsor, within the 2002 CNEL 60-65 dB(A) contour, policy guidance would relate only to mobile homes. NCP page 14, Section 2.2 and Figure 2.1.

**8. Airport Noise Impact Boundary would provide means to monitor new land use proposals and ensure the ALUP is enforced.**

**Description:** This measure provides a means to monitor new land use proposals in the area around the airport through the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The County Airport Administration would provide the ALUC a proposed boundary for identification of areas requiring real estate disclosure and review for land use compatibility with airport operations. Disclosure ensures new land uses would not be permitted within the Airport Influence Area. (NCP Page 84, Table 3-3, 6-22.)

**FAA Action: Approved.** FAA's policy is that new noise sensitive land uses should be prevented from developing around airports or, in cases where prevention is not feasible, they should be rendered compatible with noise exposure levels through measures such as sound insulation during construction. Federal Register April 3, 1998 (63 FR 16409, 16411-16412). Part 150 provides that, where the community determines that residential or school uses must be allowed in the 65 DNL db contour, measures to achieve outdoor to indoor noise level reductions (NLR) of at least 25 dB and 30 dB should be incorporated into building codes. 14 C.F.R. Part 150, Table 1.

Where the airport sponsor has no authority to control local land use decisions and it would therefore not be feasible for the airport sponsor to prevent noncompatible development, this preventive measure qualifies for approval under Part 150. This approval does not extend to any contemplated construction of new noncompatible land uses that would not include mitigation at the time of construction to reduce aviation noise impacts in living areas or otherwise provide preventive mitigation techniques. The FAA's policy published in the Federal Register April 3, 1998 (Volume 63, Number 64), states that the FAA will not approve Federal funding to mitigate noise-sensitive land uses constructed after October 1, 1998. This measure is considered to be within the authority of the City of San Jose and County of Santa Clara. The Federal Government has no control over local land use planning.

**9. Public Land Development Criteria: would provide policy guidance for development of public uses within the 2002 CNEL 60 dB(A) and greater contours.**

**Description:** Land use policy guidance for the development of public uses within the 2002 CNEL 60 dB and greater contour would be applied to the undeveloped areas as shown in figure 6.2 of the NCP. (NCP Pages 85, Table 3-3, 6-23.)

**FAA Action: Approved in part; Disapproved in part.** As to the 2002 CNEL 65 dB(a) and greater contours, the measure is approved. This measure is disapproved as to policy guidelines for development of public use within the 2002 CNEL 60 dB(A) – 65 dB(A) that are inconsistent with the ALUC standards adopted by the airport sponsor. See NCP page 70 regarding interior CNEL levels for schools.

**C. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT ELEMENTS:**

**1. Encourage Pilots to “Fly Friendly.”**

**Description:** This element would encourage pilots to use the aircraft Owner's and Pilot's Association (AOPA) training video entitled “Flying Friendly”. The video provides information for flying over populated areas with an emphasis on reducing aircraft noise effects on residential/noise sensitive areas. (NCP Page 22, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved as a voluntary measure only.** The decision on how to operate each aircraft using Reid Hillview Airport remains with the pilot-in-command. This measure could assist pilots in complying with Noise Abatement Measures 2 and 3, above.

**2. Encourage Flight Training Schools to Train Pilots to “Fly Friendly”.**

**Description:** This element would encourage flight training schools to use the Aircraft Owner's and Pilot's Association (AOPA) training video entitled “Flying Friendly”. The video provides information for flying over populated areas with an emphasis on reducing aircraft noise effects on residential/noise sensitive areas. (NCP Page 22, Table 3-4)

**FAA Action: Approved as a voluntary measure only.** The decision on how to operate each aircraft using Reid Hillview Airport remains with the pilot-in-command. This measure could assist pilots in complying with Noise Abatement Measures 2 and 3, above.

**3. Continually Publicize RHV Complaint Hotline.**

**Description:** The County telephone directory will continue to include the noise complaint telephone number. The airport management will continue to include the telephone number in airport documents available to the public. (NCP Page 22, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved.** Implementation of this measure is considered to be within the authority of the County of Santa Clara and will continue to provide a means for community outreach and education regarding airport procedures for noise abatement.

