


FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

**RECORD OF APPROVAL
14 CFR PART 150
NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM**

**Southwest Florida International Airport
Ft. Myers, Florida**



Regional Counsel, ASO-7



CONCUR

NONCONCUR

1st April 2014

Date



Airports Division Manager
Southern Region



APPROVED

DISAPPROVED

4/3/2014

Date

RECORD OF APPROVAL
Southwest Florida International Airport (RSW)
Ft. Myers, Florida

The Southwest Florida International Airport (RSW or Airport), Ft. Myers, Florida developed a Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) that describes current and future land uses based on the parameters established in Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 150, Airport Noise Compatibility Planning. The NCP is an update to RSW's existing program, which the FAA most recently approved in 2006. It consists of 16 new program measures, including ten operational measures, one land use measure, and five program management measures for which RSW seeks Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval. Additionally, the NCP contains 14 existing program measures, previously approved by the FAA, that will remain in place. The 2006 Record of Approval identifying these existing program measures is attached to this document as Attachment "A".

This NCP was submitted subsequent to a determination by the FAA that associated Noise Exposure Maps (NEM) for RSW were in compliance with applicable requirements of 14 CFR Part 150, effective February 8, 2013, the same date the determination was published in the Federal Register.

The measures listed in the body of this Record of Approval (ROA) are those for which RSW has requested FAA approval. FAA approval indicates only that the actions would, if implemented, be consistent with the purposes of 14 CFR Part 150. The FAA has provided technical advice and assistance to the Airport to ensure that the operational elements are feasible (see 14 CFR 150.23(c)). Nevertheless, approval of a measure does not constitute FAA funding commitments or decisions to implement that measure. The FAA will make funding eligibility determinations as funds are requested. Later decisions concerning possible implementation of measures in this ROA will be subject to all applicable environmental compliance and other procedures and requirements including, but not limited to, the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

There follows a summary of the proposed operational, land use control, and program management measures identified in the NCP followed by the FAA's action for each. Each measure contains a cross-reference to the NCP. The summaries are derived from the NCP and do not represent the opinions or decisions of the FAA. The Disapproval for Purposes of Part 150 of any measure listed below does not prohibit the Airport Sponsor from implementing such measure outside of the Part 150 process.

Attachment "B" to this ROA contains Public Comments that were received by the FAA during the regulatory 60-day public comment period that started on October 21, 2013 as a result of the FAA publishing a Federal Register Notice advising of the beginning of the formal 180-day NCP review period. FAA's responses to these public comments are also contained in Attachment "B". FAA fully considered the public comments received in the development of this ROA.

OPERATIONAL MEASURES

OP-1. Promote Use of RNAV Visual Optimized Profile Descent (OPD) to Runway 06

RSW requests that the Airport, the FAA, and various stakeholders including air carriers continue to promote the use of the RNAV Visual OPD procedures at RSW highlighting the benefits of fuel efficiency and noise reduction to surrounding communities (p. 11-5; fig. 11.1 and 11.2).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

OP-2. Initiate RNAV Optimized Profile Descent Further From the Airport

RSW requests that the Airport, working with the FAA, continue to explore the feasibility of implementing new RNAV OPD arrival technology that will allow aircraft to initiate continuous descent arrivals further from the Airport, thereby remaining higher over noise sensitive areas including the Estero Corridor (p.11-9; fig. 11.1 and 11.3).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

OP-3. Raise the Downwind Altitude to Runway 06

RSW requests that the Airport, working with the RSW air traffic control tower (ATCT), determine if raising the altitude of the south downwind leg is feasible from a safety and efficiency standpoint. RSW also requests that the Airport continue to work with the FAA to develop arrival procedures that will take advantage of optimized profile descents or continuous descent approaches so that aircraft minimize leveling off at low altitude over residential areas during arrival operations (p. 11-9; pp. 4-1 – 4-19; p. 5-1 - 5-11; figs. 4.1 - 4.4; 5.1, 5.2, and 5.5 - 5.10).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

OP-4. Shift Downwind Flight Track to the South

RSW requests that with the completion of the new south parallel runway at RSW (Runway 06R-24L) the south downwind leg be shifted approximately one mile further south because of both an operational need and a reduction to population impacts from aircraft overflights (p. 11-17 and 11-18).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

OP-5. Publish Charted Visual Approach to Runway 06 from the North and South

RSW requests that the Airport, working with the FAA, publish a charted visual approach procedure for Runway 06 to maximize routing of aircraft over compatible land uses when conditions permit; and also allow for aircraft that are not capable of flying the RNAV Visual OPD to follow a similar track (p. 11-18; fig. 11.5).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

OP-6. Keep Aircraft at 3,000 ft. Over Fort Myers Beach

RSW requests that the Airport, working with the FAA, explore the feasibility of raising the altitude of aircraft arriving over Fort Myers Beach to Runway 06 to 3,000 ft. by increasing the ILS intercept altitude for the ILS to Runway 06, increasing the altitude of aircraft at TROPC, creating a step down procedure, or some combination thereof (pp. 11-21 – 11-24; fig. 11.6; tables 11.4 and 11.5; app. C and app. S).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

Note: This measure is currently being performed outside of the Part 150 process.

OP-7. Delay Point at which Aircraft Lower the Landing Gear

RSW requests that the Airport work with air carriers to make sure they are aware of noise sensitive areas around the Airport to reduce impacts associated with early dropping of landing gear on approach (p. 11-25).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

OP-8. Increase Altitude of Early Morning Arrivals

RSW requests that the Airport work with the FAA and air carriers to increase awareness of noise concerns in efforts to keep aircraft higher when arriving to the Airport during early morning hours (p. 11-25).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

OP-9. Change Runway 24 to Preferred Runway From 10:00 PM – 6:00 AM

RSW requests that the Airport, working with RSW ATCT and air carriers who routinely operate at RSW, establish Runway 24 as the voluntary preferential arrival runway from 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM local time when Airport operational and weather conditions permit (p. 11-25 and 11-26; fig. 11.7).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour.

Note: This measure is currently being performed outside of the Part 150 process.

OP-10. Modify CSHEL FOUR Departure Procedure

RSW requests that the Airport work with the RSW ATCT to explore the advantages of having aircraft climb out at a speed of 220 knots, and once passing the MAPUL Intersection and upon leaving 3,000 ft.MSL, to avoid conflicts at FMY, make their right turns direct to CSHEL. This would keep aircraft on their current course south of Fiddlesticks, but allow the better performing aircraft to turn before reaching The Forest community, therefore not increasing overflights over the Fiddlesticks community, and reducing overflights over The Forest, as shown in NCP Figure 11.10. This procedure would also reduce aircraft flight path distance and possibly fuel burn (p. 11-29 – 11-32; figs. 11.8 – 11.0; table 11.6).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The analysis in the NCP does not demonstrate the measure's noise benefits on the DNL 65 dB contour,

Note: This measure is currently being performed outside of the Part 150 process.

LAND USE MEASURES

LU-1. Airport Overlay Zone Update

RSW requests that the Airport and Lee County update the current Airport Noise Overlay Zones consistent with the goals and objectives of local government for long term land use compatibility with activities at RSW (p. 12-11; figs. 12.2 – 12.4; Appendix P).

