

Edited transcript of webinar posted at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uSXHTMaCqTc&t=40s>

[speaker(@webinar time where noted)]

[Don Scata]

Welcome to our Noise Policy Review webinar. Thank you for joining us today.

My name is Don Scata, and I manage the noise division in FAA's Office of Environment and Energy. I will be presenting some information regarding FAA's Noise Policy Review. Following this presentation we will host a live question-and-answer session. The entirety of today's webinar will be recorded and posted to FAA's YouTube channel and our Noise Policy Review webpage at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>.

Throughout this presentation and during the question-and-answer session following this presentation you may submit questions by clicking the Q and A icon at the bottom of the zoom window. There is no need to wait. You will not be able to see questions asked by others; however, you will see your own questions. If we receive similar questions, we will combine them into one question. You may also submit questions to FAA's YouTube channel if watching live. We will do our best to answer as many questions as possible during this webinar. Please note: questions and comments made during this webinar will not be recorded to the federal docket. To make an official comment, a link to the Federal Register Notice is available at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>.

In late 2021, the FAA initiated a review of our noise policy as a part of our ongoing commitment to address aircraft noise. This effort will build on our work to advance the scientific understanding of noise impacts as well as the development of analytical tools and technologies. It will consider new evidence from the agency's noise

research program including from the neighborhood environmental survey and the distribution of environmental risks, trade-offs, or externalities across communities.

Our goals are to identify and implement well-reasoned, scientifically-grounded noise policy updates that incorporate FAA's updated understanding of aviation noise and human response and the development of analytical tools and technologies to better manage and reduce the environmental impacts of aviation. We also aim to conduct an inclusive, transparent, and participatory process that prioritizes input from substantially affected stakeholders including local communities.

The FAA published our Noise Policy Review Federal Register Notice on Monday, May 1, 2023. That publication started a 90-day comment period that ends on Monday, July 31, 2023. The Federal Register Notice includes a brief background on FAA's noise policy and also links to a companion framing paper. The request for comments includes 11 questions. Respondents don't have to answer every question when submitting their response to the docket.

The companion framing paper is entitled, "The Foundational Elements of the FAA Civil Aircraft Noise Policy: The Noise Measurement System, its Component Noise Metrics, and Noise Thresholds." The framing paper was designed to be read in parallel with the Federal Register Notice; it provides additional context and discussion around the 11 questions included in the notice and provides context for the review. We wrote it to help aviation stakeholders better understand the questions included in the Federal Register Notice.

The scope of this Federal Register Notice is on the foundational elements of FAA's noise policy metrics and noise thresholds. Regarding metrics, we are taking a hard look at the day-night, average sound level and are considering other metrics such

as number above as well as how each of those metrics are calculated. Regarding noise threshold in light of Neighborhood Environmental Survey findings and other research, we are considering whether to lower below DNL 65 dBA the definition of the level of significant noise exposure for actions subject to environmental review and are also considering modifying the definitions of the levels of noise exposure that are deemed normally compatible with airport operations as set forth in part 150.

The FAA recognizes that aviation noise is a pivotal quality of life issue for some. Aviation noise experiences differ. Communities and individuals have different interests, values, and concerns, and the information about aviation noise that is sought may differ. At the same time the FAA is developing a policy that will apply to the National Airspace System with a large number of stakeholders: those who operate in the system, the traveling public, and those affected on the ground. The interests and concerns of these parties are different: representing different interests, concerns, and priorities. The FAA is committed to ensuring that we provide meaningful, equitable, and transparent access to all stakeholders during this process. The public comment period helps us accomplish that goal; further, it provides opportunities for us to engage with the public and stakeholders in a consistent way so that FAA understands how we jointly view the noise problem and begin to think about potential solutions or improvements to the way our agency interacts with the public and explains how their experience of aviation noise will change over time as a result of FAA action.

Now is the time to provide input as FAA has not yet made any decisions regarding what if any of its noise policy will be updated. Your input will help us understand how we can improve community understanding and expectations regarding future noise exposure, and also how FAA makes decisions regarding the topic. The

questions in the Federal Register Notice are designed to get input that will supplement our technical expertise and consideration of aviation noise issues. We welcome any comments that our stakeholders are willing to provide and are particularly interested in the public's response to the questions and issues identified in the notice. We are looking for specific recommendations, explanation for any recommended changes, and supporting information or data comments addressing potential improvements in how, where, and with whom FAA communicates changes in aircraft noise exposure will be particularly helpful. Please note comments regarding the level of aviation noise at specific locations should be made on the FAA noise portal at the link provided.

The request for comments provides an opportunity for knowledge and potential solutions to flow from the public to the policy makers at the FAA. Our agency recognizes that those affected by our policies will have views and ideas on them, and how they can be improved. We are eager to hear your input and understand your reasoning. The FAA requests your substantive comments. You may ask what that means. A non-substantive comment is one that is not related to the issue under consideration and does not offer data or information that can influence the policy outcome. For example, a noise complaint regarding aviation activity over a specific location is non-substantive and should be directed to the FAA noise portal.

Three types of comments can provide substantive input for agency decision makers to weigh. First, comments regarding scientific or economic evidence and specialized expert knowledge relevant to the topic at hand are helpful. For example, comments that explain what information is not currently provided by the DNL noise metric that may be disclosed by the application of another noise metric are helpful. So, too, would a comment that provides information about the economic impact of a

different noise threshold: including describing how the conclusion was drawn, what data was relied upon, and what assumptions were made in the analysis. Comments should explain how they are supported by data and why the commenter believes that they are backed up by best available science.

Second, comments that point to factual or legal flaws in current or proposed policies, identify gaps between agency policy and legal requirements, or why the policy does not adequately resolve the problem it is intended to address and discuss the likely unintended consequences of an agency policy.

Finally, submissions that provide alternative solutions or enhancements to the rule and explain why these proposals are better suited to resolve the issue than the policy intends to address. This slide presents a collective view on historic and current noise problems. Historically noise issues were airport-centric, result of infrequent operations and dispersed flight paths, and very loud jet aircraft. Noise concerns were raised primarily by communities immediately adjacent to airports. In communities lived experience included low cadence of relatively loud aircraft noise events separated by long intervals. Our current noise problem is an airspace or overflight noise problem resulting from frequent operations, concentrated flight paths, relatively quiet aircraft, and noise concerns raised primarily by corridor communities further from airports.

Communities lived experience includes a high cadence of daily, relatively quiet aircraft noise events separated by short intervals. In addition, there's been an introduction of new entrant and commercial space operations. Now we're going to start unpacking some of the questions in the Federal Register Notice.

Questions 1 and 2A request information about the aircraft and vehicle types and operations that the policy should address. Looking at fixed-wing aircraft, helicopters, rockets, future supersonic aircraft, or new entrant technologies like UA, drones, or Advanced Air Mobility aircraft, such as air taxis, how and what elements of the operations should be described using noise metrics, and how information should be used by the FAA to communicate with the public regarding changes in noise exposure, and to make decisions.

Question 2B through E asks things like: who is and will be affected by aviation noise? In the vicinity of airports versus overflight communities; the vicinity of commercial space launch or re-entry operations; the vicinity of UAS or other newly emerging technology operations. How has your experience of noise changed over time? How do your interests and concerns differ from others based on your location and experience of aviation operations? How would different noise metrics address these concerns?

Congress directed the FAA to establish a single system of measuring noise in the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979; what we call ASNA. The system must have highly reliable relationship between projected noise exposure and surveyed reactions of individuals to noise and be applied uniformly in measuring noise at airports and the surrounding area. The single system must account for noise intensity, duration, frequency, and time of occurrence. FAA's noise metric system relies primarily on the day-night average sound level, or DNL; it is a single number metric to quantify cumulative aircraft noise exposure over a 24-hour period accounting for noise intensity and magnitude, duration of exposure, frequency, or number of events, and the time period in which events occur, such as day or night. It's FAA's primary decision metric

for actions subject to NEPA and airport noise compatibility planning studies prepared pursuant to 14 CFR part 150.

Question three asks about the DNL metric as a whole. What views or comments do you have regarding DNL? About its benefits or shortcomings? Would these views change if another metric was used as a companion supplement or alternative to DNL?

A companion metric is a noise metric that is used in conjunction with another noise metric such as DNL for decision making. A supplemental metric is a noise metric used to improve the public's understanding of the expected change in aviation noise that is not used for decision making. An alternative metric is a noise metric that is used *in lieu* of another metric, such as DNL, for decision making. Would these views change if FAA changed how DNL is calculated?

Question 4 asks about the calculation of DNL and averaging. DNL is calculated using the concept of an average annual day which averages annual aircraft operations into a single, representative day. Do you believe average annual day appropriately describes noise impacts? What other averaging schemes should be considered and what do they capture that average annual day does not?

Question five asks about possible decision making metrics and how they can interact. What noise metrics should be used for decision making for actions subject to NEPA and airport noise compatibility planning studies prepared pursuant to 14 CFR part 150? Should different metrics be used in different circumstances? If so, how? Should FAA continue to use DNL for decision making? How can metrics be used to support better agency decision making?

The FAA is reviewing many metrics that could be considered as a part of that system including both cumulative metrics, such as the traditional DNL or CNEL, but also

other cumulative metrics, such as an eight-hour day, which could be used to evaluate school and work settings. We will also review a range of operational single event metrics including number above, time above, Lmax, and others that might be suggested. Finally, we are working closely with FAA's office of commercial space to evaluate metrics that are more appropriate for low-frequency or impulsive noise, such as commercial space launches. The most appropriate metric could depend on the purpose of the analysis, the audience, and several other factors.