**4. Install Noise Monitors in the RHV Environs to Measure and Compare Unusual or High-Level Noise Aircraft Events with Voice-Records system.**

**Description:** The County would install noise monitors to record real-time sound levels. This measure would provide the County noise data to quantify noise events and identify the noise source. Data would be used to measure frequency of events, unusual or high-level noise and compare data to noise complaint hotline information. (NCP Page 22, Table 3-4)

**FAA Action: Approved.** Implementation of this measure is considered to be within the authority of the County of Santa Clara and will continue to provide a means for community outreach and education regarding airport procedures for noise abatement. The system will enable the County to discuss complaints with the pilots and to develop communication that can be a benefit in assuring the success of the NCP. Approval of this measure does not obligate the FAA to participate in funding the acquisition or installation of the noise monitors and associated equipment. Note, for the purpose of aviation safety, this approval does not extend to the use of monitoring equipment for enforcement purposes by in-situ measurement of any pre-set noise thresholds.

**5. Install a Radar Collection system to Match Aircraft Noise Events to Radar Tracks.**

**Description:** The County would incorporate a radar collection system that will provide radar ground tracks and altitudes of aircraft for identification. The system would be used to monitor events and for use in conducting investigation of noise complaints. This measure would assist the County in determining if pilots are following published procedures. (NCP Page 22, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved.** This measure would enable the County of Santa Clara to improve its ability to monitor the effectiveness of the approved NCP measures and to more precisely identify land uses that are not compatible with noise levels greater than CNEL 65 dB. Approval of this measure does not obligate the FAA to participate in funding the software or hardware required to establish a flight tracking system. Note, for the purpose of aviation safety, this approval does not extend to the use of monitoring equipment for enforcement purposes by in-situ measurement of any pre-set noise thresholds.

**6. Establish an Airport/Airport User/Community Noise Committee after Noise Monitor and Radar Collection System are in Place to Discuss Issues on a Quarterly Basis.**

**Description:** The County would facilitate the formation of an airport noise committee comprised of community members, airport staff, and airport users to discuss issues of noise abatement policy. (NCP Page 22, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved.** Implementation of this measure is considered to be within the authority of the County of Santa Clara and will continue to provide a means for community outreach and education regarding airport procedures for noise abatement

**7. Create a Position at RHV to Focus on Noise Abatement and Compliance Programs and to Investigate Noise Complaints.**

**Description:** The County will designate one or two individuals to deal with the public's noise complaints. The County will create a position at the Reid Hillview Airport to focus on noise complaints. (NCP Page 22, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved.** Implementation of this measure is considered to be within the authority of the County of Santa Clara and will continue to provide a means for community outreach and education regarding airport procedures for noise abatement.

**8. Update the RHV Part 150 Study NEM and NCP within five years of FAA Approval.**

**Description:** The County will update the NEM/NCP to ensure current airport operations and noise abatement measures meet land use compatibility requirements. The update will allow all interested parties to provide input and measure actual effects of the NCP mitigation measures. (NCP Page 23, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved.** This measure addresses a requirement of Part 150. It also would enable the County of Santa Clara to improve its ability to monitor the effectiveness of the approved NCP and to more precisely identify land uses that are not compatible with noise levels greater than CNEL 65 dB.

**9. Update and Distribute the Pilot Noise Abatement Handout with the FAA Approved Noise Abatement Measures.**

**Description:** The County will distribute handouts, bulletins, and newsletters to pilots to inform them of the voluntary measures approved for the noise abatement program at Reid Hillview Airport. (NCP Page 23, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved.** Wording for publications must be coordinated with the FAA before final issuance. Implementation of this measure will continue to provide a means for pilot and community outreach and education regarding airport procedures for noise abatement.

**10. Revise the Noise Abatement Signs to Reflect the FAA Approved Noise Abatement Measures.**

**Description:** Update the on-field noise abatement procedure signs to the approved noise abatement measures. This will be another visual memory jogger for those pilots transiting the airport. (NCP Page 23, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved.** Wording for signage must be coordinated with the FAA before final issuance. Approval of this measure does not obligate the FAA to participate in funding the acquisition or installation of the new signs.

**11. Maintain Information About RHV's Noise Abatement Program on the County's Web Site.**

**Description:** The County will provide current information for both airport users and the community regarding the County's aircraft noise abatement procedures. The web site is an excellent medium for communicating what the airport expects and the effects the procedures have on the community noise environment. (NCP Page 23, Table 3-4).

**FAA Action: Approved.** Implementation of this measure is considered to be within the authority of the County of Santa Clara and will continue to provide a means for community outreach and education.