FAA Action: Disapproved for purposes of Part 150. The local jurisdiction has adopted a local standard lower than the Federal standard that defines incompatible land uses below DNL 65 dB. However, the recommended noise overlay zones are not based on either of the “official Noise Exposure Maps” accepted by the FAA in this study. The Federal government has no authority to control current or future local land use designations. The local jurisdictions have the authority to pursue their own proposed land use controls and enact the proposed Noise Overlay Zoning without FAA approval. Below the 65 DNL contour, FAA as a matter of policy encourages local efforts to prevent new noncompatible development immediately abutting the 65 DNL contour and to provide a buffer for possible growth in noise beyond the forecast period. Therefore, FAA’s disapproval should not be interpreted as minimizing or negating the efforts of local jurisdictions to provide prudent planning.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT MEASURES

PM-1. Noise Compatibility Program Management

Recommendation: RSW requests that the LCPA manage the implementation of the NCP measures contained in the NCP (p. 13-2).

FAA Action: Approved.

PM-2. Update Noise Program as Mandated by Lee County Plan

RSW requests that LCPA staff routinely examine operating characteristics at RSW to determine if significant changes have occurred that would require an update to the NEMs. If a significant change has occurred, then the NEMs should be updated. The NCP should be updated every five years as designated in the Lee County Comprehensive Plan (p.13-2).

FAA Action: Approved.

PM-3. Noise Forums with RSW Air Traffic Control

RSW requests that the LCPA meet with RSW ATC on a quarterly or yearly basis to address concerns raised by both parties and to explore potential solutions that can be beneficial for all Airport stakeholders (p. 13-3).

FAA Action: Approved.

PM-4. Develop a Jeppesen Insert on Noise Abatement Programs at RSW

RSW requests that the Airport voluntarily work with RSW ATCT, air carrier station managers, and the FAA to publish Jeppesen Type pilot handouts notifying pilots of the noise abatement measures in place at RSW for better awareness and compliance of preferred measures (p. 13-3).

FAA Action: Approved

PM-5. Install Runway End and Noise Abatement Reminder Signs

RSW requests approval to install noise abatement reminder signs at the end of each runway in an effort to create pilot awareness of the noise sensitivity of the communities in proximity to RSW (pp. 13-3 and 13-4).

FAA Action: Approved. Signage must not be construed as mandatory air traffic procedures. Prior to purchase and installation, signage must be reviewed and approved by the FAA outside of the Part 150 process.

ATTACHMENT “A”

2006 RSW RECORD OF APPROVAL

**RECORD OF APPROVAL
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
FORT MYERS, FLORIDA**

The approvals listed herein include approvals of actions that the airport recommends be taken by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). It should be noted that these approvals indicate only that the actions would, if implemented, be consistent with the purposes of Part 150. The FAA has provided technical advice and assistance to the airport to ensure that the operational elements are feasible (see 14 CFR 150.23(c)). These approvals do not constitute decisions to implement the actions. Later decisions concerning possible implementation of measures in this ROA will be subject to applicable environmental or other procedures or requirements, including Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

The operational and land use control measures below summarize as closely as possible the airport operator's recommendations in the Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) and are cross-referenced to the program. The statements contained within the summarized operational and land use control measures and before the indicated FAA approval, disapproval, or other determination do not represent the opinions or decisions of the FAA.

OPERATIONAL MEASURES

1. Continue Existing Operational Noise Mitigation Procedures Except Procedure # 6.

This measure is to continue nine of ten existing voluntary operational Noise Mitigation Procedures in place. Benefits of these existing measures are summarized at Table 11-3:

1. Preferential Runway Use Program-Runway 6 is the preferred runway when the wind, weather, and activity permit.
2. Visual Approaches-Turbojet aircraft will normally be vectored to intercept the extended runway centerline seven miles or more from the end of the runway (as activity levels permit). Aircraft on the right downwind leg to Runway 6 or left downwind to Runway 24 will normally be kept above 5000 feet until they are abeam the Airport. Aircraft arriving to Runway 6 and intercepting the extended centerline over the Gulf of Mexico west of Fort Myers Beach should remain above 3,000 feet, if able, to reduce the noise over Fort Myers Beach.
3. "Keep 'em High"-The Airport participates in the "Keep 'em High" program, and turbojet aircraft are encouraged to keep as high as possible.
4. Properly equipped turbojet aircraft departing Runway 24 are encouraged to use the MAPUL-1 Standard Instrument Departure (SID) that is pending implementation by the FAA.

5. Runway 24 turbojet departures that are not properly equipped to follow the MAPUL-1 SID should request the Alico Three Departure SID.
7. Propeller aircraft should reference AOPA's recommended noise abatement procedures.
8. Turbojet business aircraft should use either the aircraft manufacturer's recommended noise Abatement Procedures, the NBAA's Approach and Landing Procedure (VFR and IFR), or Standard Departure Procedure.
9. Commercial aircraft should follow the Distant Noise Abatement Departure Profile as defined by FAA Advisory Circular AC91-53A.
10. At no time shall engines be run up for test or maintenance purposes between 2300 hours (11:00 PM) and 0600 hours (6:00 AM) without prior approval from the Executive Director or his/her representative.

(NCP, pages 11-2 thru 11-3; Exhibits 11-1; and Table 11-3)

FAA Action: Approved as a continuation of the voluntary measures in place, subject to traffic, weather, and airspace safety and efficiency. The FAA approved these measures submitted in previous Part 150 studies (1990, 1995) as demonstrating noise mitigating benefits at the airport. They place aircraft over less noise-sensitive corridors and keep aircraft at higher altitudes over noise-sensitive sites.

2. Modify Existing Noise Mitigation Procedure # 6; Runway 6 Departure Procedure

This measure is to modify Existing Operational Noise Mitigation Procedure number 6 (Runway 6 Departure Procedure). The existing measure 6 states "Runway 6 departures will be held on tower frequency until crossing departure end of runway and will be turned no further west than 350 degrees until they are five miles from the airport." The NCP recommends that the noise abatement procedure be modified to use RSW 2.7 DME to demarcate the turn for Northbound turbojet aircraft departing on Runway 6. The procedure would provide "For turbojet aircraft, no turns before RSW 2.7 DME unless directed by air traffic control". A lighted sign would also be added to the Runway 6 departure end once FAA determines where the turning point is located. The modified procedure should be included in an updated pilot briefing handout. (NCP, pages 11-2 thru 11-3).

FAA Action: Continuation of the voluntary measure in place is approved. Modifications to the procedure are disapproved for purposes of part 150, pending submission of additional information to demonstrate noise benefits. The existing measure, approved by the FAA in earlier Part 150 studies, is intended to move overflights from the school.

3. Purchase and Install Flight Tracking Equipment

It is recommended that a radar flight tracking system be implemented at the Airport to assist the Lee County Port Authority in monitoring the voluntary noise mitigation

procedures and to assist in the development of modifications to these procedures that will benefit the citizens living in proximity to the Airport. The system will not be used for mandatory enforcement of the voluntary procedures. It is recommended that the flight tracking system output be used to review all recommended operational procedures during the next part 150 update (NCP, pages 11-8; and Tables 11-1, 11-2, 11-3, and 13-1 through 13-3)

FAA Action: Approved. The flight tracking system must technically be able to interface with the FAA equipment and operations, and meet FAA data download requirements. For purposes of aviation safety, this approval does not extend to the use of monitoring equipment for enforcement purposes by in-situ measurement of any pre-set noise thresholds and shall not be used for mandatory enforcement of any voluntary measure.