Changes to DNL could include changes to adjusting the threshold, averaging technique, and or changes to its nighttime weighting. DNL with additional supplemental metrics can be used together. Number above, or NA, answers how often will the aircraft level meet or exceed a certain level. Time above, or TA, answers how long will the sound last at or above a certain level. Number above and time above break the DNL metric into its component parts to help explain the noise exposure in a different way.

Question 6 asks about communicating changes in noise exposure. FAA's current supplemental noise metric policy is contained in FAA's NEPA policies and procedures - FAA order 1050.1F. The FAA uses the policy to engage with the public to better explain changes in noise exposure.

Supplemental metrics are not used for decision making. If the FAA were to change this policy, should FAA consider what information FAA communicates regarding changes in noise exposure? Where and with whom FAA communicates? What information methods FAA uses to communicate? What venues FAA uses to share information regarding changes in noise exposure?

FAA noise thresholds refer to two different levels: FAA significant noise impact threshold for actions being reviewed under the National Environmental Policy Act, or



NEPA, and the land use compatibility guidelines established in 14 CFR part 150 Appendix A. Noise thresholds are informed by a historic dose response curve called the Schultz curve which provided a useful method for representing the community response to aircraft noise. Both are set at DNL 65 dB.

Regarding noise thresholds, question 7 asks how should historic and neighborhood environmental survey findings be considered in establishing a noise threshold for actions subject to NEPA and land use noise thresholds in 14 CFR part 150? Should FAA consider other information regarding noise impacts in establishing noise metrics? Should the noise thresholds be established using DNL or another cumulative noise metric?

Question 8 asks should FAA establish noise thresholds using single event or operational metrics for certain types of actions subject to FAA approval or control? When should FAA use these metrics? What should be the level of noise exposure that defines the limits of significant noise exposure in NEPA analyses and for actions subject to 14 CFR part 150?

Question 9 asks about low frequency and impulsive noise events. Should the FAA establish noise thresholds for certain types of actions subject to FAA approval or control such as when the FAA office of commercial space transportation authorizes a launch and re-entry of commercial space transportation vehicles? What should be the level of noise exposure that defines the limits of significant noise exposure in NEPA analyses and for actions subject to 14 CFR part 150?

Question 11 references the body of scientific and economic literature compiled by the FAA regarding the way aviation noise correlates with annoyance as well as environmental economic and health impacts. It refers the public to Appendix 1 which

synthesizes health impacts, such as cardiovascular sleep, mental health, birth outcomes, and children's learning. Also, it looks at annoyance, noise effects, noise level recommendations, alternative metrics, flight track dispersion, military jet noise, and mental health. It looks at economics and things like health costs and home values and also summarizes synthesis research.

Question 10 asks what other issues or topics should the FAA consider in this review regarding noise metrics - the method of calculating them; the establishment of noise thresholds; or FAA's method of communicating the change in noise exposure. We ask the public to please explain their response. This Noise Policy Review could have a number of potential outcomes. It could result in FAA updating our regulations, orders, guidance, etc. For example, FAA might revise the threshold of noise-sensitive land use compatibility for 14 CFR part 150 and or environmental reviews. It might also provide additional guidance on how to prepare those documents. It could result in different levels of analysis and review for a particular action, such as a change in a flight procedure, and it could result in identifying better ways of communicating with the public about the effects of noise. While this policy review is an important step for the FAA to take it is critical that we are transparent and clear about the effect any policy changes could have on existing noise exposure. There are some things that will not be affected by any policy changes being considered in this review. Changes in policy alone will not reduce noise exposure. For future environmental reviews a change in policy could result in different outcomes that may have reduced impacts depending on what alternatives are available and the specific Federal action being considered.

The proposed policy changes we are talking about here will not change where and when aircraft currently fly; however, as just mentioned, future decisions would take

into account the new policy and may result in less impactful outcomes. And finally, policy changes will not require FAA to redo any environmental analyses or decisions that have been made. Future environmental reviews completed after any policy changes were implemented would take into account any changes. For additional information you can visit our Noise Policy Review webpage at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>. You can also email us for additional information at NoisePolicyReview@faa.gov or leave us a voicemail by calling 202-269-6999. Now we're going to shift gears for our Q&A session.

Our Q&A session is about to begin. You may submit questions by clicking the Q&A icon at the bottom of the zoom window. You will not be able to see questions asked by others; however, you will see your own questions. If we receive similar questions, we will combine them into one question. You may also submit questions to FAA's YouTube channel if watching live. We will do our best to answer as many questions as possible during this webinar. Please note: questions and comments made during this webinar will not be recorded to the federal docket. To make an official comment a link to the Federal Register Notice is available at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>.

And now I'd like to introduce today's panelists as I've already introduced myself, I will start with Adam Scholten. Adam is an Environmental Protection Specialist in the noise division of FAA's Office of Environment and Energy. Adam has 13 years of experience working in aviation eight of which have been in the environmental field. Adam began his aviation environmental career as a consultant specializing in airport noise before joining the FAA in 2021. As a consultant, Adam conducted noise modeling utilizing FAA tools such as the Aviation Environmental Design Tool and worked

extensively to support airports and community round tables, to analyze aircraft flight procedures, and provide guidance on the development of alternative procedures that could help to reduce noise exposure. Since joining FAA Adam has focused on developing methodologies to assist the FAA in assessing noise associated with unmanned aircraft and working with others in the noise division to launch the FAA's Noise Policy Review.

Andrew Brooks is the regional environmental program manager for FAA's Eastern region airports division. Andrew has over 24 years of experience working in the environmental field 21 of which are with the Federal Aviation Administration. He began his career with the Environmental Protection Agency before joining the FAA in 2002 as an Environmental Protection Specialist. He has served as the Eastern region environmental program manager for airports division for the last 11 years managing complex environmental projects and noise compatibility planning on behalf of the FAA across seven states in the District of Columbia. Andrew is a national expert on aviation noise and compatibility planning and has been an instructor for the FAA's noise and land use compatibility planning course for the past seven years.

Ryan Weller is an Environmental Protection specialist for the FAA's Western Service Center. He started his FAA career in the Northwest Mountain Technical Operations Division in 2001 and moved to the Western Service Center in 2007. Prior to Federal service Ryan worked in private industry in the chemical and hazardous waste industry. Ryan has managed environmental reviews for regional and local airspace redesign projects along with military special use airspace projects.

Thank you, again, for participating in this webinar. As we begin the Q&A session, I'd like to invite our panelists to turn on their cameras. We will begin the Q&A momentarily.

Thank you very much, it looks like we have our four panelists on screen. I'll just remind you all to turn your mics off when before you start speaking our first question is what are the FAA's goals for the policy review. I can take that one. We have two primary goals for the Noise Policy Review: the first is a subset of goal we're looking to identify and implement well-reasoned, scientifically-grounded noise policy updates that incorporate our updated understanding of aviation noise and human response and the development of analytical tools and technologies to better manage and reduce the environmental impacts of aviation. The other goal is procedural. We're looking to conduct an inclusive, transparent, and participatory process that prioritizes input from substantially affected stakeholders including local communities.

Our second question, I think Adam you might be the best to answer this one. What are the next steps in the FAA policy review? Is a participant's only means of participating providing input through commenting?

[Adam Scholten]

Thanks, Don. There's a variety of next steps in the review, and I'll step through those now. The current step that we are at right now is we're at the Federal Register Notice that's seeking stakeholder input on the policy options. Once the public comment period on that closes the FAA is going to review and consider the feedback that we received on the Federal Register Notice docket, and we're going to begin developing recommended policy changes based you know in considering that feedback. After that there will be an FAA decision on the recommendations for how we want to change our

policy, and we're going to be communicating that change in decisions through various processes which will then implement the change, and there will be separate public involvement for that, and depending on what changes are made. In terms of providing input the only way to submit a formal comment at this stage of the process is through the FAA's docket on regulations.gov. In addition to these webinars there will be FAA officials that are going to be meeting with aviation stakeholders, such as elected officials and airport round tables, provide information and answer questions, and if you need assistance in learning how to submit a comment to the docket, please refer to our videos under the 'Your Input Matters' tab of our website.

I'm at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview> which has steps and walks through how to access the FRN and also provide a comment and that the doc is also linked on our website. When we do have recommended revisions to our policy, we are going to announce them and identify ways the public can continue to participate and provide input and would just ask that you know as we go through this process we'll be updating our Noise Policy Review landing page which asks everyone to subscribe to that which is at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>.

[Don Scata@27:17]

Thanks Adam. Andrew, I think this next question could go to you. How can people participate in the Noise Policy Review?

[Andrew Brooks]

Thank you, Don. So first and foremost, through attendance at these meetings, in webinars, providing your questions, providing your input into the Q&A as indicated to get response from us on the panel here hopefully you know be it that means interested

parties will get information that they're seeking and then that can inform comments that they could submit forward on the docket.

There's a docket at <https://regulations.gov>. It's FAA-2023-0855. That information can also be found on our website at <https://faa.gov/noisepolicyreview> all one word, and that will have information not only on how to submit input into the docket but also how to attend future webinars if the folks online want to share that information with other interested parties, maybe in organizations or communities that they're working with right now. Thank you, Don.

[Don Scata]

Thanks, Andrew. Next question. I think I'll take on. The question is, 'The FAA has been doing research for decades, and the policies are approximately 40 years old. How is FAA evaluating the large body of data or information on this topic during the review? That's a great question, and we've done a lot of work reviewing that large body of research as a part of the Noise Policy Review project. We're requesting input from the public and our stakeholders regarding any other studies that should be considered. A list of the research studies that we've already reviewed can be found in our framing paper entitled, 'The Foundational Elements of the Federal Aviation Administration Civil Aircraft and Noise Policy, the Noise Measurement System, it's Component Noise Metrics, and Noise Threshold' in Appendix A of that document. The framing paper can be viewed at our Noise Policy Review webpage at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview> or in the supporting documents tab for docket FAA-2023-0855 on <https://www.regulations.gov>. Adam, this one's for you. Will changes to the NEPA significance threshold lower noise impacts around the US?

