

**FINAL MEETING MINUTES
OAKLAND AIRPORT-COMMUNITY NOISE MANAGEMENT FORUM**

April 20, 2016

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

1. INTRODUCTIONS	2
A. Bryant L. Francis, New Director of Aviation	2
B. Laurel Strand, New Oakland Citizen Representative	3
C. Abegael Jakey, FedEx Alternate Representative	3
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	3
A. Honoring Dave Needle	3
B. Co-Chairs Meeting with Port Staff	4
C. Acceptance of 4th Qtr. 2015 Noise Report (Receive and File).....	4
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (January 20, 2016)	4
4. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS	5
A. Montclair Noise/Flight Track Simulation Report	5
B. FAA Metroplex Initiative Update	8
C. Discussions w/FAA and Elected Leadership	8
D. SOSEB Activities Update	8
5. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	10
6. NOISE OFFICE REORT	13
A. Noise Office Staffing Update	13
B. Super Bowl 50 Recap	13
7. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP REPORTS	14
A. Main Runway Overlay Project	14
8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE	14
9. CORRESPONDENCE.....	16
A. Press release—New Aviation Director.....	16
B. Letter to Barbara Lee from Laurel Strand	16
10. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (JULY 20, 2016).....	16
11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....	16

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The April 20, 2016 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by the Forum's Facilitator, Michael McClintock. Mr. McClintock welcomed the Forum members and guests. He asked the Forum members and advisors to introduce themselves for the benefit of the audience:

Forum Members/Alternates Present:

Benny Lee, Co-Chair, Elected Representative, City of San Leandro
Walt Jacobs, Co-Chair, Citizen Representative, Alameda
Tony Daysog, Councilmember, City of Alameda
Cindy Horvath, Alternate for Wilma Chan, Alameda County Supervisor
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, City of Berkeley
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Greg Jones, Councilmember, City of Hayward
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Pat Mossburg, Alternate for Larry Reid, Council President pro tem, City of Oakland
Laurel Strand, Citizen representative, Oakland
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Subru Bhat, Citizen Representative, Union City
Bryant L. Francis, Aviation Director

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Jose Hernandez, Sr. Congressional Aide to Representative Barbara Lee
Matt Davis, Airport Operations Manager
Jesse Richardson, Jr., Noise and Environmental Affairs
Gene Reindel, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Rhia Gundry, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Harvey Hartmann, Consultant to the Port
Vince Mestre, Landrum & Brown
Don Kirby, FAA Air Traffic Manager, Northern California TRACON
Ford Frazier, Southwest Airlines
Jim Baas, FedEx Flight Operations
Abegael Jakey, FedEx Flight Operations
Kathy Ornelas, City of San Leandro
Sean Moran, Noise Analyst, Hayward Executive Airport
Bert Ganoung, Aircraft Noise Abatement Manager, San Francisco International Airport
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, CSR, Stenographer
Mike McClintock, Forum Facilitator

A. Bryant L. Francis, New Director of Aviation

Facilitator McClintock introduced Mr. Bryant L. Francis as the Port's new Aviation Director. Director Francis welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. He said their interest in the airport and its goal to minimize aircraft noise impacts was appreciated. Being new to the airport

and the Bay Area, he said his team is providing him with information and briefings to bring him up to speed on the issues. He said the Forum was an area of serious interest to him and he thanked those who were willing to come out and share their concerns. It was his desire that the Forum continue to be one of partnership and broad participation. He appreciated the participation by the various stakeholders and thanked them for their ongoing involvement, as they provide valuable input for these meetings. He noted that the Metroplex was of particular interest and that it would be the subject of discussion later in the agenda. He concluded by saying that he's here tonight to listen, to learn and to understand more about the airport noise concerns of those who live with it on a daily basis.