4. Support the implementation/funding for the implementation of RNAV procedures. While Table 13-1, Summary of Recommended Measures, describes this as a single measure, the NCP describes this support in two ways. (NCP, pages 11-5 thru 11-6; 11-8 and 11-9; Tables 11-1, 11-2, 11-3, and 13-1).

(a) Pages 11-5 and 11-6 suggest a curved RNAV approach to Runway 6, the “MAPUL 1 Instrument Departure Procedure (IDP) in reverse” might be feasible in the future. The NCP states “This approach would also likely provide the most benefit if implemented primarily during nighttime hours. The NCP recommendation is to “continue to monitor the potential for this type of approach and further evaluate it when the technology is more readily available.” The airport sponsor recommends the FAA study advance technology navigational procedures to determine if they can be used for noise mitigation at RSW.

FAA Action: Approved as to sponsor efforts to monitor and evaluate this RNAV approach.

(b) At pages 11-8 and 11-9, the NCP evaluates “Other actions or combinations of actions which would have a beneficial noise control or abatement impact on the public.” The NCP states in relevant part “...the MAPUL-1 RNAV procedure is currently pending publication and implementation. This procedure will help reduce the potential for drift as aircraft depart runway 24 and climb out through the Alico corridor. The MAPUL-1 RNAV procedure will allow properly equipped aircraft to make adjustments to their course as may be required to...minimize the impacts on the surrounding residential communities.” In the NCP, it is recommended that the FAA continue with the planned implementation of MAPUL-1 RNAV procedure and maintain support for the expansion of the RNAV program.

FAA Action: No Action Required.

LAND USE MEASURES

The analysis of recommendations in Chapter 11 refers to a single land use measure described in Chapter 12 of the NCP (page 11-6, Options Required for Consideration by FAR Part 150). That recommendation is to update overlay zones and the requirements therein for Lee County.

5. Update Noise Overlay Zones

During the Noise Overlay Zone Land Development Code approval process (completed in 2000), the Lee County Commission directed the Lee County Port Authority to reevaluate the overlay zone in an Update to the FAR Part 150 study to be completed by 2006. The Commission recognized that quieter aircraft were being added to the air carrier and cargo fleet mix and felt that the update should occur to determine whether the extent of the overlay zone limits and associated controls should be maintained or modified

Proposed overlay zones are shown on Exhibit 12-2 and are for the year 2020. This is to address potential long range noise impacts and expected growth in airport operations (page 12-6). A summary of the land uses for the four zones depicted on Exhibit 12-2 is on page 12-4. Zone B encompasses the DNL 60 dB noise contour. No new noise-sensitive land uses would be allowed. Overflights and notice of potential noise associated with the airport would apply to all development, new and existing. Land uses in Zone B compare to previous Zone 3, with the addition of public notification.

Due to the reduction in noise exposure since the last Part 150 study (approved in 1995), the zones and controls have been modified. Zones C and D (encompassing areas larger than Zone B), would include notification of potential noise and overflights. Notification will include reference to factual information about flight corridors, proposed long range airport development, and anticipated growth in operations at the airport for the 2020 timeframe (Zone C). Flight training notice would be provided for Zone D (page 12-9).

The LCPA will be proactive about publishing notification and preparing a noise notification brochure for distribution as described on page 12-10. It will provide facts about corridors and discourage noise sensitive development in the corridors (page 12-11, Exhibit 12-10). Also, LCPA will have a record of flight corridors used, via passive radar (Measure 3 in this ROA). LCPA proposes to update forecasts in five years per Lee Plan Policy 1.7.1 or sooner if events occur to significantly alter the contours (pages 12-12 and 12-13).

(NCP, pages 12-1 thru 12-13; Exhibits 12-1, 12-2, 12-3, 12-4, 12-5, 12-6, 12-7, 12-8, 12-9, and 12-10; and Tables 12-1, 12-2, and 13-1)

FAA Action: Approved. This is within the authority of the local land use jurisdictions; the Federal government does not control local land use. Outside the DNL 65 dB noise contour, FAA as a matter of policy encourages local efforts to prevent new noncompatible development immediately abutting the DNL 65 dB contour and to provide a buffer for possible growth in noise contours beyond the forecast period.

ATTACHMENT “B”

Public Comments Received From the October 21, 2013 Federal Register Notice of the Beginning of the Formal 180-Day NCP Review Process and FAA Responses to the Public Comments

SUMMARIZED COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NCP DURING THE 60-DAY FEDERAL REGISTER PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND RESPONSES TO THE SUMMARIZED COMMENTS

Southwest Florida International Airport

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) published a notification of Receipt of Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) and Request for Review for Southwest Florida International Airport (RSW) in the Federal Register on Monday October 28th, 2013. The effective date of the start of the FAA's review was noted as October 21st. The maximum review period of 180 days requires that the FAA issues an approval or disapproval of the measures contained in the NCP on or before April 19th, 2014. Specifically, the FAA will be evaluating whether the "proposed measures may reduce the level of aviation safety or create undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, and whether they are reasonably consistent with obtaining the program's goal of reducing non-compatible land uses and preventing the introduction of additional non-compatible land uses."

The publication of the Federal Register notice included a 60 day public comment period which started on October 21st, 2013 and ended on December 20th, 2013. During this comment period, 22 individuals submitted comment letters and/or e-mails to the FAA that could be grouped into four categories including: low flying aircraft, frequency and location of aircraft, nighttime runway use, and the need for expedited implementation of the NCP measures. Most of the individuals referenced multiple categories in their letters. All of the individuals that made comments live in the Fort Myers Beach/Estero Island area. Only a few of the comments received actually referenced the NCP or the recommendations included therein. The majority of the comments received raised concerns about aircraft overflights in general and aircraft flying at low altitudes. Those that did reference the NCP specifically were supportive of the recommended measures and noted a desire to move forward quickly with their implementation. Below is a summary of the comments received by category and responses to the comments.

1. Noise

Nearly all of the public comments received during the Federal Register comment period were related to noise. Depending on the community and its location in relation to RSW, comments ranged from the number of aircraft overflights or overflights at times of the day when people are

most susceptible to aircraft overflight noise. Some communities only receive departure overflights, while others only receive arrival overflights.

Comment Response: *The Lee County Port Authority (LCPA) undertook the 14 CFR Part 150 Study process to actively address public concerns related to aircraft overflights for various communities located around RSW. The overall goal of the 14 CFR Part 150 Study Update includes documenting the current and projected (five year) noise exposure to compatible and noncompatible land uses in the RSW area, and from those results make recommendations to help benefit non-compatible land uses by reducing their noise exposure. As stated in the Noise Exposure Map (NEM) and NCP portions of the Study, there are no non-compatible land uses located within the current or projected 65 DNL noise contours for RSW. However, the LCPA realizes that noise from aircraft overflights does not stop at the 65 DNL noise contour and has worked proactively with the FAA to try to address community noise concerns. The NCP portion of this 14 CFR Part 150 Study Update examined multiple measures or alternatives for their ability to reduce noise impacts to noncompatible land uses and evaluated the reasonability and feasibility of these measures to be implemented (see NCP Chapters 10 through 14).*

2. Low Flying Aircraft

A number of comments were received from the Fort Myers Beach community related to low flying aircraft. These comments are related to arriving aircraft as a result of the Florida West Coast Airspace Redesign (FLOWCAR), and the Instrument Landing System (ILS) intercept altitude of 1,600 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL) as discussed in NCP Chapter 11 and Appendix C. The Town of Fort Myers Beach, during the public hearing, brought forth a resolution (Appendix S) to modify the language included in NCP recommendation 11.3.6 to assist in keeping aircraft above 3,000 feet. This resolution was included in the final NCP document submitted to the FAA.

