



PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA

Tempe Aviation Commission

Tuesday, May 12, 2009

6:30 p.m.

Public Works Conference Room, Garden Level City Hall Complex
31 East 5th Street, Tempe, Arizona

REVISED AGENDA

1. **Public Appearances;** The Tempe Aviation Commission welcomes public comment at this time. There is a *three-minute time limit* per citizen.
2. **Consideration of Meeting Minutes (April 14, April 22, and May 6th 2009);** for discussion and approval.
3. **Updates from staff;** Open Meeting Law, by Charlotte Benson.
4. **QED Noise Study Report;** letter to Mayor and Council for discussion and possible action. The Commission proposes to ratify action taken at the April 22 meeting that is void for lack of a quorum. The action is attached to this agenda.
5. **Mandate and future Strategies;** for discussion and possible action in view of special meeting on May 6th, 2009
6. **Commissioners' business;** topics for future discussion.
7. **Schedule next TAVCO meeting.**
8. **Adjournment.**

According to the Arizona Open Meeting Law, the City Council may only discuss matters listed on the City Council agenda. The City of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. With 48 hours advance notice, special assistance is available at public meetings for sight and/or hearing-impaired persons. Please call 350-8241 (voice) or 350-8400 (TDD) to request an accommodation to participate in a public meeting. The East City Hall parking garage is now open, parking information is available at <http://www.tempe.gov/comdev/docs/NewCityHallGarage.pdf> Parking for City meetings and other City Hall business is available along Sixth Street, Hayden Square parking garage and Centerpoint surface lot. Tempe also has more than 15 bus routes that serve the downtown Tempe area. For bus route and schedule information, please visit www.valleymetro.org or call 602-253-5000.

Attachment to May 12th, 2009 agenda for the Tempe Aviation Commission:

Action taken on special meeting by the Tempe Aviation proposed for ratification:

1. Motion by Barbara Sherman to accept the QED study, with explicit concerns crafted by members in two memos and presented verbally during the meeting. The motion was seconded by Duane Washkowiak and unanimously accepted.

The members discussed how QED had adhered to what the city had asked for, and how to deal with statements in the final report that were problematic.

2. Motion by Karyn Gitlis to recommend that the City do not circulate copies of the report in the future without attaching a position letter from the Commission. Barbara Sherman seconded the motion. The motion was accepted with all attending members voting for the motion.

The members discussed the crafting of a position letter that included both recommendations and critique of the report, and agreed it should be drafted by the Chair and include concerns over statements in the QED report that were considered to be inaccurate or misleading. Members expressed particular concerns over a statement in the report saying that the IGA by most measures had been achieved, and agreed that Tempe's design and promotion of a "corridor concept" also should have been included in the report. A statement about the 4DME procedure being generally favorable to Tempe was also discussed and the members agreed on adding a comment in the position letter expressing that the statement was questionable considering how compliance with the procedure was measured. It would only be valid using the Phoenix gate measure. The QED report understated the fact that the Gate had reduced the effectiveness of the Salt riverbed corridor, and the report did talk about enforcement of the 4-DME gate when it should say that the gate was used by Phoenix to enforce the 4 DME Standard Instrument Departure procedure agreed upon with Tempe in the IGA. The members expressed their agreement with a written memo from a member that rejected the discussion in the report of applying a lower threshold noise level than 65 DNL in Tempe, and a comment in the report about the noise monitoring system functioning reliably. This statement could be easily misinterpreted to mean that the data produced by the system was reliable. The QED did no verification of the reliability of the data, because it was not part of their scope of work

3. Motion from Barbara Sherman to include a statement in the position letter expressing the opinion that the IGA was not believed to have been negotiated or implemented in good faith. The motion was seconded by Karyn Gitlis and unanimously accepted with no discussion.