B. Laurel Strand, New Oakland Citizen Representative

The facilitator said we also have a new member of the Forum, a new citizen representative from the City of Oakland, Laurel Strand. Ms. Strand said she was very honored to be appointed as Oakland's citizen representative to the Forum, and hoped to be a voice for the airport neighbors and all of the citizens of Oakland who are complaining about the recent noise increases, particularly in the East Bay hills and in Montclair. What she has noticed most about the complaints, is that the residents of Montclair live at elevations from about 500 feet, to 1,500 feet. Her hope is that the flight tracks can be changed so that they no longer fly over the hills. She also expressed her concern about the danger and the safety of planes now flying so low over the hills. She concluded by saying that she hoped she could contribute to the forum and learn from it.

C. Abegael Jakey, FedEx Alternative Representative

The facilitator introduced Ms. Abegael Jakey from FedEx. Ms. Jakey will be working with Jim Baas as his alternate and as a Forum advisor. McClintock welcomed her to the Forum and said that the Forum was pleased to have both her and Capt. Baas here.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Honoring Dave Needle

Facilitator McClintock noted the passing of Dave Needle, saying that since our last meeting, we, the Forum, and especially Alameda, lost a very smart, talented and engaging personality. Dave was a valuable person who made great contributions not only to his community, but to the Forum as well. He asked for a moment of silence in Dave's memory and afterwards asked if anyone wished to share their thoughts about him. Cindy Horvath said that both Dave and Red Wetherill were appointed to the Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission. She said they were the most amazing pair that the commission had ever seen, and was very sorry when they both decided at the same time to leave the commission. The two of them were a formidable force, and they will be greatly missed. Co-Chair Benny Lee offered that Dave was very technically oriented. He was one of the original hardware designers for the Amiga computer and Atari Lynx. He said he would be missed. Tony Daysog said that both Dave Needle and Red Wetherill will be incredibly missed by the residents of Alameda for the many contributions that they made to Alameda, not just in the field of dealing with the airport. He said that the thing that really struck him about Dave over the years was when he showed me his own system for tracking Oakland's air traffic. It was just incredible.

Walt Jacobs said he knew Dave for a very long time, and he was a fantastic guy, and he lent so much to the Forum and to the Noise Office at the Port--helping them devise systems to monitor noise and things like that. Between Dave and Red it all adds up to an enormous loss because these were two people who were absolutely dedicated to the community and making life palatable for everybody. And we need to keep that mission in mind at all times. Barbara Tuleja said she knew both Red and Dave quite well. They were personal friends, and they are a great loss to me. But they are also a great loss to CLASS, and CLASS wouldn't be what it is today if wasn't for the two of them. She added that Dave always said that he was an extraterrestrial, and he was so much above the average person that we meet that she had to believe him. They were both funny and good, and they gave all of their time. She said she was lucky to have known them. Matt Davis, speaking for the Port, said that Dave's technical expertise and knowledge was incredible. More than anything, he was a pillar of this program, and he was instrumental in creating and maintaining that relationship with the Port and developing a very good program, which is not always easy to do in this type of environment. So, you know, an incredible person, incredible asset to this program. He will be sorely missed.

B. Co-Chairs Meeting with Port Staff

The facilitator noted for the record that he and Co-Chair Jacobs met with Port staff on April 13 to talk about the agenda and some of the issues that were coming up. It was, as always, very worthwhile. Walt and h learned a lot. McClintock said that some of his perceptions about what was going on in the world were corrected. He said the Forum is in a better position to take some actions tonight that are more focused than, perhaps, we would have been earlier. Walt Jacobs said that we are working closely with the Port. We recognize where the challenges lie, and what they can do and what they can't do. For those things they can't do, we have to find other ways to get things done. And in this, they're our partner.

C. Acceptance of 4th Qtr. 2015 Noise Report (Receive and File)

The facilitator said that the last item under announcements was the 4th quarter 2015 noise report. Typically, this is received and filed unless there are questions or discussion. To the matter of the fourth quarter noise report, the facilitator said he would entertain a motion to receive and file. Co-Chair Jacobs so moved. Co-Chair Lee seconded. Motion carried.