Comment Response: *This FAR Part 150 Study Update reviewed the feasibility of raising aircraft altitudes as they transition to the airport for landing. The benefits of raising the altitude of the arriving aircraft are potentially two-fold: one, aircraft will be higher, and therefore would be further away from noise sensitive receivers on the ground; and two, aircraft arriving from higher altitudes will normally have to remain at idle thrust as they descend for longer periods of time instead of flying level and engaging the throttles to maintain altitude. A number of operational alternative measures were recommended by the LCPA in the NCP to ensure that aircraft fly higher arrival profiles as documented in Chapter 11 of the NCP Study Update and outlined below:*

- 1. Promote Use of RNAV Optimized Profile Descent to Runway 06 (Measure OP-1)*
- 2. Initiate RNAV Optimized Profile Descents Further From the Airport (Measure OP-2)*
- 3. Raise the Downwind Altitude to Runway 06 (Measure OP-3)*
- 4. Keep Aircraft at 3,000 ft. Over Ft. Myers Beach (Measure OP-6)*

Other administrative measures to help reduce the annoyance from aircraft operations included in Chapter 13 of the NCP are:

1. *Develop a Jeppesen Insert on Noise Abatement Program at RSW (Measure PM-4)*
2. *Install Runway End and Noise Abatement Reminder Signs (Measure PM-5)*

These administrative measures are an effort to spread awareness of the noise sensitive locations surrounding RSW, and to educate pilots of the noise abatement procedures in effect at the Airport.

3. Volume and Dispersion of Aircraft Operations

There were a number of public comments related to the volume of aircraft flying very specific routes into and out-of RSW. The implementation and use of RNAV flight procedures since completion of the previous RSW 14 CFR Part 150 Study in May, 2006 results in a “railroad effect” of air traffic.

Comment Response: *The new RNAV procedures as a result of FLOWCAR and the CSHEL FOUR Departure procedures can cause a “railroad effect” over certain communities located around RSW. RNAV is a very precise form of navigation and as a result certain areas receive more aircraft overflights relative to other areas near the Airport. The increased activity during peak season (winter and spring months) combined with weather conditions often results in a much higher occurrence of overflights in certain areas as compared to other times of the year. The measures discussed and recommended in the NCP are in an effort to reduce noise annoyance from noise sensitive areas by recommending flight paths that take advantage of more compatible land uses, increase the altitude of overflights, and create a greater dispersion of departure flight paths. Examples of the recommendations can be found in Chapter 11 of the NCP and include:*

1. *Promoting the Use of RNAV Optimized Profile Descents (Measure OP-1,2)*
2. *Raising the Downwind Altitude to Runway 06 and/or Shift Downwind Flight Track to the South (Measure OP-3,4)*
3. *Modifying the CSHEL Four Departure Procedure (Measure OP-10)*

A charted visual approach has also been recommended in the NCP to reduce the number of overflights over more densely populated communities and allow for increased utilization of the RNAV Visual approach (Measure OP-5), which routes aircraft through the “back bay area” between Fort Myers Beach and the mainland.

4. Time of Day and Aircraft Operations

Public comments were received related to aircraft overflights late at night, or during the early morning hours. Comments ranged from having these off-hour aircraft fly at higher altitudes or on different flight paths so that noise sensitive communities would not be disturbed.

Comment Response: *Although very few late night and early morning operations occur at RSW, these flights can be disruptive to communities and other noise sensitive land uses. Chapters 5 and 7 of the updated NEM documents the time of day that aircraft operations occur at RSW, and the Integrated Noise Model (INM) used to model the DNL contours which applies a 10 dB penalty to*

those aircraft operations occurring between 10:00pm and 6:59am. Efforts were made in the NCP portion of the Study Update to reduce the annoyance of late night/early morning flights on noncompatible land uses. Examples of these measures, which are recommended in Chapter 11 of the NCP include:

- 1. Increase Altitude of Early Morning Arrivals (Measure OP-8)*
- 2. Keep Aircraft at 3,000 ft. Over Ft. Myers Beach (Measure OP-6)*
- 3. Initiate RNAV Optimized Profile Descent Further From the Airport (OP-2)*
- 4. Change Runway 24 to Preferred Runway From 10:00pm – 6:00am (OP-9)*

Administrative measure to help reduce the annoyance from late night/early morning aircraft operations included in Chapter 13 of the NCP are:


- 1. Develop a Jeppesen Insert on Noise Abatement Program at RSW (PM-4)*
- 2. Install Runway End and Noise Abatement Reminder Signs (PM-5)*

These administrative measures are an effort to spread awareness of the noise sensitive locations surrounding RSW, and to educate pilots of the noise abatement procedures in effect at the Airport.

5. Implementation of Recommended NCP Measures

A number of public comments were received that were supportive of the NCP recommendations, but wanted to ensure that they are implemented.

Comment Response: *It is important to note that because there are no incompatible land uses in the existing or future 65 DNL contour for RSW, none of the recommended measures can be approved by the FAA for the purposes of 14 CFR Part 150. However, the LCPA continues to work with the FAA and stakeholders cooperatively to ensure that the measures recommended within this study are implemented outside the purview of the Part 150 program. At the time of submittal of the NCP to the FAA, a number of NCP recommended measures were already being moved forward or have been implemented with the FAA's support and cooperation.*


Mr. Allan Nagy
Noise/Environmental Programs
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Citadel International Building Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822

Dear Mr. Nagy,

As a property owner in the Town of Fort Myers Beach and as a representative of the citizens group AIR, standing for Aircraft Intrusion Relief, I am submitting comments on the 14 CFR Part 150 Study approved by the Lee County Board of Port Commissioners (BOPC) at their January 14, 2013 meeting.

Aircraft over flights have negatively impacted the Town of Fort Myers Beach, which is also known as Estero Island, ever since Southwest Florida International Airport (SWFIA) moved to its current location. The Town's quality of life has deteriorated as more aircraft have frequented SWFIA, but degraded significantly following the airspace redesign that created the new SHFTY arrival route in October 2008. The number of low-flying aircraft over our island community more than doubled not only because of the new routing, but also because complaints from other communities diverted even more aircraft over Estero Island.


There are several recommendations of the Part 150 Study that are intended to improve issues for the Town of Fort Myers Beach if fully implemented. Specifically they are Sections:

- 11.3.1 Promote Use of RNAV Visual Optimized Profile Descent to Runway 06.
- 11.3.2 Initiate RNAV Optimized Profile Descent Further From the Airport.
- 11.3.5 Publish Charted Visual Approach to Runway 06 from the North and South.
- 11.3.6 Keep Aircraft at 3,000 ft Over Fort Myers Beach, with the wording change approved by the BOPC at the January 14, 2013 hearing to: Keep Aircraft at or Above 3,000 ft Until East of Estero Island.
- 11.3.7 Delay Point at which Aircraft Lower the Landing Gear.
- 11.3.8 Increase Altitude of Early Morning Arrivals.
- 11.3.9 Change Runway 24 to Preferred Runway From 10:00 PM – 6:00 AM.

