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Noise Complaint Response Process

- **WebTrak**
  - Complaints submitted through WebTrak

- **ANOMS SERVER**
  - Entered into ANOMS by LAWA Staff

- **Noise Management Office**
  - Staff investigates complaints and provides findings

- **Response letters mailed to residents requesting a written response**

**Noise Complaint Report**
- Monthly report posted on LAWA’s Noise Management website

**Noise Complaints received via**
- Noise Line 424-64-NOISE and City of El Segundo Noise Complaint line
Noise Complaint Investigation

- Data Clean-Up
- ANOMS Data Query
- Reference Tools
  - VCR Playback mode
  - FAA ATC Tower Logs
  - FAA ATC Communications
- Generate, review, & edit findings
Noise Complaint Investigation Findings

Findings include information such as:

- Operation causing disturbance
- Aircraft type
- Altitude and location
- LAX Operations – Standard or Unusual
- Overflights – Operations from other airports

Data Limitations

- GA or VFR operations
- FAA-defined sensitive operations, special flight activities or military operations.
- Private aircraft with blocked flight ID information
Noise Complaint Responses

• LAWA investigates up to five complaints per person per month whether a response is requested or not

• Findings obtained from the investigation are provided in a letter when a written response is requested

• Response time is approximately 2-4 weeks from the time of complaint filing
Monthly reports published on LAWA Website

- Disturbance type
- Number of complaints and complainants by city
- Monthly complaint distribution map
- Deviations from Over Ocean Operations (OOO)
- Operations with two or more complaints
- Findings for all complaints that are investigated
Noise Complaint Monthly Comparison

Jan. 1 – Sept. 30, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Complaints</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noise Complaint Distribution by City

Jan. 1 – Sept. 30, 2015

Note: Anonymous complaints are not pictured on chart and represent 24% of total complaints
Other includes 34 other cities
Type of Disturbance (as reported by complainant)

Disturbance Type

Note: Includes only complaints which were investigated
Cause of Disturbance (Findings)

Jan. 1 – Sept. 30, 2015
Noise Complaint Distribution Map

Jan. 1 – Sept. 30, 2015

- Each box represents an individual complainant

Note: Complaints received from Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, and Penngrove, CA are not displayed on map
Questions?