[Adam Scholten]

No. Lowering the NEPA significance threshold or the FAA's land use compatibility guidelines for noise sensitive land areas will not have the same impact as turning the dial down on a stereo. The factors that control noise impacts around the US are the aerodynamics of specific aircraft and vehicles and the total number of operations by these aircraft and vehicles over specific locations. Neither of these factors are affected by this Noise Policy Review.

The NEPA significance threshold is a tool that the FAA uses to disclose information on the effects of proposals for FAA actions or approvals that may impact the noise environment. Any potential change to our NEPA significance threshold will not automatically lower noise impacts around the US; however, it may assist the FAA with disclosing potential impacts from potential projects. It may assist the FAA in our decision-making process, and it may increase the level of environmental review that the FAA conducts for certain projects. So, something that, for example, may qualify as a CATEX currently may require the FAA to prepare an environmental assessment in the future, or the FAA may have to prepare more environmental impact statements.

[Don Scata]

Thank you, Adam.

[Andrew Brooks]

Don, if I may follow on that. I think the goal of this process is to acknowledge some of the past deficiencies that our agency has had in terms of communicating noise, and, you know, seek methods to improve that. So, to follow on with what Adam was saying, yes there won't be an immediate benefit to noise. That will come from improvements to technology, improvements to aircraft, changes to operational patterns, and so forth; however, this new parameter that we would develop under the Noise



Policy Review would certainly provide a more informative process moving forward. One that's more dedicated to communication ideally and informing decision makers with a more robust concept of the farther reaching effects of noise in certain circumstances. So, as Adam was indicating, right now many of the policy procedure changes that are considered by the FAA currently may qualify for a categorical exclusion, and it is possible that those procedures, depending on what the noise policy recommendations outcome are, would require further detailed review under the National Environmental Policy Act, and it may also change certain procedures or certain other aspects of airport development or aviation development that are currently considered under environmental assessments to a more thorough and robust review. So, thank you, Adam, I appreciate allowing some additional input on that one, and thank you, Don,

[Don Scata]

You're welcome. Thanks for the addition. We had a question about the presentation being available digitally, and the answer to that question is yes, this webinar is being recorded, and we'll be making it available on our landing page at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>. All four of the webinars will be recorded and made available after they're completed.

Next question is for Ryan. Will the FAA consider the impact of flight concentrations during the review?

[Ryan Weller]

Okay, thank you, Don. So the focus really in this effort is kind of the foundational elements of it. Really it's the noise policy metrics and the thresholds themselves. So, while you know the concentration is really kind of a specific question about that. We're out here trying to find solutions, and we're listening to folks, and we're getting comments

back. So, again, we want to hear those comments. In particular, the supplemental noise metrics and some of the other noise analysis options that are out there. Even though we're not specifically looking at noise concentration specifically. You know that might be something that has a commenter's interest that they could provide and maybe potentially provide a metric that would disclose some more impacts that would lend itself more to the concentration issue. So, I think that in in a sense we're not specifically looking at concentration. Some of the comments that we could receive would be related to which tools we use and how we use them and the noise metrics that are used and the noise information that's being disclosed. So I think it's a good opportunity for the public and for anyone out there to provide their input and provide some really good input and comments in this process. So I certainly encourage everyone and anyone out there to provide your comments. Thank you, Don.

[Don Scata]

Thanks, Ryan. Andrew, it looks like someone's asking for a little bit of clarification based on an answer I gave. Maybe you can take this on. Will the webinar slides themselves be posted separately than the videos?

[Andrew Brooks]

Yes, they'll be available on the website as well. Same website, <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>, again all one word, and, Don, it looks like Adam actually had a potential follow-up to the previous

[Don Scata]

Oh sorry about that, Adam. I can't see you very easily. Go ahead.

[Adam Scholten]

Oh, no problem. I just had a small follow-up to what Ryan was saying. You know just regarding that you know we are focusing our policy review on metrics and thresholds because those are the foundational elements of our noise policy, but we are definitely open to receiving feedback specifically looking at supplemental metrics or other metrics that may speak to different aspects of noise that you know that community members feel that are currently not present in our policy. So, a metric maybe that would speak to concentrations is something that we would consider, and we really do encourage folks to comment on that and if there is a specific metric or a threshold that a community member or anyone has input put on that they would like us to consider, we invite those comments and we'll consider them. That's all. Thank you, Don.

[Andrew Brooks]

Don, if I can follow up on that and this is kind of a follow-up to the first question that we had as well. So, I think really what Adam is saying is that would be one of the hopeful outcomes of this process is our current noise policy is somewhat monolithic. It was developed in response to ANSA as Don indicated during the presentation way back in 1980, and it applies the same standard to all situations, and really you know the information that we're hoping to get out of this process and the input from the public would really ideally inform a more adaptable noise policy moving forward to allow for those situations that both Ryan and Adam were discussing. So, thank you, Don.

[Don Scata]

You bet. Thanks for the additional answer. Ryan, this next one's for you. Will the Noise Policy Review reduce noise from aircraft and other users of the airspace?

[Ryan Weller]

So, yeah, I just want to make sure we're all clear on this that the FAA is trying to be very transparent about this, and our efforts here are really changing the policy of how and what tools we have and the thresholds that we're using to analyze those. So, in a sense, it's not so much an effort out there to reduce noise, but it's really on how we analyze those impacts and how we disclose them, and what tools we use to do that. So this is really that opportunity for us to kind of do some wholesale changes in these areas that we can communicate better. There's certainly a lot of tools out there that we're looking at. We're trying to figure out the right situation and the right tools and the metrics to use for those. We've certainly had some unique new aircraft that have entered the airspace out there, and this is looking at how the policy changes for how that whole analysis happens for airspace changes and for other changes around the airport. So, again, it's not necessarily turning down the dial of a stereo. I think that analogy was brought up before. In the sense we're not so much doing that but it's a matter of saying how do we how do we analyze these changes, and how do we put them out there in a public realm so that folks can understand what those impacts really are on a daily basis. So, yeah, I think that's it.

[Don Scata]

Thanks, Ryan. Adam, next one's for you. Is there a possibility that changes to DNL will require the FAA or airport sponsors to go back and evaluate past projects with new metrics?

[Adam Scholten]

Thanks, Don. Any policy changes that result from the Noise Policy Review will have a perspective effect only. Meaning the FAA is not going to go back and revisit past decisions. We also are not going to require airport sponsors to reopen any

concluded environmental reviews; however, that being said, future environmental reviews such as those that are completed after any policy changes are implemented and the policy becomes affected would take into account any changes that are implemented as part of the policy review. So, speaking to kind of what we talked about earlier and Andrew expanded upon, there may be some cases in the future where we have more in rigorous levels of environmental review for future projects depending on what the final recommendations are and what's implemented at the outset of the policy review.

[Don Scata]

Thanks, Adam. Next question I can take on. What is the FAA's timeline to share recommended policy changes after the comment period ends? So, that's a tough question to answer. We certainly intend to review and consider all input received on the docket through this process. We will read every single comment that we receive just as we did for the last Federal Register Notice we had on our noise research. The challenge is we don't know yet how much information or input we will receive and, therefore, we can't really estimate time frames for future steps of the review including when we would share recommended changes. We know for the last Federal Register Notice we received a few more than 4,000 comments. So, we have a sense of how long a thorough review and consideration of that amount of input takes, but we don't really know how much we're going to get back from our stakeholders through this process. So, we can't really give a rough timeline on when we would be sharing recommended changes. We can encourage you all to sign up for updates to our website which is <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>. All the way down on the bottom there is a link you can click to sign up for updates, and as we make updates to that page we will be

sending out notifications to folks that sign up. So that would be the easiest and best way to keep track of how things are progressing. Let's see, next one for Ryan. Will the FAA consider the impact of flight concentrations during the review?

[Ryan Weller@41:44]

Yeah, I think I kind of touched upon this before. There's a commentator that had some questions about concentration and that certainly is in our discussions as we move forward for possible suggestions, and I think really it lends itself to kind of the metrics that are potentially out there, and I think commenters can provide us some input on that. You know as far as what would be a more advantageous or more helpful tool out there as opposed to the DNL. That's something that we're certainly open for considering. Now these things that we're talking about as far as potential changes to policies are really kind of forward-looking and not so much backward looking, and I know that there's a lot of interest in current noise issues that are out there, and this policy really is towards what's happening and what's going to happen in the future as far as potential policy changes. Let say we had an action that happened back five or six years ago; this policy change probably is not going to be impacting that unless there's some new changes to that where we have to do an additional new NEPA analysis. So, I kind of caution the folks out there that see this as something that's going to change the current issue, and I think it really kind of focuses in on how the policy moves forward in the future and not so much in the past.

[Don Scata@43:16]

Thanks, Ryan. Adam, next question is for you. What is FAA's current noise metric and how is it used?

[Adam Scholten]

The FAA's current noise metric is the day-night, average sound level abbreviated as DNL which is a cumulative noise metric that takes into account the number of events, the frequency, the duration, and the intensity of the events in the calculation, and using the cumulative energy of the noise events it picks that number and averages it into a 24-hour period which would be representative of a day, so to speak, in that metric using that in conjunction also with an averaging scheme known as an average-annual day which takes the operations over the course of the year at an airport or a collection of airports depending on what the analysis is that's being done or the project and averages those out into what would be considered a representative day based on those average annual distributions not only in terms of the number of operations but the frequency, the times when they operate, the types of aircraft that operate, and so forth.

