

I have attached the two current noise exposure maps sent to the FAA for approval. These maps (from the public record), if and when approved, will be the basis for mitigation alternatives prepared by the two Part 150 TAC¹ committees (JFK and LGA). Please note that these maps include the 55 DNL contours for which we have fought, for over a year and a half. As I have said over and over, the 55 DNL value is critical because, according to the BMJ and Harvard school of public health, people receiving that noise dosage and above are at increased risk for cardiovascular disease.

As you probably know, your reps in the House Quiet Skies Caucus and the State Senate and assembly have been staunch supporters of the effort to change the DNL threshold from 65 to 55 DNL.

What you may not know is that the Congress recently passed an interim re-authorization bill that did not include ANY legislation to help get us on path to reducing the DNL threshold.

The good news:

- there will be a second part that must be passed and signed into law by September 2017;
- the only bill to have support from the House Transportation and Infrastructure committee is HR4441.²

The bad news:

- Many seem to think that things happen in Congress on their own. We must make sure those running for office, and those already in office, do not forget that many of us are still hurting by the noise and pollution.

Who knows what the next Congress will bring, but we have to do our best to get them to provide the direction and cover that the FAA needs to do a fair job. To me the FAA has become the straw man in this fight, when in reality it is the Congress that calls the shots.³ The FAA argument is that their goals are only for safety and efficiency isn't enough anymore.

We must get Congress to demand that the health and welfare of the citizenry under those safe and efficient flight paths must also be in the mix of trade-off factors when our airspace may be modified.

One last thing; as you may know the DNL value gives different noise weights for different times of day; a straight number for daylight hours and a 10 dB penalty for nighttime flights between 11PM to 7 AM. Said another way, flights at night are weighted such that each nighttime flight is weighted as if the noise was being generated by ten aircraft.

Interestingly, the FAA has allowed California to use CNEL. What's the difference? Well the CNEL value has not only the overnight DNL penalty, but also penalizes flights between 7 PM to 11 PM as if there were 5 flights for each one.

What does this mean? Not a tremendous difference. Generally about 1 dB. But that one dB can mean the difference between those entitled to mitigation and those that are not and most importantly recognizes some of the damage suffered during family and homework time.

We have passed along the California CNEL legislation to Assemblyman Ed Ra, our constant, tireless and steadfast supporter, for his review of applicability to New York.

Copied from a 9/14/2016 email by Len Schaier, QuietSkies.net. Len is a member of Part 150 TAC committees at both JFK and LGA. (Highlights, footnotes and minor edits may have been added, but only to add clarification)

¹ aiREFORM footnote: Technical Advisory Committee

² aiREFORM footnote: the bill is mired in Committee. It offers a 'study', but also offers many controversial elements, including ATC privatization (which would place accountability even further from the People). For extensive details see: <http://aireform.com/airr-going-nowhere-while-shuster-schleps-in-florida/>

³ aiREFORM footnote: the view at aiREFORM places nearly the entire blame on FAA, as a captured agency. That said, if Congress would do their job and fully oversee FAA, FAA would be forced to serve People, not just industry.