D. Acknowledgement of Sean Moran

The facilitator said he needed to add one last minute informational item, and that is to acknowledge the fact that Sean Moran, the noise officer at the Hayward Airport, who's attended the majority of our meetings over the past several years, is moving on. He's going to be the noise abatement officer at San Jose International Airport. The Forum wished Sean luck and expressed the desire to continue to working with him.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (JANUARY 20, 2016)

Facilitator McClintock noted that this item was for the approval of the draft minutes of the January 2016 Forum meeting. The facilitator noted that Forum members had received a copy of the draft minutes of the October meeting with their agenda packages. He asked if there were any comments, questions, or corrections. Two items were noted for correction. Co-Chair Lee

moved approval with the corrections. Ernie DelliGatti seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions (Ms. Horvath and Ms. Mossburg).

4. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

A. Montclair Noise/Flight Track Simulation Report

Gene Reindel reported on the results of noise analyses that his firm carried out in response to the complaints and the information that was received at the last noise Forum about the noise and flight track situation in Montclair. Reindel said that there were three questions that his analyses attempted to answer: (1) Is there a quantifiable way to express the noise change that the community is experiencing? (2) Do the recent flight procedure changes, as implemented, exceed the FAA noise threshold for impact? and (3) what is the difference in flight tracks before and after implementation of the Metroplex? Time periods for the evaluations were provided to HMMH by the Port and in the form of community recommendations. Data were obtained from the Port's noise monitoring system (ANOMS), and were analyzed for the periods of April 1 through September 30, 2014—the pre-Metroplex implementation period. The same time period one year later represented the post Metroplex implementation. In addition, at the request of the community which noticed a change around October 15, the period of October 15 through December 31, 2015 was also analyzed. The flight data included operations from both Oakland and San Francisco Airports. Mr. Reindel showed the results of this analysis in the form of flight density plots or “heat maps.” The heat maps used color coding to show the density of flight track usage. The darker the color, the more flight tracks. The maps showed arrivals from OAK and takeoffs from SFO over Montclair. He said that the exhibits demonstrated that after Metroplex implementation the flight tracks became more concentrated over Montclair, except for the period October through December 2015 where there were insufficient data.

The change noticed by the community on October 15 was related to the WNDSR arrival procedure, which, prior to October 15 was the WNDSR1 procedure and after October 15 became the WNDSR2 arrival procedure. For this analysis HMMH established an electronic “gate” to help determine where and at what altitude aircraft were transiting the Montclair district. The gate was located over a residential area in Montclair centered on Paso Robles Drive and can be considered as a window in the sky through which aircraft pass at different altitudes and flight tracks. He showed the traffic through the gate prior to Metroplex implementation, after implementation as WNDSR1, and after October 15 as WNDSR2. The data showed that after Metroplex implementation the flight paths for WNDSR1 were more concentrated over Montclair, and even more concentrated with the implementation of WNDSR2. The elevations in Montclair range from 500 to 1,500 feet. The aircraft transiting the gate averaged around 5,000 feet altitude, which put them over Montclair at or about 3,500 feet. He next reviewed the SFO departures over Montclair, which averaged 10,000 feet along two distinct tracks. For this analysis the gate was rotated to catch the SFO departures over the same Paso Robles Drive neighborhood. However, after reviewing the data, Reindel said, this still does not explain the change noticed by the Montclair residents in October.

For this reason, they chose to use a different approach in looking at the flight track density plots. This approach yielded a much more compelling picture. Before Metroplex the flight paths covered a wider swath—on the order of 3.5 to 4.0 nautical miles (4.0 to 4.6 statute miles). Once WNDSR was put in place this swath was reduced to 0.25 nautical mile (0.29 statute mile), and

consisted of 65-75% of all the arrivals. For San Francisco International Airport departures, prior to Metroplex implementation, it was the "SHORE" procedure, and after Metroplex it became the "TRUKN" procedure. Reindel said they did the same analysis for the "SHORE" procedure versus the TRUKN, and, here again, the same sort of thing was observed. Prior to Metroplex maybe 5 percent of the flights were over any given point—a swath of about a three and a half miles. After Metroplex up to 25% of the departures went over a given point under the gate. His conclusion was that after Metroplex the average center of the flight tracks moved enough to result in OAK arrivals and SFO departures flying over the same space. So Oakland arrivals moved about a half mile northeast, San Francisco departures moved about a quarter mile west, but the flight track distribution changed from about three nautical miles to a half nautical mile, or even less.

