

John
Gannon **State Rep. District 17 Seat A**
www.Johngannon.org

2104 S. Pond Street Boise, Idaho 83705 johngannon100@aol.com 343-1608

November 13, 2015

Administrator
Boise Airport Noise Study 2015
Via Email: Khughes@HNTB.com

Dear Administrator:

I write as an airport neighbor and as a legislator for this area. Just as widening a road requires the purchase of affected properties and mitigation measures such as on Ustick Road and Cole Road, a tremendous expansion of the noise level at the airport to an incompatible level by FAA standards, requires compensation and substantial mitigation. Unfortunately, it is difficult to competently comment on the contents of the 400 page study because like others, I only became aware of this noise study around September 23. But, I have the following thoughts:

1. The noise study endorses a tremendous displacement of people and homes. LU 9 discusses the purchase of homes within the 65 decibel contour and adjacent to that contour. Your study says 1000 people who live in 419 homes in that 65 decibel contour will not be compatible with airport noise if the F-15's arrive, and 327 homes will not be compatible with a squadron of F-35's. 89 of these homes will be incompatible no matter what. This is tremendously significant.

A. The mitigation recommendation does not include a cost benefit analysis. I submit that the purchase of only 200 homes will cost \$150,000 x 200 or a whopping \$30 million. 400 homes will cost \$60 million. Correct?

B. This mitigation recommendation was made with virtually no input from the public contrary to FAA advisory bulletins and the Code of Federal Regulations. There was no citizens advisory committee ever, and the two meetings prior to the October 6 meeting were poorly noticed. I, as an elected official heard about this study from constituents around September 23. The October 6 meeting had no handout – no one was given the handout that the two or three people at the September 2 meeting received. I quote from 14 CFR 150.23(d):

“Prior to and during the development of a program, and prior to submission of the resulting draft program to the FAA, the airport operator shall afford adequate opportunity for the active and direct participation of the general public to submit their views, data, and comments on the formulation

and adequacy of that program. Prior to submitting the program to the FAA the airport operator shall provide notice and the opportunity for a public hearing.”

Prior to the “development of a program” the public was not involved.

2. The Noise Study does not consider the cost/benefit or even mention the far South runway which could be expanded so that the military would have its own home and fly into the desert.

A. The cost was estimated to me by the Airport Director to be \$60 million. A City Council member Elaine Clegg endorsed this option. I think it has merit to even mitigate the 89 homes that the study says will be impacted regardless of whether the F-15's or F-35's come.

But, this option is not considered or discussed, and it makes this study flawed and not in conformance with 14 CFR 150.23

3. Conclusion: I believe the Noise Study should be rejected and the work started over. All mitigation ideas need to be addressed and discussed.

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Sincerely,

John Gannon