The Town of Fort Myers Beach recognized that to accomplish recommendation 11.3.6 it would be necessary to raise the ILS intercept altitude to Runway 06 of the TROPIC waypoint west of Estero Island from 3,000 ft to 3,300 ft. This would require a slight increase in the glide slope, but would be well within a safe range used at other airports. This request was included in a Town of Fort Myers Beach Resolution Number 13-01 that was presented at the January 14, 2013 hearing, approved by the Lee County BOPC and forwarded to the FAA as the Part 150 update.

We support the recommendations of the 14 CFR Part 150 Study Update with the above-approved changes by the Lee County BOPC on January 14, 2013.

Sincerely,



Thomas A. Babcock, 

Aircraft Issues Over Estero Island
Mark Drzewiecki

to:

Allan Nagy

12/07/2013 11:55 AM



Allan Nagy
Noise/Environmental Programs
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Citadel International Building Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822

Dear Mr. Nagy,

As a homeowner on Fort Myers Beach Florida I have great concern regarding the airplane traffic that is flying directly over my home.

My house is located at mid-island and the noise levels, increasing number of planes and increasing amount of black soot on my house, pool screen enclosure and deck are affecting our sleep, comfort, health and property values.

I don't understand why, when the airport is more than 10 miles away by air that these aircraft cannot stay above 3000-3500 feet and be in a glide path not under power-or better yet rerouted over Estero Bay. Some planes are so low with engines powering that we cannot even have a conversation until they pass.

These conditions were not present when we purchased our home in 2008. I am even more concerned that if this flight pattern is not altered now that with the airport expansion and more flights each day it will become even worse.

Please do what you can to communicate these concerns and the documented flight data showing flyovers as low as 1500 feet under power to the people that have the authority to mandate a permanent change as soon as possible.

If there is anything else that I can do to help remedy this problem please let me know.

Sincerely,





No
2004

No
2004





Town of Fort Myers Beach



Alan Mandel
Mayor

Joe Kosinski
Vice Mayor

Dan Andre
Council Member

Jo List
Council Member

Bob Raymond
Council Member

December 6, 2013

Allan Nagy, Noise/Environmental Programs
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Citadel International Building Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32922

Dear Mr. Nagy,

The Town of Fort Myers Beach, Florida is a barrier island community located in the Gulf of Mexico in Lee County Florida. Our permanent population is about 6,200 residents, but because we are a significant tourism destination, our population will swell to a daily average of about 40,000 during the winter tourist season that runs from December through April. Our nearest airport is Southwest Florida Regional or RSW and the flight paths of arriving aircraft are often over our island. Loud noise from low flying aircraft is a subject matter that has generated a great deal of public discomfort and complaints.

The RSW Airport Authority commissioned a 2011 Part 150 study and cooperatively worked together with impacted local communities, including ours, in defining issues and recommended solutions. We are aware the study was submitted to the FAA and you have accepted it and published it in anticipation of public comment through December 20, 2013.

On Monday December 2, 2013 the Town Council of the Town of Fort Myers Beach unanimously voted to send this letter to your attention. We respectfully request the FAA move forward with approval of the recommendations as included within the 2011 Part 150 study and then implement those recommendation as soon as possible.

We thank you for your time and attention and look to a positive outcome to this important community issue.

Sincerely,

Alan Mandel, Mayor
Town of Fort Myers Beach



Mr. Allan Nagy
Noise/Environmental Programs
5950 Hazeltine Drive
Citadel International Building Suite 400
Orlando, Florida 32822

Dear Sir:


We have resided in beautiful Fort Myers Beach for forty years. Now, though we were assured no one community would be affected by aircraft over-flights, we find the quality of life we have enjoyed for many years has been affected by the railroad track that has been created over Fort Myers Beach. The planes using this track cause a deafening noise overhead and drop a black substance onto our patio. With the approaching season and a new runway in the future, we know there will be an increasing number of flights every day and this problem of noise and air pollution will only get worse. Therefore, we ask your help to:

- keep aircraft over Fort Myers Beach at 3000 feet
- use Estero Bay for arrivals avoiding Fort Myers Beach, especially late night flights
- increase use of runway 24 at night
- reinstate visual approach over Estero Bay from the south to runway 6
- change the new waypoint in the gulf from 3,000 feet to 3,200 feet

Thank you for your anticipated support in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Edwina and Joe Raffa
Edwina and Joe Raffa



Dear Mr. Nagy,

My husband and I are residents of St Myers Beach. Unfortunately we are located in the alien (railroad track) where the planes to R.S.W Airport Cross Estero Island daily, low, and many times a day.

Our sleep is disturbed at night with low flying planes, so low we can hear the landing gear lock down. During the day some of these planes are so low we can read their logo and plane number -

Keeping the planes at 3000 feet and using runway 24 at night would do a lot to decrease the noise pollution.

More flights will be entering our air space as "Season" starts. - Some days flights arrive 3 minutes apart and sitting outside is a challenge. Soot covers our table and floor on our lanai.

Our quality of life has deteriorated since 1992 when we began living here.

Our health has been compromised by the poor air quality from these flights.

We ask that you look into these problems and find a solution. We've been waiting a very long time - hopefully now its time to take action.


Thanking you in advance,
Mr. and Mrs John Shelly



Dear Mr. Nagy

My wife and I are residents and property owners on Fort Myers Beach Fl. From Sept thru March and have been waiting patiently for a solution to the problem of aircraft flying low over our home. Two of our neighbors have already have sold their homes because of the noise and a few more are contemplating it including myself if we do not experience some relief. I am sure you have been made aware of the problem and can state the specifics better than I can. We only know that leaving the windows or lanai doors open is not possible while trying to sleep, watch TV or converse normally. Visitors to our home continually ask us what is going on with the planes. All we can tell them is that it is being worked on getting resolved.(same answer we have been giving for the last three years) We are hoping that you can help us to get the planes from flying low over our home and neighborhood. I understood that the minimum flight altitude was already supposed to be 3000 ft but that I must be possessed with Eagle eyes as I can read the lettering on the planes often quite clearly. We fully understand the importance of RSW airport to our local economy and the future growth of this region; however we also believe that the situation can be resolved by routing the planes over the Back Bay and requiring a minimum of 4000 ft over the island if a few flights due to weather or scheduling make that necessary. We thank you in advance for your help on solving this problem and wish the best of holidays and a Happy New Year.

Sincerely,



Harry & Chris Lefferts



Maria Revesz Eigerman



December 17, 2013

Mr. Allan Nagy
Noise/Environmental Programs
Federal Aviation Administration
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Citadel International Building, Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822

Subject: RSW Traffic and our Town's Quality of Life

Dear Mr. Nagy:

The objective of this letter is twofold. First, I wish to give official notice of the severe noise and air pollution impacts on me and my family caused by inbound flights using a one-half mile section of Estero Island (the Town of Ft. Myers Beach) as a "railroad track" to RSW. Second, as a voter and taxpayer, I urgently request relief, which FAA can conveniently and safely provide.