As for the noise implications, Reindel said they did noise evaluations for 32 residences which were engaged on this issue. The locations of these residences were entered into the FAA's Integrated Noise Model (INM) for each of the three time periods to produce community noise equivalent level, or CNEL, values for the average day. CNEL values were obtained for Oakland operations only and San Francisco operations only, and then both were combined just as the FAA did in their EA. He said the results were as follows: OAK pre-Metroplex CNEL 42-43 dB; OAK w/ Metroplex CNEL >42-<43 dB; OAK post 10/15 CNEL 43.5 -45.0 dB. So after 10/15 there was a 1½ dB increase in the cumulative noise level as result of Metroplex implementation for OAK traffic. For SFO traffic only, the results were as follow: SFO pre-Metroplex CNEL 44 dB; SFO w/Metroplex CNEL >44 dB; When the data were combined it yielded an increase of about 1 ½ dB CNEL. He concluded that these are noticeable increases in noise for Montclair residences, without a doubt. In response to questions, Gene explained the difference between the A-weighted and C-weighted decibel scales and single-event noise versus cumulative noise events. Reindel reiterated his findings. To the question of is there a quantifiable way to express the noise change that the community is experiencing, he answered "yes." His analysis showed Montclair is experiencing about a one to one and a half dB increase in noise, which is generally noticeable. But it's important to note that this did not reach the level indicated by the federal regulations as a reportable noise increase because it occurred below the DNL (CNEL) 60 dB criterion level. FAA regulations say it's reportable with a noise increase of 5 dB above DNL 60 dB. It's still not a significant impact; it's just reportable. This was also the finding of the Metroplex EA.

To the question of do the recent flight procedure changes, as implemented, exceed the FAA's noise threshold for significant impact, Reindel said "no." The applicable FAA regulation states a proposed federal action will result in a significant impact if the action would increase the noise level by 1.5 dB or more for a noise-sensitive area within the DNL 65 dB contour. While HMMH's investigation demonstrated that the changes in noise from the Metroplex' consolidation of flight tracks in the areas in which this occurred, were well outside the 65 dB noise contour. So, as stated in the FAA's EA, while there is a change in flight tracks that has resulted in probably a one to one and a half dB increase in noise, it's still not at the level of significant impact based on FAA regulations. Lastly, Gene talked about the findings from the additional analyses he performed. While there was an increase in noise, he said, the larger and more noticeable increase came from the FAA's implementation of the WNDSR2. When they put this into the noise model, they saw that it resulted in an additional noise increase over and above WNDSR1. However, more research needs to be done because, according to the FAA, it is possible that aircraft may have to alter thrust settings in the cockpit to maintain the required altitudes with the new procedure. These thrust changes were not included in the noise modeling and it has not

been verified that they are actually occurring. This says that more research and analysis is needed, including a more detailed look at the aircraft altitude profiles. Are there level flight segments in the data as they change from continuous descent trying to maintain an altitude? This occurs for a number of reasons -- separation from other aircraft procedures in the area, such as the departures flying overhead of the arrivals. Noise monitoring to determine the noise increase from the change in altitude profiles is being scheduled at this time. Jesse Richardson added that he has been working with SOSEB to deploy two portable noise monitors on June 3 for a 3-month deployment.

