



May 31, 2026

Submitted electronically

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs
Office of Management and Budget

Re: Renewal of FAA Aircraft Noise Complaint and Inquiry Response (ANCIR) Information Collection
OMB Control No. 2120-0773
FAA Docket No. FAA-2026-0661

To Whom It May Concern:

The Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance (AICA) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments regarding the FAA's request to renew the Aircraft Noise Complaint and Inquiry System (ANCIR) information collection under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), Docket No. FAA-2026-0661. AICA previously submitted comments, supported by 76 organizations, in response to the FAA's 60-day Federal Register notice associated with ANCIR, Comment Tracking Number FAA-2026-0661-0068.

Our prior submission explained that complaint data may inform understanding of recurring concerns without being determinative of operational or policy changes. AICA's submission does not suggest that ANCIR complaint data alone should dictate operational, procedural, or policy outcomes. Rather, the submission recognized that ANCIR information may contribute to FAA understanding of recurring community concerns, which may in turn inform community engagement activities, operational review, mitigation evaluation, and noise policy discussions, including the FAA's Noise Policy Review.

Issues Requiring Clarification

Important questions remain regarding the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collection. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) should request clarification from the FAA regarding how its characterization of ANCIR as a "centralized, standardized intake/routing/tracking/response system" relates to the additional functions the FAA itself describes throughout the January 20, 2026 and May 11, 2026 Federal Register notices and other FAA communications regarding ANCIR's intended role and functions. In particular, two issues warrant further clarification.

Issue 1: Clarity Regarding ANCIR's Stated Functions and Public Utility

The May 11, 2026 Federal Register notice states that ANCIR is "not an operational analysis or automatic mitigation tool" and that complaint data "is not, by itself, determinative of operational or policy changes." At the same time, both notices state that the collection "supports broader goals like detecting noise trends, improving community engagement, and understanding environmental impacts," helps "understand community concerns," is used to "develop public FAQs, share insights with stakeholders, and support safety analysis across agencies," and "enhances transparency and public trust." The notices also describe ANCIR as "essential for the FAA to fulfill its public engagement responsibilities" and "essential for the FAA to provide timely, accurate, and location-specific responses."

These statements shape public expectations regarding the purpose and utility of the information collection. Additional FAA communications describing ANCIR as a portal for “all complaints/inquiries” may further contribute to public confusion regarding ANCIR’s intended role, intake scope, and community engagement purpose, even though the system itself is structured around the submission of discrete aircraft noise events. The notices themselves identify analytical and informational functions associated with ANCIR, including detecting noise trends, sharing insights with stakeholders, and supporting safety analysis across agencies. These are affirmative statements about functions the collection is intended to support. If ANCIR detects noise trends, it is reasonable to expect some visible indication of the trends identified through the collection. If it shares insights with stakeholders, it is reasonable to expect greater visibility regarding the nature of those insights. If it supports safety analysis across agencies, it is reasonable to expect clearer indication of the safety-related findings, concerns, or patterns informed by the collection.

At present, such information is not readily apparent in publicly available ANCIR reporting, which appears focused primarily on aggregate submission statistics such as complaint counts, repeat submissions, and geographic distributions. These statistics appear to be derived primarily from an intake structure focused on date, time, and location-specific information regarding individual aircraft noise events, rather than the trends, insights, or analytical understanding described by the FAA. The gap between what the FAA describes and what ANCIR reporting reflects raises reasonable questions regarding how its publicly available outputs relate to the functions described by the FAA throughout the Federal Register notices. AICA does not suggest that the FAA must publicly disclose internal deliberative analyses. Rather, the question is whether and in what ways the functions publicly attributed to ANCIR are meaningfully reflected, communicated, or otherwise identifiable through the collection and associated reporting, including whether the nature of the trends, insights, understandings, or analytical outputs the FAA states the system supports can be reasonably understood beyond generalized descriptions of internal process or usage.

Similar concerns regarding the clarity of ANCIR’s stated community engagement role have also been reflected in community and congressional discussions. In a recent Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus letter to the U.S. Department of Transportation and the FAA, Members observed that the ANCIR portal currently functions “primarily as a complaint intake mechanism rather than allowing meaningful engagement between the FAA and affected communities.” These observations further underscore the importance of clarity regarding the stated purposes, public-facing utility, and community engagement role of the information collection.

Concerns regarding participation and geographic representation have been raised independently by other commenters in this docket. The San Francisco International Airport (SFO)/Community Roundtable requested in its docket submission (FAA-2026-0661-0080) that the FAA establish a means to determine whether the portal “negatively affects complaint participation or geographic representation of noise impacts.” The FAA stated in a May 7, 2026 letter included in the Roundtable’s June 3, 2026 public meeting packet that these concerns are within scope because they “relate to ways the FAA may enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected,” and that it would consider “whether there are opportunities to better understand participation patterns and the representativeness of reported community impacts.”

Issue 2: Treatment of Repeated Submissions and Representation of Recurring Conditions

AICA appreciates that the FAA acknowledged in the May 11, 2026 Federal Register notice that “repeated submissions can reflect recurring conditions” and that the FAA “will consider clarifying how repeated submissions are handled and described.” Because ANCIR is structured around the reporting of discrete aircraft noise events, multiple submissions associated with a particular individual may reflect recurring conditions over time. At present, ANCIR's reporting does not adequately interpret or characterize what those multiple submissions represent, including characteristics such as frequency, persistence, loudness, or timing of reported noise impacts.

The San Francisco International Airport (SFO)/Community Roundtable also raised whether the portal allows identification of “noise effects from concentrated flight paths.” AICA's observations regarding ANCIR's event-based intake structure raise a related but distinct concern: residents whose noise experience does not correspond to a discrete, identifiable event may be unable to report adequately within the structure the portal provides, potentially producing a dataset that does not reflect the full geographic distribution of affected communities and their noise impacts.

These structural characteristics may relate to important aspects of the FAA’s acknowledgment that ANCIR could potentially “better capture types of impacts complainants report.” In this context, the interpretation and description of such submissions directly affect the representativeness, informational value, and usefulness of the collection, all relevant considerations under the PRA. This is particularly significant in light of the FAA’s statement that “complaint data can inform understanding of recurring concerns but is not, by itself, determinative of operational or policy changes,” since multiple event-based submissions associated with reported conditions over time may themselves constitute important information regarding the nature, persistence, and extent of the aircraft noise impacts associated with those concerns.

Greater transparency and clarity regarding how ANCIR information is interpreted, described, and reflected in publicly available reporting would directly address these concerns. Accordingly, AICA encourages OMB to seek clarification regarding both (1) how the FAA’s characterization of ANCIR as a “centralized, standardized intake/routing/tracking/response system” relates to the additional functions the FAA describes throughout the January 20, 2026 and May 11, 2026 Federal Register notices and other FAA communications regarding ANCIR’s intended role and functions, and (2) how repeated submissions and recurring conditions are interpreted, characterized, and reflected in the collection and its publicly available reporting.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



Darlene Yaplee
President and Co-Founder
Aviation-Impacted Communities Alliance (AICA)