How DNL is currently used is it's our decision-making metric with regards to noise and evaluating noise exposure and environmental impacts from that and is used in a couple of different areas. It's used for projects involving Federal actions that are subject to the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA, and it's also used for land use considerations and guidelines under the 14 CFR part 150 or the part 150 program. One thing we are considering, although we have a single metric right now which is DNL that I that I just discussed, we are also considering as part of this review using a suite of metrics that might allow the FAA to address different scenarios based on the noise environment and these include such scenarios as the source of the noise itself, the type of vehicle other, other operational considerations, and this policy review applies only to civilian aircraft and vehicles like commercial space transportation vehicles, rockets, and newly emerging technologies like unmanned aircraft systems, so UAS or

drones, an urban or Advanced Air Mobility such as UAM or air taxis as they're also commonly called.

[Don Scata]

Thanks, Adam. Ryan, this is the next question. I think is a combination of several that we've received. So, it's a couple parts. So, basically there's a statement: next gen is the problem. Why won't you move flight paths back to pre-next-gen? How are you going to help these communities that are suffering now with all the pollution and loud noise that are bombarding those communities?

[Ryan Weller]@46:11]

Okay, so I'll just touch on next-gen real quickly. Next gen was an initiative that started a number of years back, and a lot of times it was an airspace redesign project. I think that's where most of the interest has been, and it has been moving from more of a ground-based navigation system to a satellite-based navigation system, and I think that's where some of the questions that came before when the questioner was asking about concentration in some of those aspects of it. So, if you hear the word next-gen, it's kind of that airspace redesign satellite-based initiative. So, those projects have been moving ahead over the last number of years, and a lot of those changes have already been implemented. With airspace changes and implementation I know the commenter was saying why can't we move them back to where they were what, happens is it's a domino effect in a sense if you move one most the time you have a whole number of other aircraft that have to be or that potentially could be impacted so simply moving back to an older set of technologies using newer set of technologies is a lot of times just not a feasible option, and so again what this policy is really looking at is moving forward with changes and saying okay we have our current noise metric, and we have our



thresholds, and what can we do to improve those, and that's really what this initiative is about is looking at those two aspects of it. I know that there's a lot of interest about current issues, and one area I always recommend the community and anyone else out there is to go to the round tables that are established around a lot of these major airports, and that really becomes a good vehicle for the public and whoever else out there to share ideas, to come together, and provide, I think, some real positive input to the FAA to be able to say we're looking at it from a community aspect, not specifically a neighborhood aspect, so it looks at as regional area around an airport, and I just encourage folks to go to your round tables, participate in them, and I think they're they're a really good vehicle to get your voices heard and to gain information. So, thanks.

[Don Scata@48:02]

Thanks, Ryan. Andrew, I saw a question come through about whether any of us have lived under flight paths. Do you have any experience in that?

[Andrew Brooks]

Sure do, Don. I appreciate that so I spent my youth living in Pacifica California. I was actually under the international heavy departure path for San Francisco International Airport. You could go out in my backyard, and I'd watch the heavy international flights take off on a daily basis, and I noted that in a most recent survey of communities submitting complaints that my hometown of Pacifica, California actually was one of the top communities that was complaining about noise. I believe it was 15th overall of all the communities that complained. Following that I moved out to New York, but I did go to school at a university called Adelphi University which is in Garden City and as many folks know in that Community that's under the arrival path for the 2-2 left

and two two right approaches to JFK. I did spend a number of years in that area. Not only going to school but also working in that area and experience so that arrival path on a regular basis. Went to graduate school at American University in northwest DC, and had experience living and working in that environment for the departure patterns and arrival patterns in and out of Reagan that followed the Potomac River. Then following that I moved back to New York, and I lived in Corona the flushing area which was under the LaGuardia arrival and for the expressway visual to Runway 31 which I know a lot of folks in that Community are more concerned with the departure traffic, but we did get a lot of exposure to the steady stream of arrival traffic in the house that I was living in there, and then currently I live under the primary helicopter departure and arrival path for a small hub airport on Long Island, and so I've kind of had exposure to this throughout my life in many environments Nationwide.

So those folks that feel that perhaps they're not being heard or represented because they don't feel that their lived experience is being valued or incorporated into this panel in this group that are handling those policy review issues I just did want to spend some time and give you know my personal expertise to assure folks that we, like you, have been in these environments, and we have lived our lives and been exposed. We do hear you. We may not necessarily understand your unique circumstance or your unique situation, but we do hear you and as we've all indicated repeatedly, we are listening to the input and the input is valued throughout the process. So, Don, thank you for giving me a minute or two to just speak about my personal living experience and hopefully some folks on the group can relate to that.

[Don Scata@52:23]

Thanks, Andrew. Thanks for sharing that part of your story. I also live underneath a significant amount of aircraft noise. I can't say that I follow it around as much as you had throughout my life, but that is my current situation. Okay let's see, next question. What sort of changes can the public expect following the Noise Policy Review? That's another question that we're not able to answer in detail because we haven't yet made any decisions about what changes will occur as a result of the review or how they will be implemented. It's a very true statement when I say that we have not made decisions at that we're seeking input from all of our stakeholders to inform where we go, and what decisions we end up making with regards to the recommendation. So, we can't really say what we would expect to change because we don't know the changes that are coming. You know I think it's important to note that regardless of the outcome of the this review the evaluation of noise metrics and noise thresholds will not in itself reduce aircraft noise in any location around the United States. That's not going to make aircraft quieter or change where they fly. We won't be reducing the demand for air travel or cargo. Only in quieter aircraft, fewer flight operations or both can reduce noise and the Noise Policy Review isn't changing those considerations. We don't have the authority to force fewer passenger or cargo flights in and out of airports within U.S airspace.

I think, Adam, maybe this one can go to you. Many reject the premise that there should be a re-review after the 2021 review which I'm thinking maybe refers to our publication of the NES Federal Register Notice and question the validity of this new process that will delay and or deny relief to the thousands of folks suffering under next gen's low, loud, repetitive, relocated flight tracks or flight paths. Instead why won't we

focus our energy on communities that commented on the 21 review and fix the problem rather than doing these re-reviews?

[Adam Scholten@54:38]

The reason that we're going through this process now is because we're committed to considering the public's input early and often in our policy development process, and that's why we're requesting your input now because we're looking to make potential changes and really value your feedback on what areas we should consider changing and how. We drafted the request for comments to get your views and ideas regarding the information that we use to develop and make decisions that affect aviation noise. You know the January 2021 notice there were a lot of comments, but the comments to that resoundingly were that the FAA should modify its policies rather than wait for the results of research or doing additional ongoing research, and the public also wanted FAA to use different metrics other than DNL to communicate regarding aviation noise impacts, and now we're really looking to get your input on how our noise metrics can improve how we communicate you know with you and other stakeholders, and especially regarding changes in noise due to our actions or the actions that we're approving you know, and this includes not only information the noise metric discloses but the duration that it covers and how they're calculated, and you know what ways are best to help and most transparent to help us communicate and relate to the lived experience of communities and others in the public. So you know the public comments addressing potential improvements and how, where, and with whom we communicate regarding changes in aircraft noise exposure are going to be particularly helpful because we continue to develop a policy and are working to that will respond to effect communities core interest concerns and needs, and by going through this policy review

process we're hoping to really get some feedback on what things would be most helpful to that would equate with what communities are experiencing. So you know when we have new actions in the future or making new decisions we're able to communicate that effectively what you know the potential changes in noise exposure may be and be transparent.

[Don Scata@56:51]

Thanks, Adam. That's a good answer. I think it's worth emphasizing when we did the Federal Register Notice sharing the results of the Neighborhood Environmental Survey that we were asking for feedback on the results of that survey, and as you said we heard that folks wanted us to take the step of modifying our policies, and that's what prompted us to begin this this Noise Policy Review. We're very interested in getting additional feedback from everyone knowing that they're commenting on a potential policy not the results of a research project. We feel like that's the best framing or the best approach for us to get everyone that's interested in participating's comments. Thank you.

Let's see, next question. How can this be a public input session when the phone message says all viewers will be muted? So, we're committed to an open and meaningful public engagement. We're working to provide communities with information through this series of webinars. We'll have four of them. Social media, website updates, and opportunities to provide feedback at critical points in the process. We released our Federal Register Notice or our notice for request for comment on May 1<sup>st</sup>. That provides detailed information to the public about the agency's the questions we want to consider. It's open for review for 90 days from May 1st through July 31<sup>st</sup>, and during that time the public can provide the FAA with their feedback to the docket, and

you can do that by going to <https://www.regulations.gov> and searching for the docket number FAA-2023-0855. You can go to the docket by our website at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>, and, as I mentioned, during the 90-day period we're going to have a series of four webinars, this is the first. We've posted a series of educational videos on the request for comments. We have an email address that you can use to reach out to us if you have questions that's [noisepolicyreview@faa.gov](mailto:noisepolicyreview@faa.gov) and we're going to make the recorded versions of all of the webinars available on our YouTube channel and our landing page for viewing later on. So, I think that's the best that we can do. I think there's just a limitation on the ability for us to handle input by phone during the webinars, and it's that's the best we can do for this.

So, next question for Adam. Why does the FAA use noise modeling versus noise monitoring?