Ernie DelliGatti asked about the FAA's computer noise model and offered that because of the geography and terrain of the Montclair area with its ridges and canyons, the acoustical characteristics may be amplified through reverberation, and this is what people may be hearing. He recommended that it would be worthwhile to make some observations to validate the computer model. Reindel said that this was a good recommendation and he would like to have the computer model take into account terrain. Co-Chair Lee asked for a numerical accounting of the daily flight activity by altitude. He also said the duration of the individual events need to be accounted for. Laurel Strand asked how wide the flight tracks were over Paso Robles drive. Gene answered that they're less than a half mile wide; whereas, they used to be three to probably -- three to four miles wide. Ms. Strand commented that Montclair is basically 2.5 miles square and the earlier flight tracks were spread over 4 miles. Now they are concentrated directly over her community, and lower than 5,000 feet. Reindel said this was true. The data show that some aircraft are as low as 2,000 to 4,000 feet. James Nelson asked about the typical maximum altitude level for arrivals over Montclair. Reindel said he had not looked for this specific piece of information. Tony Daysog commented that more noise monitors were needed in Alameda, San Leandro and Oakland to better share equally in monitoring noise impacts. Cindy Horvath asked if the data analyzed by HMMH included business jet and general aviation. Gene replied that it includes all of the above. Ms. Horvath said she was asking because some of the aircraft transiting the gate at the lower altitudes could be business jets and GA. It would be interesting to see, because those can be quite loud as well, not just commercial planes. Ed Bogue asked how it was possible to model the noise when the aircraft types were not identified. Reindel said, the types of aircraft are in the model. They are tied to the individual flight tracks as derived from the ANOMS system. Ms. Terri Griffith asked if the noise model accounted for the low ambient noise level in Montclair. Gene replied that the model does not take into account ambient noise levels, but one of the reasons they are doing field noise measurements is to establish the ambient noise level. That is one of the benefits of doing the monitoring up there, because then we will have background or ambient-type information. So we will be able to show what the spread is between the loudness of an aircraft versus the typical level in the neighborhood.

An individual challenged the fact that the Montclair ambient noise level was not incorporated into the noise model and suggested that perhaps the model was using Oakland's urban ambient noise level, which, in his estimation, would invalidate the entire model. He objected to the use of the computer noise model and said the analyses should be based on actual measurements. Reindel said the INM incorporates terrain data from topographical data for the area, and the model incorporated 32 different points in the analysis—some as low as 500 feet and as high as 1500 feet. As for the ambient noise level, by regulation, the FAA does not allow ambient noise to be part of the model because they want a like-to-like comparison of all airports around the country. It doesn't mean it's right or wrong. So, again, he said, that's part of the reason for doing the measurements -- to actually provide further information. What is that ambient? What is the

disparity between an aircraft noise event flying over, and what's there without that? [Other speakers were garbled at this point and their comments not reflected herein]. Kurt Peterson asked if the data presented by Mr. Reindel was an average of the 32 points in Montclair. Reindel said the information presented was the daily average for each of the 32 points, i.e., showing the range change at each individual point. Peterson asked if one of the 32 points was the gate or is it an average. Gene replied that the gate was in the sky and the points were on the ground. The noise data reflected the aircraft activity through the gate at each individual point. Kurt said that the greatest impacts would be directly under the gate and that they would be higher than what the model implied. He then asked Don Kirby to explain why they changed from on procedure to another. The facilitator it was not necessary, because there has been sufficient information previously presented as to the reasons for the FAA to implement the Metroplex and the fact that Mr. Kirby is not responsible for the Metroplex. Larry Rosenthal questioned the use of dBA. Gene Reindel explained that the A-weighted decibel scale was more attuned to what the human ear perceives. It is the metric required by the FAA for noise modeling. Mr. Rosenthal was correct that dBC includes the lower noise frequencies, the ones that vibrate and shake the walls. Typically, dBC is used in architectural noise analyses. The discussion continued on the various attributes and aspects of dBA and dBC. Matt Davis said that he wanted to state the Port's support for establishing the background noise levels in Montclair. This is the reason they will be deploying the portable monitors in June.

Gene concluded his presentation by reiterating the fact that we are all in this together. That's why we have the Noise Forum. He said the good news was that the noise analyses have validated the concerns of the Montclair district. It has shown there is a noticeable difference of up to one and a half dB in CNEL, which is a very noticeable difference. So let's not lose sight of the fact that this is step one, getting to understand what it is you are experiencing in the Montclair neighborhood.