I have owned my home in the center of our Island for 16 years. Since approximately 2010, the negative impacts of low-and-loud air traffic using the "railroad track" over the beach and my home have increased steadily, to the point that some 73% of all inbound flights cross Estero Island. I am frequently awakened at 5:30 AM by the inbound courier jumbo. Between 11 AM and 1PM, particularly on weekend days, normal conversation with family and friends is impossible outdoors as plane after plane roars by overhead at less than 5-minute intervals. Similarly, in the late afternoon, a cavalcade of inbound flights can be seen queuing up over the Gulf and then dropping to 3000 feet or less—some with gear down—for their approach over the center of Estero Island. At night, between 10:30 PM and midnight, we are assaulted by yet another rash of flights, many of which I have reported on the RSW/FAA complaint line. Once awake, I cannot get back to sleep, knowing that the FedEx flight is already loading up for its pre-dawn visit.

Apart from the maddening noise nuisance, my outdoor furniture, boat, dock, pool cage and white fencing are routinely covered by a greasy black soot (unburned hydrocarbons not natural to Island air) which I must constantly clean up and have no alternative but to inhale if I want to be anywhere outdoors. This situation is common to all my neighbors and, of course, to the narrow segment of the Gulf and beach overflown day in and day out. The tourists complain, but the water and wildlife cannot.

Since a second runway at RSW can only increase arrival traffic, I implore you to urge official changes which will eliminate the "railroad tracking" which is destroying the quality of life in center-island and negatively impacting the value of real estate in this "protected" residential area. The currently disproportionate concentration of negative environmental and health impacts here is simply unacceptable.

Fortunately, it can also be remedied. Easily available solutions include the following:

- increase use of the SHIFTY route over Estero Bay (successfully tried in 2008)
- increase minimum altitude at the new Gulf waypoint to 3200 feet to assure at least 3000 feet as aircraft cross Estero Island
- direct many more inbound flights to runway 24 at night

These and other changes are essential to reversing the years-long trend of QOL degradation that increasing volumes of air traffic have caused in our Town. The summer months of 2013 provided some respite, but the flight tracker data in the days leading up to Thanksgiving show an alarming return to business-as-usual. As air traffic grows from the Holidays through Easter , there is now no reason to believe that Ft. Myers Beach—and the center of the Island, particularly—will not continue to bear the brunt of the assault.

I urge you and your agency to provide us with meaningful relief and so prove that citizen feedback actually matters to the FAA.

Yours very truly,

(See signature on hard copy
sent via USPS)

Maria R. Eigerman

MRE:gn

Cc: Lee County Commission
Town of Ft. Myers Beach

Airplane Noise over Ft Myers Beach
ellen Fernandes

to:

Allan Nagy

12/05/2013 06:53 PM

To whom it may concern,

Why am I seeing planes fly south over Estero Bay only to come back north - RIGHT OVER MY BUILDING ?

The noise of these jets is extremely loud and interrupts any conversation and television volume goes way way up.

I have lived on the south end of Fort Myers Beach for over 24 years and there was never a problem of airplane noise until around 2008 when I noticed aircraft flying over my building. Imagine it being nice and quiet, listening to the waves and then all of a sudden the noise of an airplane engine. There have been times when planes flew so low towards my building that I literally jumped off the couch! And there are times when the night flights fly in and look like they are coming straight into the building!

Just this morning alone, within a 15 minute span, I must have counted at least six to eight aircraft fly over my building! The same pattern. They go south and then turn north and head right over & between my building. This pattern continues every day - with travel heaviest on the weekends. Who can enjoy a quiet day on the beach with loud engine noise every few minutes?

AirTran is one the noisiest airplane. How do I know? The planes fly so low you can see the tail insignia.

To have a conversation on the ground is nearly impossible.

Conversation stops until the planes leave the area. In the evening we count endless planes with lights in our windows, in the same pattern fly over our building. The noise level is intolerable. The TV cannot be heard.

And this is with the windows closed. (and these are new windows).

This is an island where relaxing and enjoying the outdoors is pretty much the lifestyle here.

With all these planes flying over constant, all day and all thru the night (I've seen planes flying over after midnight) it is devaluing the homes on the south end of the island.

The soot that we breathe from this is horrible.

I implore you & your teams to continue to work to reroute the airplane flight pattern. It truly disrupts a quality way of life and is extremely irritating and unnecessary.

Thank you.
Respectfully,
E Fernandes



**FW: DELIVERY FAILURE: User nagy (nagy@faa.gov) not listed
in Domino Directory**
Joan Joy to: Allan Nagy

12/08/2013 09:07 AM

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

To: nagy@faa.gov

Subject: Plane noise

Date: Sun, 8 Dec 2013 08:41:35 -0500

My husband and I are residents of Florida and live in Fort Myers Beach. Our community has been greatly effected since 2008 by the increase of planes flying over our beach. In fact 75 to 85% fly over our area mostly within a half mile radius.

This is very stressful for those of us who are forced to listen to constant, unbearable noise 24/7, causing lack of sleep and aggravation. We thought that the landing pattern was never supposed to effect one community more than another. However a railroad track has been created over the beach, while neighboring Estero has fewer and higher planes.

Therefore, we ask for these changes which have been recommended:

Keep ALL PLANES OVER 3000 feet over Estero Island

Increase the use of runway 24 at night

Reinstate the visual approach from the south to runway 6

Increase the use of the back bay

My understanding is that other communities have fewer planes and higher altitudes in place and that some of the current approaches over the beach take the planes out further and therefore cost more time and money.

We would just like to enjoy our retirement as we did when the SHFTY south route was in place.

Joan and Denis Joy

. Reporting-MTA: dns;awarhub.faa.gov

Final-Recipient: rfc822;nagy@faa.gov

Action: failed

Status: 5.1.1

Diagnostic-Code: X-Notes; User nagy (nagy@faa.gov) not listed in Domin

airplane issue over Fort Myers Beach Florida
Pegmccloskey

to:

Allan Nagy

12/04/2013 06:42 PM

[REDACTED]

Margaret I. McCloskey

[REDACTED]

I am a resident of Fort Myers Beach, Florida since 2003. I now live in a "railroad track" created by planes coming into Regional Southwest Airport. This was not the case in 2003. I have seen planes lower their landing gear over my house, and planes of which I could read the name of the airline. Needless to say, these are very loud. The noise created by this situation is not the only problem. I have an oily black "soot" which is on my lanai, car, driveway, patio, etc. I can't imagine what this does to one's lungs and often have "dry throat" which was not a part of my health in 2008. Aircraft should be made to fly at 3200 feet - it should be mandatory for all planes and not selective.

I understand that by using Estero Bay (Runway 6 from the south and Runway 24 at night) Fort Myers Beach (Estero Island land) would be avoided. Currently, daily flights are not nearly as plentiful as they were at Thanksgiving, nor as they will be at Holiday time and in January, February, March, and April. It is a most disturbing worry/nuisance at this busy time.

I remember attending a meeting when someone stated that Southwest Airlines said they could save hundreds of thousands of dollars in fuel if they came into RSW from the south over Estero Bay (thus avoiding land). I believe the savings come from the length of time the planes can "glide" prior to landing. Why hasn't this been done? It seems it would save money and give us a quality of life that we had prior to 2008, when most of this situation became a public issue.