[Adam Scholten@59:30]

That's a great question, Don, and there's a lot of reasons for that, and I'll try to step through those as best I can, but you know due to the need to generate detailed noise results over large areas noise modeling is really the only practical way to determine geospatially where the noise effects are accurately and reliably in a surrounding community. Especially when analyzing proposals related to aviation noise. And there's many challenges and limitations associated with that; some of which include the fact that you know in terms of using noise measurements versus modeling you know when thinking about measurements you know non-aviation noise sources can have a large influence on the noise monitoring data. So, you know if the monitor is near a highway or you know a neighbor's mowing a lawn or something else that can you know influence the results of the noise monitor which it can be difficult to separate from

aviation noise events you know during the post-processing. Also, longer-term noise monitoring requires regular maintenance and calibration of the individual noise monitors on a continuous basis. Especially if you're doing year-round modeling that's got to be done multiple times throughout the course of the year, and that has considerable costs to do, and you have to have the resources obviously to do that. Another area that's a challenge between monitoring and modeling is that to ensure the same accuracy and fidelity of the data that's generated by the noise models you have to have an extremely large number of noise monitoring locations in terms of like tens of thousands depending on the size of the geographic area, but the bigger the area the more you're going to need, and you're going to be able to have to have tons of these monitors to match the fidelity that you would get in terms of noise modeling.

I think the biggest challenge is that you can't measure future noise. When we're evaluating future actions that the agency may be taking or projects that we're approving there is no way to monitor what the future noise from that's going to be, and so the only way to do that is to model it, and noise modeling is really the only way to evaluate a what-if scenario for proposed future operations. So there's a lot of challenges between noise modeling and monitoring and that's one of the primary reasons that we model noise as supposed to monitoring it.

[Don Scata@1:02:08]

Thanks, Adam. I always like to think of it as you can't measure the future. You can't measure future alternatives. Great answer. Okay, next question. Which airport round tables are we reaching out to for meetings? So we don't have a list of round tables that we're proactively reaching out to. Round tables are welcome to request a meeting or a presentation through their community engagement officer or their regional

administrator's office or by using our [noisepolicyreview@faa.gov](mailto:noisepolicyreview@faa.gov) email. We're responding to requests as we get them, and the point of doing these webinars, the series of four webinars, is really for us to be able to reach as large an audience as possible that's interested in hearing from us on this topic. So, we're certainly interested and available to talk to round tables, but we also wanted to make sure that we provided an opportunity for everyone to have a chance to interact with us.

Okay, next question. Ryan, will the slide deck be available on our website after this webinar, not later when the webinars are completed? The folks that want to submit a detailed comment need the information soon, and then there's a question about any chance to extend the July 1st deadline which I think they meant July 31<sup>st</sup>.

[Ryan Weller@01:03:31]

Yeah I was gonna make sure that we're clear on the on the deadline. It is it is truly July 31st to submit comments. So, certainly get your get your comments in, and we are working as quickly as possible to get everything posted up. We have a series of four of these webinars this week and next week and our goal is to have those all up there as soon as possible. So, the slide deck will be up ASAP. I can't confirm the exact time or date but just keep posting or keep watching for a post on the website. It's <https://faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>. If you just go in and do a search of FAA Noise Policy Review it'll pop up. I did that the other day just to see if it worked, and it gets you there pretty quickly. So, yeah, July 31st get your comments in. We'd love to hear your input. We're going to go through each one of those and consider every one of them. So, thanks.

[Don Scata@01:04:41]



Thanks, Ryan, and with regards to the comment or the extension question I think we're still very early in the 90-day comment period. If there's an interest in requesting extensions the best place to do that would be sending an email to [Billyspolicyreview@faa.gov](mailto:Billyspolicyreview@faa.gov).

Next question, Ryan, if you don't mind taking a second one. The 11 questions that we included in the Federal Register Notice do not include emissions impacts. Will the FAA take comments on emissions?

[Ryan Weller@01:05:13]

Well this is a Noise Policy Review initiative here so as far as emissions go it's not so much a part of this initiative. So, we are going to be focusing in on the noise aspects of it, and like we've said it over and over again, it's the metrics that we use and the thresholds that we use, and so that's really where we're going to keep our focus in on going forward. So, thanks.

[Don Scata@01:05:43]

Thanks, Ryan. Andrew, next question is for you. So this commenter says they're troubled by the comment we said we will not be doing any retroactive environmental reviews or analyzes. Are we willing to consider some policy changes that review existing impacts through the new lens since the DNL 65 or CNEL level has been shown to be inadequate?

[Andrew Brooks@01:06:08]

Don, thank you. I think this is a really good question, and you know I see a number of the folks are concerned with this, and I do want to stress the challenge associated with revisiting past decisions given a policy change that happens post-decision. Once these decisions are made, the projects are subsequently implemented,

and, as you know, Ryan and various other folks on various other projects have indicated the issues and challenges in a next-gen environment, for example, of just going back to previous procedures those would still hold with this context, as well. A decision would be made based on a policy available at the time, and implementing noise policy review with a retroactive stance it's just not practicable, honestly; however, there are many things that can be done to facilitate the transition to the noise policy. For example, as those policy recommendations start to get made environmental documents will start with incorporating a forward-looking analytical stance where we will try to allow for a seamless transition into the new noise policy and environment so that immediately following the implementation of any recommendations coming out of noise policy that those elements will be analyzed within the context of the new noise policy once it becomes effective. That really goes for a National Environmental Policy Act type analysis where we're looking at noise as part of the overall environmental impact of the project. In a part 150 noise land use and compatibility planning environment certainly once the noise policy update is offered and then any recommendations or changes in it are implemented with regard to not only a new noise compatibility standard but also land use compatibility standards if those are also recommended, then any airport would be able to update their existing part 150 study going all the way back to the start of the part 150 process back in the mid 80s. So there are things that can be done almost immediately after the implementation or as the implementation is getting ready to stand up; however, looking back it's just not practicable in this context. So, thank you, Don.

[Don Scata@01:08:44]

Thanks, Andrew. Okay, next question I can take on. Beyond the FAA's request for comments through this Federal Register notice, what other outreach and

communications will the FAA do to external and internal stakeholders? Will the FAA be transparent and publish this? So we're doing a lot of outreach. We have the four webinars. We've posted a news and update. We have our web page. We've mentioned we'll be doing or available to do discussions with round tables or airports or community groups that are interested. We're also going to continue to update our web page as we have information available in our most recent Federal Register Notice. We said that we'll be following up with a future Federal Register Notice communicating the recommendations. So, we've sort of outlined the scope of the potential engagement well. The other one I wanted to mention is we're also coordinating with other federal agencies through the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise to make sure they're aware of what's going on and providing them an opportunity to provide input. So we've been transparent. We'll continue to do so about the different opportunities to engage with us during the comment period, and we'll continue to do as much outreach as we can.

Let's see. Adam, next one up. Will the questions and answers being provided by will they be available to review on our website after the webinar?

[Adam Scholten@01:10:31]

Yeah, so all these webinars as Ryan and others have said these webinar recordings are going to be posted to our landing page on the <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>, and that's going to include the full webinar that includes this entire Q&A session.

[Don Scata]

Thank you, Adam. Let's see, next question I'll start with Andrew I think you can add on maybe after I finish. So the question is our questions in the Federal Register

Notice are based on an assumption that the general public has the scientific knowledge to answer those questions appropriately. How do we expect the general public, that is the layperson, to answer technical questions where they have no background? The commenter said that seems quite unfair. I think certainly we recognize that people have throughout the stakeholder community have various levels of understanding and knowledge around this topic, and that's why we approached the questions in the way that we did. We tried to ask them in as plain language of a way as possible. We also created the video series to help everyone understand a little more about the things that we're asking about. We have some videos explaining what noise metrics are, what the potential metrics mean, what thresholds mean, you know, sort of laying out all those details, and we also wrote the companion paper to help provide context around those questions, and this webinar further broke down the questions into sort of help folks better understand we're trying to get at. So, there is an understanding that this is a challenging topic. Noises is inherently a technical topic, and the math behind noise is complex. So, we understand that, but it doesn't mean that we shouldn't be seeking input from our stakeholders. We're open to any kind of input that folks are able to provide. Folks don't have to provide an answer to every one of the questions that we've asked. Folks don't have to answer the questions we ask. They can share whatever information they'd like to share on their feelings about where we should be going with this review. So there's lots of opportunities to provide input in into this process.

Andrew, did you want to add more?

[Andrew Brooks@01:13:05]

Yeah, Don, I appreciate that, and I think I know the person that actually submitted this question very well. So, that being said, yeah there is an assumption of a

technical basis associated with the questions, and in crafting the questions associated with the Federal Register Notice we tried to strike that balance, but what I would like to suggest is that you may not know the specific metric that is appropriate for analyzing an issue of concern to you, such as sleep disturbance or speech interference or educational disruption, but what you can comment, not knowing that, is saying well I am concerned with sleep disturbance and share some of your lived experience and help that context, and then we can take that input, and then say okay well sleep disturbance is this individual's primary issue. This is a metric that correlates well with that or speech interference. I know there are questions about changing how metrics are calculated. Even comments that are broad such as under a better understanding or correlation of input or you know a policy basis that translates well to individuals' lived experience, something as broad as that is helpful and informative for those of us that are working the Noise Policy Review issue. So, just to follow on what Don said again; just provide the input, provide the recommendations to the detail that you have them. If you want to coordinate with a group and provide on behalf of a round table or another civic organization, do that as well. You may find that there are folks in those groups that can help expand upon that, and then there is a lot of time left open in this process. We have until July 31st and please continue to have those discussions but more most importantly is make sure you just provide your feedback for consideration. So, thank you, Don.

[Don Scata@01:15:20]

Thanks, Andrew, and I guess I forget whether I mentioned it. You also can ask us questions. If you have any questions about what we're asking, email us at [noisepolicyreview@faa.gov](mailto:noisepolicyreview@faa.gov).

Andrew, next question I think is best for you. It's connected to one that I think I asked you already. Why has the FAA interpreted or decided that there will be no retroactive application of the potential new policy? Does the FAA have the ability to change this? Who else can change this and how?