Please consider these and other important documented findings so that Fort Myers citizens have a more peaceful, safe, and healthy quality of life - which is why I moved here!!

Thank you for your consideration in this important issue for Fort Myers Beach.

FW: part 150 noise study ft myers beach
tw merrill

to:

Allan Nagy

12/19/2013 08:37 PM

Show Details

To: allan.nagy@faa.gov

Subject: part 150 noise study ft myers beach

Date: Tue, 17 Dec 2013 19:36:22 -0500

Dear Mr. Nagy,

I have lived on Ft. Myers Beach over 20 years. When I built my house there were no aircraft coming over. Then the 5 mile marker for approach from the west was moved to 7 miles. We then began to see aircraft over us.

We are on an island 10 miles west of RSW. There is a very large area of water between us and the airport called Estero Bay. Over time more flights came over our skinny little island instead of the large Estero Bay which is unpopulated. In winter our population is approximately 60,000. Now we are literally pummeled by overflights, sometimes as low as 1400 feet. Let's clarify this ... we are 10 miles from the airport and major airline flights are as low as 1400'!!!

We have tried to work with this situation and have been told for 15 years there are voluntary altitude minimums for pilots of 3000' but very little has been done until very recently. This airport has allowed the lowest approach altitudes of any airport in Florida for years. Now they finally say they will keep aircraft above 3000' due to recent changes, but the truth is they still do not. They have a clear habit of not doing what they say.

Worse, there have been well over 2 decades of precedent using approaches over Estero Bay. Clearly, approaches could use this unpopulated area far more than they do. Planes then would not even go over our populated area if this were done.

FAA is supposedly in charge of safety. However this area has a very large bird population and a dedicated bird refuge right where the airplanes fly over our populated island. Use of the Estero Bay would be far safer. There seems to be a purposeful routing of aircraft aimed directly at our populated area with little regard for residents due to height of aircraft, constant noise and slime issues, and safety of population.

In my opinion, this is a rogue airport. They have allowed flights at low elevations for years and targeted our island 10 miles from the airport for continually increasing problems and liability from overflights described above. For example, for years they have allowed the lowest approaches of any airport in Florida while offering constant excuses and cover ups. There has been no need for such consistently low approaches. They obviously have little sensitivity for residents or safety. They listen and simply do what they want and do not seem to communicate our population's interests to the FAA as should be done.

I am familiar with FAA, pilot and controller requirements through years of involvement with the airline industry. I am also familiar with how the FAA has been helpful to other airports with population concerns and how routing can be modified slightly to help at times. (i.e. John Wayne in Newport Beach, Ca. and even RSW to help other communities here, etc.) We do not need anywhere near as much.

They tell us for the umpteenth time things are different now. I doubt it. We need a better attitude and minor changes can make a huge difference.

There are numerous minor modifications to the current situation over Ft. Myers Beach that are possible. Little has been done yet. There are some recommendations filtering through the system but some small modifications better pinpointed could be far more effective.

RSW needs a thorough review. Attitude has a lot to do with achieving important goals rather than glossing over situations. The situation here is clear: If there is a will there can be a way.

Please offer residents here a better deal than the abysmal attitude that has prevailed for so many years.

Sincerely Yours,

Tom Merrill




Noise/Environment Programs-Ft Myers Beach, FL
highlife5

to:

Allan Nagy

12/06/2013 09:38 PM



Dear Mr. Nagy-this email is in reference to aircraft noise pollution over Ft Myers Beach, FL. We lived near O'Hare Airport in Chicago and moved because of the increasing noise generated by aircraft. We purchased our new home in Ft Myers Beach in 2000 and **there were no aircraft flying over my home until 2008 when the FAA changed the flight paths.** Since then we have been blasted with shrill noise and dirt from low flying planes at all hours. The quality of life of our retirement home on the Beach has been shattered

From early in the morning [6am] to late at night [midnight], aircraft fly directly overhead, some lower than 2000'. Realtors have stated that the value of our home has decreased. Who will reimburse us for the loss? We didn't ask for this Mr. Nagy, we purposely researched flight paths prior to purchasing our ultimate retirement home to insure that we would not again be harassed by aircraft noise. We lived in our new home for 8 years before the FAA made changes that would forever have a negative impact on our life style. I'm sure the decision to change flight paths was based on economics, safety and efficiency.....unfortunately factors relating to commercial interests, not ours. Factors affecting us were not considered nor were we asked!

almost all flights landing at RSW fly over Ft Myers Beach on final approach [we are the collector for all landings]

aircraft fly below agreed upon minimum altitudes [3000' minimum is exceeded by as much as 1500']
late night/early morning cargo flights do not use alternate runway 24

The really sad part of this situation is that there are solutions that could have/should have been implemented that would partially alleviate the negative impact. Suggestions and negotiations made by resident groups last more than 7 months ago have not been implemented. While these suggestions would not eliminate the mental and physical effects of aircraft over our home, they would be one small step to regaining some sanity over our community. We're not asking for a total ban on aircraft over our home, we understand the significance of profit. All I'm asking is that the residential property owner that pays taxes and votes be given a fair shake in the flight operations at RSW that effect our life.

Sincerely:

Robert & Brenda Miller





Estero Island Aircraft Approach
Mimibubble to: Allan Nagy

12/05/2013 10:29 AM

Nancy Mulholland

December 5, 2013

Mr. Alan Nagy
Noise/Environmental Programs
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Citadel International Bldg Suite 400
Orlando FL 32822

Allan.Nagy@faa.gov

Dear Mr. Nagy:

I live on Estero Island directly in what has again become the preferred flight path to Regional Southwest Airport. The noise created by incoming flights has affected conversation in my home and my sleep. My lanai is constantly dirty and I must be breathing in all that debris. I am forced to keep my windows closed and the air-conditioning on all year.

There are alternatives. If flights use Estero Bay to approach the airport and stay at 3200 feet when they must fly over Estero Island the noise problem could be significantly reduced. During holiday periods and during season as many as 80% of flights are flying directly over Estero Island.

Please address these matters and make these changes.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. The quality of my life and many of my friends and neighbors on Ft. Myers Beach are affected by this situation.

Yours truly,

Nancy Mulholland

Aircraft over Ft Myers Beach FL
Robert Pijanowski

to:

Allan Nagy

12/06/2013 07:02 PM

Show Details

Dear Sir,

I live at [REDACTED] Jet aircraft fly directly over my residence daily and nightly. Most are flying at less than 3000 ft. as they approach Southwest Regional International airport. Most are very loud. I understand that there are alternate routes these planes can take to land at RSW. Is it possible that these alternate routes can be utilized? Also can they approach the airport at a higher altitude? While I realize the final determination to land an airplane rests with the pilot, can ATC advise them to use routes and or use landing fields that may minimize the constant roar we are experiencing here on the ground.

Thank you for your attention.

Robert Pijanowski

Fw: Airplane Traffic over FMB
Marilyn Quackenbush

to:

Allan Nagy

12/06/2013 06:16 PM

Please respond to Marilyn Quackenbush
Show Details

Looks as though I spelled your name wrong when I originally sent this. So, I'm sending it again with hopefully the right spelling!