[Andrew Brooks@01:15:49]

Well, I guess the issue really stems is that you know again we have a as was previously answered we have an understanding of what the time frame will be for this process, but we don't have a defined time frame. We also know that this process will lead to recommendations. Some of those recommendations may have a further, longer time frame for actual implementation. So once this process goes through between now to the time of final implementation, we don't really have to define time frame for that; however, we are working in the environment moving forward with an understanding that things are going to be changing, and we will be adaptive and responsive to those requirements as they are defined throughout the implementation of future decisions, to the degree that we have knowledge, and uncertainty that they will be enacted.

Once decisions are set, projects are implemented, for example, in an airport's context, if we are considering a runway extension project, we will make a decision based on the policy in place at the time that it is in place. The mitigation will be made based on the mitigation requirements at the time that it is in place, and then that project will go to construction and potentially be operational. We cannot then go back and revisit past decisions. There's no vehicle for that. Not just for noise, but for multiple policies that are considered across all of the impact categories that we work with. So we understand the concern, and it's been vocalized repeatedly. So, we do hear you, and right now the approach that we're taking is to, again, work within the current

framework, give a consideration to additional supplemental metrics to help understand/ help the facilitation of understanding of potential impacts, and then as we go through the process be open and inclusive and inform folks as decisions are made. So, I trust that addresses the question. I understand it's not the satisfactory answer that folks may be looking for, but that is the situation that we find ourselves in. So, I thank you, Don.

[Don Scata@01:18:00]

You bet. Thanks, Andrew. Next question I can take on. The answers we're giving are referencing many Federal Aviation Administration regs, etc. Will a transcript of these answers be available so the attendees can more easily look for the reference documents? So, yes, we will be, as we said, we'll be making the recordings available on YouTube and <https://faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>. Closed captioning will be available for those recordings. So you'll be able to see all of those references in sort of text form in the videos, but we also encourage you to take a look at our companion framing paper; that's the paper that's entitled 'The Foundational Elements of the FAA Civil Aircraft Noise Policy, the Noise Measurement System it's Component Noise Metrics, and Noise Thresholds.' That paper is available at <https://faa.gov/noisepolicyreview/NPR-framing>. Those resources along with the educational videos that we posted to our noise policy webpage really should help everyone become familiar with the terminology, with the regulations that we reference, and things like that. Let's see, next question, Adam. It's a question I think I can take on, but it says the question was Adam mentioned further public comment in the process. What are the types of public comments you would expect in the future that's different from the current Federal Registered Notice? So, I think that sort of is looking towards the future. How is any potential policy change that could result in this process

going to be made, and then what's the process for us to engage with the public through that? So, you know if we can imagine a scenario where we need to update, as a result of a recommendation, we decide that we're going to change something in our NEPA National Environmental Policy Act order, we would go through the process of updating that order. That's FAA order 1050.1F, and there's a public involvement process built into an update to that order where we would do an engagement process; we would coordinate with accounts White House Council on Environmental Quality; we go through whatever process is needed if we had to update a regulation; we would have to go through the notice and comment rulemaking process which includes public participation, as well. So, we don't know exactly what changes we'll make as I said, and we don't know how the changes will be implemented, but we do know that there will be sort of future opportunities for public participation in the various potential ways we could implement. What we're going to do is review the comments and input that we receive as quickly as we can, but we also want to give ourselves time to review all of the comments that we get to make sure that we read all of them and consider the input that's being provided; that could take a fair bit of time depending on how much input we get. So please understand that we don't know yet how much feedback we're going to get, and that really will be what drives the pace and how things progress. I think that largely covers that question. Did anyone else have anything to add on that one?

No? Okay let's see, here's a question. I guess I'll take this one, as well. Why are we not including or excluding part 36 from this review? So part 36 is our noise certification standards for new and modified designs of civil aircraft, and they're codified in 14 CFR part 36. We're not intending to consider changes to those regulations in the Noise Policy Review because that's not really consistent with the goals that we already



discussed about the Noise Policy Review. Our noise control measures have been successful in reducing the amount of noise produced by airplanes operating in U.S. airspace over the last six decades. Aircraft have gotten much quieter, and for example, the noise produced from one flight by a Boeing 707 200 jet, which was a typical commercial aircraft that was flying in 1957, is roughly equivalent to the noise produced from thirty 737-800's that's typical today, and I guess the last part on this is we do a lot of our standard setting work at the UN's international body called the International Civil Aviation Organization. That is a place where we set up or usually establish standards for noise on civil aircraft. So that's the process that we would typically set those, and then we would promulgate the rules through notice and comment rulemaking domestically. Adam, next question for you. What is the reasoning behind the consideration of using a multi-hour or day metric?

[Adam Scholten@01:23:06]

Thanks, Don. That's a great question. There's a few different reasonings for that, but we know that when using the metric that we currently have, which is DNL, you know that's over a 24-hour period which is something that can be easily spoken to like a day. It's easily quantifiable quantity. We also look at an average annual day with DNL which is taking into account annual operations and putting that into what is considered a representative day. So it's something that you know can speak to a period of time that can be quantified relatively easily from the standpoint of you can say on an average day what the noise exposure is going to be, but we understand that the benefit of using DNL is it takes into account not only just the duration of the noise events but also the intensity and frequency and also takes into account the fact too there is a weighting, a 10 times operational penalty that's applied to operations that occur during the nighttime

hours; meaning one operation during the hours from 10 P.M to 7 A.M counts as 10 to account for increased sensitivity to noise during the night time. So, that's kind of the reasoning behind using that metric, but that doesn't mean that as we go through this policy review we aren't going to look at other time periods or averaging schemes and use either in conjunction with DNL or with other metrics. Earlier in the webinar one of the things that was mentioned in the presentation that started was talking about like an Leq or an equivalent sound level and using something like a school hour day or an eight-hour day or the time period when children are in school. So, as part of this policy review, we're looking to expand beyond potentially using something that's a day or a multi-hour metric, and we're considering all other kinds of different averaging schemes and ways to incorporate those into the calculations and metrics that may be less than a day, maybe an hour, maybe eight hours. That's really one of the things that we're seeking feedback on. Also using a single metric, we're also open to looking at using different kinds of metric in conjunction with a supplement to or even as a replacement for DNL. So, the reasoning behind that is it's something that is a regularly quantifiable period, but we are looking at using other time periods and other metrics as part of this review and really interested in feedback on that.

[Don Scata@01:25:52]

Thanks, Adam. Ryan, we haven't heard from you in a while so I'm gonna see if you mind taking on the next question. What is a rough timeline for when any new metrics could be put into use? The person's curious if it's one to two years, three to five years, or eight to ten years or probably anything in between. Wouldn't (*you have*) any idea which one of those is most likely?

[Ryan Weller@01:26:11]

Yeah, you know as the years wise go, I'm not going to be able to guess on that. As the process unfolds, we're going to be, you know, the next step in this process is obviously going through all the comments and coming up with kind of a proposal, and that proposal is going to be like the other panelists have mentioned. It could be different metrics; it could be different thresholds; it could be just different disclosure mechanisms. You know, requirements for posting things differently on websites, or providing different information to different groups. I mean it's gonna be a broad spectrum of comments we get back in which is, I think, great because we're trying to figure out and find the best solution to this to say okay what we have today if we're going to change it, how could we improve that, and so it's going to be drafting this kind of revision piece which is kind of our NEPA process, and then the part 150 process, and then there's a number of steps that we have to go through after that which is kind of the formal process of going to the DOT, Department of Transportation, and also going to the Council for Environmental Quality which is a White House kind of entity; so that you know it sounds like there's a lot, and there are a lot, but we have to; it's mandated by law for us to do these things; so, we're going to be having to kind of jump through this process, and then eventually we'll get to a point of having this publication of a revised policy. If that's the outcome. And at that point, and probably earlier, we're going to have places for input that the public and whoever else out there, interested stakeholders, can come in and provide those comments, and then at some point there'll be a publication of kind of a final publication or procedure or whatever it is at the end of it. So, it sounds long and complicated. It probably is, but it's kind of those required steps that we have to do to get to this point. This is a big deal for the FAA uh, and for I mean me personally I/we've been working with DNL for years and years, and so to think about a policy change that

changes the threshold or changes how you analyze these changes is a really big complicated issue, and you know we understand that there's been a lot of frustration about how things have been done in the past, but what I would encourage everyone to do is say okay well you know there's some things that were done in the past, and I think we've heard we can't really go back in the past, but how do we move forward with this to make this a better process so that I might not be happy with the answer, but maybe I'm better informed by the answer if that's your case, or hey, I think it would be better, this other metric I've heard about. I've done a little research; I think this sounds better, or I would like to be informed more often in a different means than I was informed before. Those are the kinds of inputs that we really want to hear, and I think that those are the kinds of things that are productive and helpful and getting a good policy moving forward. So, thanks.

[Don Scata@01:29:30]

Did you want to add something (*addressed to Andrew*)

[Andrew Brooks]

Yeah, no, I appreciate that, Don, and I think Ryan conveyed the complexity that we're facing moving forward with this process. I think one other difficulty or two other difficulties associated with being more definitive in the time frame is it's really dependent upon the types of recommendation that this process ultimately comes down with. If it's more disclosure, more policy type elements, those may be able to be implemented relatively quicker; whereas, if we're looking to update our orders, that goes through a more involved process, or if we're looking to update regulations, that's an even more involved process, and some of those things do take some time to navigate through. So that's one consideration. The second consideration is that this standard is not just used

by the FAA in terms of federal government. There are other federal agencies that use this standard, as well, and we're working with the federal agency partners on the various interagency committees on noise and on aircraft noise to have those conversations about what these changes mean not only for us but for potentially follow-through ramifications for them, as well, and those conversations certainly are going to take some time, as well. So, we understand the urgency, and we're working to implement as quickly as we can, but we do have these established frameworks that we do need to navigate. So, thank you, Don, for allowing me to give some additional thoughts on them.