On Friday, December 6, 2013 1:01 PM, Marilyn Quackenbush <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Alan,

The traffic over Fort Myers Beach has increased steadily and we'd like it to stop. Not only is there more traffic, but the traffic is getting lower and lower. We just don't understand why the traffic can't be routed over Estero Bay so it won't impact us or our neighbors. Something needs to be done, and the sooner the better! We don't want our property values to decrease because prospective owners don't want to listen to this disruptive noise any more than we do!

Thanks for listening to us!

Sincerely,

Marilyn Quackenbush

Flights over Fort Myers Beach/Estero Island

[REDACTED]
to:

Allan Nagy

12/04/2013 09:37 PM

[REDACTED]
Dear Allan Nagy,

My name is Summer Stockton and I am a long time resident of Fort Myers Beach (FMB). I am writing to you in an effort to reduce if not eliminate air traffic over our town. Over 73% of aircraft is flying over what was our beautiful island of tranquility and it is affecting the quality of life of both our residents and tourists. I am respectfully requesting that the FAA enforce a rule to keep aircraft at least 3000 feet above FMB and require the way-point in the gulf to be 3200 feet. Additionally, I ask that you please help alleviate this noise pollution problem by increasing the use of runway 24 at night. It seems to be the best solution for all parties since an aircraft can turn half the distance when landing on runway 24 than when landing on runway 6 and at twice the distance, making runway 24 far more efficient. Is there a valid reason the FAA cannot go back to utilizing the south route over Estero Bay instead of FMB? Again, these flights are really disturbing our beach community and since there are better alternatives it seems only fair the FAA grant these aforementioned requests. Thank you very much for your time and attention to this grave matter.

Sincerely,
Summer Stockton
[REDACTED]

Airplane noise pollution Ft. Myers BEACH
Klaus Jutta Stübler

to:

Allan Nagy

12/19/2013 08:41 AM



Dear Mr. Nagy,

as the owner for more than 19 years at the [REDACTED]
we support the e-mail from Mr. Hetterich.
Please, change the flight track over the island of Ft. Myers Beach.

Thank you!

KLAUS AND JUTTA STUEBLER



To: Mr. Allan Nagy
Noise/Invironmental Programs
5950 Hazeltine National Drive
Citadel International Building Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822

From: Heinz Hetterich



Dear Mr. Nagy,

After retiring in 2007, I decided to buy property on the south end of Fort Myers Beach, at that time a quiet and peaceful area of the island.

Unfortunately, this has changed drastically since then, mainly because of more and more airplanes flying (as just now) directly or close by over the building until midnight.

What has been especially noticed by many neighbors, that a certain type of aircraft is making an ear piercing, howling noise. They also seem to be flying pretty low, although I can only judge it by the relatively loud noise.

I am asking for myself and on behalf of many neighbors living in the area, that we are receiving help soon to restore quality of life for everybody.

Many of us have worked their whole life and served their country (I`m Veteran of Foreign Wars) for many years.

Sincerely,
Heinz Hetterich


This public comment is to help the voting population in general and flying customers of the U.S.A. The noise study was done in preparation for the addition of RWY 6 R to prepare proper landing sequences for two runways.

I am a resident of Fort Myers Beach, FL and live 10.2 nautical miles from runway 6. When I bought my residence in 2003 air traffic was almost zero. Now it is frequent and loud. All of the information provided to you by AIR Intrusion Relief shows over use of runway 6 from the Gulf of Mexico at an altitude that is too low. The best way to correct this is to change the I.L.S. to a steeper angle. 5 or 6 degree's will cause all I.F.R. (all commercial traffic) to be 4,000' to 5,000' A.G.L. at Fort Myers Beach and require all traffic to comply with this same descent rate to RSW airport.

A.I.R. recommended different patterns or inside of Estero Island and no permanent track to runway 6L or 6R. Only altitude will minimize the noise, irrespective of the aircraft track!

Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,


John W. Pohland



Notes:

I am a licensed U.S. pilot S.E.L.

I worked to reduce noise when employed by Harley-Davidson Motor Co., a manufacturer of 2 wheeled motorcycles. I worked with sound engineers in the design/ building/ prototype/ and sound reducing equipment.

I am also a representative to Lee County's M.P.O. in its citizens advisory committee. We work for Lee M.P.O. transportation systems including Port Authority issues.



TO MR. ALAN NAGY

As a Ft Myers Beach resident I would like to urge you to institute changes in the flight patterns which would avoid flying over Ft Myers Beach.

My concerns are quality of life, noise and health issues related to pollution coming from low flying planes over this heavily populated area. Some planes come overhead so low as to drown out conversations or the sound on the T.V.

A path over the water - Estero Bay - to the south is the answer - along with requiring planes to keep a 3000 foot height. Statistics show that some planes fly as low as 1500-2000 feet.

Please enact stricter regulations - especially in light of the upcoming airport expansion. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

J. D. Dzymenth





**FW: DELIVERY FAILURE: User nagy (nagy@faa.gov) not listed
in Domino Directory**
Joan Joy to: Allan Nagy

12/08/2013 09:07 AM

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

From: [REDACTED]

To: nagy@faa.gov
[REDACTED]

Subject: Plane noise

Date: Sun, 8 Dec 2013 08:41:35 -0500

My husband and I are residents of Florida and live in Fort Myers Beach. Our community has been greatly effected since 2008 by the increase of planes flying over our beach. In fact 75 to 85% fly over our area mostly within a half mile radius.

This is very stressful for those of us who are forced to listen to constant, unbearable noise 24/7, causing lack of sleep and aggravation. We thought that the landing pattern was never supposed to effect one community more than another. However a railroad track has been created over the beach, while neighboring Estero has fewer and higher planes.

Therefore, we ask for these changes which have been recommended:

Keep ALL PLANES OVER 3000 feet over Estero Island

Increase the use of runway 24 at night

Reinstate the visual approach from the south to runway 6

Increase the use of the back bay

My understanding is that other communities have fewer planes and higher altitudes in place and that some of the current approaches over the beach take the planes out further and therefore cost more time and money.

We would just like to enjoy our retirement as we did when the SHFTY south route was in place.

Joan and Denis Joy

. Reporting-MTA: dns;awarhub.faa.gov

Final-Recipient: rfc822;nagy@faa.gov

Action: failed

Status: 5.1.1

Diagnostic-Code: X-Notes; User nagy (nagy@faa.gov) not listed in Domin



December 13, 2013

Mr. Allan Nagy
Noise/Environmental Programs
5950 Hazeltine National Dr.
Citadel Int'l Building Suite 400
Orlando, FL 32822

Mr. Nagy,

As a condo owner on FMB since 1978, I have noticed since the new RSW has been built an EXCESSIVE number of flights over Estero Island—FMB.

Page field, when it was first used for commercial flights to Ft. Myers as well as the old RSW did not have as many INTRUSIVE flights over our island. Only since the new RSW came on line have we noticed a greater influx of flights over the island—and at various heights as well-- some even with "wheels down" although miles from the field!!!

This pattern of flights has caused excessive build up of soot on our lanai—so much so that we have to clean/swab the lanai before we can put anything on it and the NOISE level is stunning. Who wants to be on an island or a beach with all this TOXIC stuff going down?

I propose that the FAA or whoever is in charge rethink this Ruination of our Environment and put the pathways over the back bay as has been done in the past. I see no reason other than sometimes the weather patterns can change the runway touchdowns.

Other than that FIX the PROBLEM, Tom Fraser,