[Don Scata@01:31:04]

Yeah, you bet. I guess the last thing that I don't think I heard either of you say is when it comes to new metrics we have the ability now in our in NEPA procedures to use metrics more than DNL - supplemental metrics. So, depending on where we go, and what sort of outcomes we have, we have some flexibility to very quickly start using some of the metrics that may come out of this process as being recommended as in a supplemental way as we have sort of for disclosure as we work to do the things that Ryan and Andrew mentioned regarding updating our policy. Okay, let's see. Sorry, just want to make sure I don't miss a question. Adam, I think this next one's for you, and it's on metrics again. The public gave information about alternative metrics in response to our 2021 Federal Register Notice talking about our noise research. Why didn't FAA create a proposal based on those comments about alternative metrics and provide a proposal for the public to comment on rather than asking for information that this commenter says was already provided?

[Adam Scholten@01:32:24]

That's a really good question, and the Federal Register Notice that was provided in 2021 was on our research portfolio which included the results of the Neighborhood Environmental Survey which we, I think, all know that found that in general more people are annoyed by aircraft noise, and that survey is the major reason why you know we're initiating this Noise Policy Review, but that Federal Register Notice really was asking for comments on what our research portfolio was, and the overwhelming number of comments we received were to do something and initiate this process to make a change, and although there were some comments that were submitted on different types of alternative metrics and some proposals submitted for potentially how we may want to change our policy, that wasn't really the focus of that particular FRN. It was on our research. So, we wanted to have this FRN; (*it*) is part of the process to make that focus specifically on consideration of some proposals maybe that we should consider, and what our stakeholders feel they would like to see in our policy review given that; although, we did receive some comments and proposals on the last FRN giving our research, that wasn't really the focus of it. So, we wanted to provide another opportunity and an opportunity to more folks who maybe didn't realize that you know maybe they felt that they should have commented on that FRN because that really wasn't necessarily the topic of the FRN at the time, but give them the opportunity to do that. And, again, it doesn't mean that comments that we received from the prior FRN we are not going to consider regarding alternative metrics, and how those may be used in terms of commenting on a research portfolio, but there really wasn't the focus of that FRN, and we just wanted to provide an ample opportunity for folks to have input and proposals, and you know 2021 wasn't a long time ago either, but you know research is constantly evolving; there's been new studies that have come out, for example, and

that's one of the things we're looking at is input on health and economics research, and what else should we use in addition to the NES to shape our noise policy, and is annoyance the sole thing that we should be looking at which is really what the NES focused on. So, although we did receive some feedback on some potential options given the last FRN regarding our research. That wasn't the focus of that FRN, and we just want to make the opportunity to all to have the offer, and really focus on this effort in changing our policy and what suggestions could be out there.

[Don Scata@01:35:09]

Yeah, Adam, that's a great answer. I think it was a choice that we made because we very much value and want feedback from all of our stakeholders on the direction we should take as opposed to providing a policy suggestion and getting reactions to that. We really at this point haven't made a decision and are really interested in hearing feedback from all of our stakeholders on the direction that we should take. Let's see. Ryan, it looks like I've got a couple coming up for you as a heads up. First one is can you explain the process for environmental review for an airspace change and when and how the community may be involved in that process?

[Ryan Weller]

Sure, so the airspace changes are occurring on a very regular basis, and when I say that it's about every 56 days or so we have publications of changes. A lot of the changes we have involved with airspace are air traffic related in that criteria, or the requirements, let's just say, maybe were updated, and we have to adjust some of the routes that are existing, and so that's kind of a constant. It's almost like a maintenance process that we go through with that, but as far as the environmental review that happens prior to any of those changes, there's an environmental; NEPA is, if it's a major

change, then we would go through our NEPA process which we would do an evaluation of a number of categories-noise being one of them. Obviously, that's the topic we're talking about today, but we go through a number of other categories: environmental justice, air quality, a lot of the NEPA categories, and come to a conclusion, and we issue our environmental review document that could be a categorical exclusion, that could be an environmental assessment, or an environmental impact statement. So those are kind of the three levels of environmental review. So as far as the public is involved the larger changes are often included in an environmental assessment, and the environmental assessment has a public involvement component of it where we go out with our draft environmental review that's provided to the public, provided to everyone, and there's an opportunity for comments to be brought in very similar to what we're doing in this no noise initiative, by the way, and I think one commenter I saw a little while ago said you know this sounds a lot like NEPA, and it kind of is. This environmental process kind of parallels a lot of what we're doing here for this noise policy, but we go through those processes, too, to get to a conclusion, and that's all done prior to the point of actually issuing the change, and so there's a lot of environmental review that's done before, and I think part of the question they're asking is how does the community get involved, and you know the areas that I've seen the most successful at is really having kind of a regional look at it. When you have an issue a lot of times I've heard maybe a neighborhood or community say well you can just move it over here, and that sometimes becomes a problem because there usually are other people living over here or other resources, and so what we like to do is say you know I mentioned round tables before, and I think comment came back well not all areas have round tables, and I totally understand that, and that's absolutely true, but I



think there's a lot of opportunities through the airports themselves to work with the communities to come back and say hey we think we have a solution here that would be helpful, and that's one way that the community can really get involved is if getting involved with the round table if not with the local airport to be able to kind of come together to say we think we have a solution that's kind of mutually agreeable upon all the folks that are affected here, and we've seen some really good success stories with that in the past where that has come together. Just saying move it over there a lot of times ends up not being as productive a process.

So, let's see; do I think I may have another question here. I think it's in regards to can an FAA consultant be made available to the public to help articulate their comments? So, we, as the FAA, cannot provide necessarily a consultant to folks out there that would like to have that. We encourage, if there are consultants out there that are working with maybe existing groups or whatever, they can certainly provide that support to them, and provide comments, and I think that kind of lends itself to the way the questions, and I know that there's a lot of comments about how technical those questions are, in the notice that went out, and I think you know what we found is that there's a very highly educated group out there that are going to be providing very technical questions, and a lot of them are consultants, and so that's where some of those high technical questions were presented because we knew there would be consultants and other really highly technical experts out there that would want to provide that level of detail which is good for us in the process, too, but we also encourage those folks out there to provide your experience and how you think it could be improved. If you think it could be better presented to you in a different fashion, or

maybe in a different method, that's really what we're looking for. So, I think we've kind of talked about that.

I know there's been a lot of interest about some of the existing projects that are out there. We have a number of them in the west that I can think of that are still ongoing, and certainly some of the methods for communication, if we get a lot of good comments, I think we could integrate that in some of our ongoing environmental reviews that are occurring. I know there's one at Burbank right now, and that's certainly a very active and very ongoing project where the public is going to have an opportunity to provide their comments, and that will be at the draft environmental assessments, and that's the place where we want to have comments come in, and we want to hear from folks, and we want to see if there's some other means that we can provide that information. It's a complicated process, like I said before. There's a lot of dependencies upon the air traffic structure in Southern California. I mentioned the domino effect when you touch one you end up touching eight or ten other procedures and how does that impact all of them. So it's certainly something that if it was easy I think we would have done it, but it's a complicated process, and I'll just say that environmental review is occurring, and it's very active, and it will have opportunities for the public to provide comments in the near future.

[Don Scata@01:42:32]

Okay thanks, Ryan, and I think that's a great invitation. I think it's important to clarify we're not asking for people to make project-specific comments in the federal docket for this notice, but you're saying that there will be opportunities for each of those projects coming up where they could make comments such as the Burbank draft environmental assessment stage. So just to be clear that would be the place. If you

have comments, you'd want to direct them into the project specific process; is that right?

Yeah you're nodding.

[Ryan Weller]

Yeah, absolutely.

[Don Scata]

Yeah, thanks. Let's see, I think next one up can be for Adam. At least you can start, Adam. What is the FAA's perspective on DNL 65 being let's see at 12.3 percent annoyed for Schultz and DNL 46 at 12.3 percent annoyed for the Neighborhood Environmental Survey?

[Adam Scholten@01:43:26]

Thanks, Don. Well looking at the Schultz curve and DNL 65 and how the agency arrived at that number there were a lot of factors. One of the things to consider is that arriving at the DNL 65 threshold simply wasn't based purely on annoyance and the Schultz curve. It was also based on a lot of other factors including work that had been done by the Environmental Protection Agency in the 1970s and in various Federal interagency committees that have dealt with noise and continue to meet with noise now as we have the FICAN which meets currently, but DNL 65 was arrived at not simply based on the Schultz curve but based largely on some EPA recommendations that were made in the levels and the science at the time that was not only just based on auditory effects and research and into the health impacts which was pretty limited at that time, but also the feasibility, technically and economically, for not just the FAA, but other federal agencies, to implement a noise significance threshold, and so DNL 65 was chosen based on a variety of factors; part of which was just the feasibility to implement it - both in a technical and economical perspective and the tools that were available to

even do the noise modeling at the time, and then looking at the Schultz curve and the annoyance research at the time and taking into account all those factors that's kind of where we arrived at with DNL 65, and looking at the Schultz curve, the 12.3 percent highly annoyed. Now we've done the NES, and we found that people are generally more annoyed at much lower noise levels than what the Schultz curve found, and there's a lot of reasons for that. The Schultz curve was done many years ago; it also dealt with multiple, different transportation noise sources; it wasn't just specific to aviation where the NES was. So, now we're taking a look at reevaluating that policy, and the fact that people are just generally more highly annoyed at multiple different noise levels, and not just looking at annoyance, but also as we noted in the FRN we're interested how we should take into account various health and economic impacts research that's come out and continues to come out that is to help to improve our understanding of noise impacts.

[Don Scata@01:46:09]

Thanks, Adam. Let's see, Andrew, I think next one can go for you. It's more of a comment than a question, but I'll read you what we heard just to be clear on the need for an extension on the comment period. Most aviation round tables meet periodically. The SFO community round table only meet six times per year; other round tables meet quarterly. Public entities, such as round tables, can't take a position, like a public comment, except at regularly noticed public meetings. Because of round table meeting spacing 90 days between meetings may completely disenfranchise many round tables and their constituents. So, do you have any thoughts or comments you can add to that on the response?

[Andrew Brooks@01:46:51]

Sure, Don. Thank you, and certainly understand the concern and comments that were made in the past about coordinating through round table for common submission were not, by any means, meant to indicate that that would be the only way that we would recognize comments. It was just a suggestion for folks. Certainly though the round tables may meet every two to three months, there are still opportunities to communicate with the other members on the round table in the interim and have those conversations to help inform individual comments outside of a round table context is an avenue that that can be taken for folks that may be seeking additional technical knowledge or to share expertise uh with regard to common submission. That being said, certainly any request for a common period extension, should one be made, should be made through the docket and would be considered. So we encourage you to do that. The docket that's been previously mentioned: the docket's available on the website <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>. So, if there is an intention to make requests for comment period extension, and I did see a couple of those float through the Q&A's prior, please ensure that they're submitted formally on the record. Thank you, Don.

[Don Scata@01:48:16]

Thanks, Andrew. Next question. Let's see, I'm not sure if it's best for Ryan or Adam to answer. So I'll let you all decide. Recently the FAA joined Massport and MIT for a Logan Airport AIRNAV study, and after four years the public was told we can't do that for almost all of the ideas that would help to disperse aviation noise more fairly across the region. What does FAA now know about the use of alternative and companion metrics for regulatory purposes that it can't do? Please tell us now, not after four more years.

So, Adam Ryan, you're not sure which one?

[Ryan Weller]

Yeah, I guess I'm not super familiar with that specific project, and I'm not sure if we're going to talk about specific project-related issues here, but I can say as far as what we're doing with the noise policy and this initiative as we move forward with environmental reviews and analysis it's intended to improve that process so that we are providing the right amount of information, in the right format, and the right metrics. So this is that opportunity to influence where we can possibly change how we analyze those changes, airspace changes that are being proposed, and then possibly being able to understand in a better way why those changes are occurring or are not occurring. So, I think in a roundabout way we're not specifically talking about this project up at Massport, but providing input in this process is going to help all those future projects to be able to improve them and improve the communication moving forward. I don't know if you want to add anything to that.

[Adam Scholten]

No I don't have much to add to that other than just that the study that MIT did there is some things that we did learn from that project. There's a lot of research they did behind that project looking at alternative metrics and how airspace changes would/could potentially change looking at different metrics, and we support and fund a lot of research that MIT is involved with through the aviation sustainability center for the environment, or ASCENT, and they're looking at a variety of different things and different metrics and that sort of thing is our ongoing research and there's always new research coming out. So, I guess in terms of what we know now that we didn't necessarily know four years ago, I can't point to anything specifically, but we're

constantly reviewing research that comes out and using that to help inform where we're headed in this Noise Policy Review, and that's one of the things we're really seeking feedback on is the body of research that we consider for looking at how we should use potential other metrics and thresholds, and what other data we should use to help inform that decision.

[Don Scata@01:51:17]

Thank you, Ryan and Adam. Next question I'll take. What's the point of submitting comments when we all consistently say that nothing's going to change current conditions? The best way to answer that question is we're in the context of us trying to be really transparent about what's possible through this review. We've said from the beginning and that the scope is focused on the foundational elements of our noise policy, and that's metrics and thresholds, and the way that will play out is it'll have the potential to affect looking forward maybe the level of review or the sort of alternatives that are considered and how future decisions are made. That's different than saying if we change a metric or a threshold, there's an instantaneous reduction in noise somewhere in a specific location around the country. So the reason one would want us to make comments is they want to have input into the future decision we'll be taking on how to modify our policy with the understanding that that future decision could have impacts on other future environmental reviews or updates to our regulations.

Anything else? No? Okay, let's see. Next up, Andrew. Will 14 CFR part 150 be updated based on the outcome of this process?

[Andrew Brooks@01:52:37]

Thank you, Don. It's too early to say. It certainly is within the realm of potentiality. Depends on the recommendations associated with the Noise Policy

Review and review of all the input considered from the stakeholders. Certainly, the one aspect that we're definitely looking for feedback on would be anything pertaining to compatibility or significance thresholds. Currently our NEPA significance threshold correlates with our land use compatibility threshold. The land use compatibility threshold is established by 14 CFR part 150. So, the degree to which that would change it could potentially lead to an update to the regulations. As I mentioned before, that would require a rulemaking process which would take some time to go through, but time should not be the factor for consideration on that recommendation. If it is a worthwhile effort, we certainly will proceed with that.

So, Don, if I may, I think if I could clarify a previous answer I gave because I did see some questions regarding the request for the comment extension. I mentioned comments via the docket. You can also submit a request for extension to the email. Either one of those options will make sure that we get a formal request for consideration (during) the comment period. So I just want to clarify that as well as there was a question on that. So I appreciate it, Don. Thank you.

[Don Scata@01:54:08]

You bet and you're right. Both ways work. If you, I think sending it to the email address you'll get a response from us at least acknowledging the receipt versus on the docket it'll just be posted online. So just keep that in mind for folks.

Let's see, Adam. How does the FAA define communities in vicinity of airports versus overflight communities which are outside the DNL 65 dB contour?

[Adam Scholten@01:54:46]

That's a great question, and the phrase overflight communities is actually in the request for comment and the companion framing paper, and what that's referring to is



communities that are located under the flight paths of aircraft and vehicles that are distressed by aircraft noise and located outside the DNL 65 dB contour. So basically the communities that are being overflowed by aircraft but aren't necessarily right next to the airport, and then communities in the vicinity of airports are generally communities that are more closely located to an airport in terms of geographical terms, and they may be, but they may not necessarily be located in the DNL 65 contour. So, there's a lot of airports around the country that the DNL 65 dB contour actually doesn't leave airport property, but there's still folks that are residing near that airport. So those would be considered in the vicinity of the airport. Not to say that both the overflight and vicinity communities are not both near an airport. It's just the type of environment that they're dealing with is a little bit different as opposed to more aircraft over flights at greater distances from the airport as opposed to being closer into the airport. Neither of which necessarily has to be within the DNL 65 Contour, although, they may be.

[Andrew Brooks@01:56:16]

Don, if I can add on to that.

[Don Scata]

Yeah.

[Andrew Brooks]

So I think to build off what Adam was saying is that those overflight communities are in acknowledgment of the increase in the number of complaints that we've received further afield from the airport itself. During the presentation Don shared a slide depicting areas where complaints occurred around Boston Logan, and the depiction indicated that some of those were much farther afield than the contours that were depicted. So in the current environment, our compatibility threshold is 65 DNL and that

would be reflected in the contours. So this is an attempt to acknowledge those communities that receive overflights that are currently considered compatible, yet as we've shown, do have a prevalence of complaints associated with aircraft overflights. So, thank you.

[Don Scata]

Great. Thank you both. Ryan what feedback have community engagement officers or ombudsman shared about Community engagement desired by communities?

[Ryan Weller@01:57:22]

So, these folks, we've got quite a few of them. The community engagement officers are working hand-in-hand with the regional administrators' offices, and these are regionalized folks that really know the airports, know the concerns, and are embedded in a lot of the round tables as participants or subject matter experts, and so we, as in the environmental review group, oftentimes, and it's part of our process really, is working with these community engagement officers because one of the things we have to consider in our environmental review is extraordinary circumstances, and one of them is public controversy based upon environmental grounds, and so that's a key component of our environmental review process is to evaluate that, and say is there or is there not this category of extraordinary circumstances. So, I think they were brought in probably five or six years ago, the community engagement officers, and like I said, they are the local experts that know and interact and are involved and really understand the local, individualized areas where the concerns. In our environmental review we rely upon them heavily to provide us that local input on whether there are concerns in certain areas.

[Don Scata@01:59:00]

So thanks, Ryan. All right, let's see is a question I could take on. Is EPA providing feedback to the FAA on new metrics or DNL levels? I mentioned this during a response I think to an earlier question. We're participating or engaging in discussions with other federal agencies through the federal interagency committee on aviation noise which is called FICAN. The EPA, HUD, DoD, NASA, you know. all the agencies that have civil noise equities participate, and we're coordinating with them, and briefing them on developments and seeking input from them throughout this process, and we'll continue to do so. So, the answer to that question is they have the opportunities.

Okay it looks like it's three o'clock. So I think we're about to wrap up. Thank you for joining us today. We hope this presentation and our responses to your questions have been helpful in addressing those questions. Please submit any comments you'd like, formal comments, to our docket on <https://www.regulations.gov> using docket number FAA-2023-0855.

Due to time constraints we weren't able to get to all relevant questions. Some questions were asked and answered several times. If you joined us part way through this webinar the recording will be posted online at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview> and on our YouTube channel. We invite you to join us as you're available to. Our other webinars we have scheduled over the next two weeks. We'll be here answering your questions on May 18<sup>th</sup>, May 23<sup>rd</sup>, and May 25<sup>th</sup> at various times. You can find those details at <https://www.faa.gov/noisepolicyreview>.

Thank you again to the panelists for being here to answer questions, and for all of you for participating. Have a good day.

(Fin)