B. FAA Metroplex Initiative Update

Nothing to report. Other actions included in sections A and C.

C. Discussions w/FAA and Elected Leadership

The facilitator called upon Port staff to report on discussion with the FAA and elected leadership concerning the Metroplex. Matt Davis said the airport has been working the FAA and talking with Glen Martin, the regional manager of the FAA who's been assigned to "OAPM" and Metroplex issues with Northern California. In essence, he said, what the FAA is looking for and has agreed to allow those communities with noise forums to do is to bring their issues before the forum and define their specific issues and have the forums report back to the FAA with any potential solutions to the problems. These issues should only concern Metroplex procedures, and in the case of OAK they are the WNDSR arrivals, HUSSH departures and the TRKN SFO departures over Oakland. He said the FAA is open and willing to look at whatever the Forum presents to them. He said the appropriate next step is to recommend to the FAA our proposed solutions.

D. SOSEB Activities Update

The facilitator said that Ms. Helen Kozoriz Shoemaker would make the presentation on SOSEB activities, to be followed by Bruce Wetstone to talk about a technical proposal, and Matt Pour-

farzaneh on the HUSSH procedure. McClintock distributed a letter and technical report from Ms. Kozoriz Shoemaker to the Forum. She provided the Forum with an update on the group's activities since January 20, including (1) acting as an organized voice for the East Bay on personal and neighborhood impacts from Metroplex implementation; (2) assisting and encouraging residents to file noise complaints OAK and SFO; (3) contacting the two noise offices; (4) attending public meetings, and" (5) communicating concerns to elected officials about the concentration of overflights into OAK and out of SFO above Montclair. She said SOSEB has launched a petition drive and pursues community outreach at farmer's markets and community meetings; and is politically engaged at the local, state and federal levels. SOSEB is working with Oakland's vice mayor to draft a resolution petitioning the FAA for immediate corrective action for adoption by the Oakland City Council. They have met with congressional representative Barbara Lee and Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, and are working with other congressional representatives and U.S. Senators Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer to appoint a select committee to communicate constituent concerns to the FAA regarding OAK and SFO flight procedures. She said SOSEB would like to be represented on the Forum subcommittee that will address East Bay Noise concerns. She said that representation on this committee would help provide liaison to the community, continue its engagement with the Port and political representatives, and provide technical assistance to work toward meaningful solutions and ensure transparency and public participation. SOSEB has formed its own technical group to initiate the process of developing technical solutions to address both the OAK and SFO noise issues, and have coordinated with the Port to conduct field noise monitoring in Montclair beginning in June.

Bruce Wetstone summarized the letter proposal from Leslie Ransbottom. Ms. Ransbottom is part of SOSEB's technical committee, which includes people they believe are qualified to render technical assistance in coming up with solutions, including himself (a pilot and IA consultant), a former FAA air traffic controller, a data analyst from Lawrence Livermore Labs. He encouraged the Forum to consider SOSEB's technical team as potential candidates for a subcommittee or working group which may be formed to address technical issues and come up with proposals to the FAA that they may be able to accept or use in their analyses to find mitigation for the noise that's being experienced in the Montclair area. CLASS president, Matt Pourfarzaneh gave a presentation on the HUSSH procedure. He said CLASS represents about 3,000 households in Alameda on Bay Farm Island. His house was selected as a noise monitoring site, and is located about 1.2 miles away from Runway 30. The monitor was at his house for about 44 days to monitor the Metroplex HUSSH procedure which replaced the pre-Metroplex SILENT7 procedure. The HUSSH procedure is in effect from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The straight out departure is in effect from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. He showed slides with activity tables for the two procedures. For the HUSSH procedures the takeoffs ranged from 7 to 34 per night. For the daytime procedure there were from 94 to 239 flights per day over his house. He said what he wanted to show was that there was no statistical significance between the noise levels for each procedure because the departure heading for HUSSH is 296 degrees, while straight out is 300 degrees—only a 4-degree difference. The SILENT7 was on a 270 degree heading, a 30-degree difference. The turn to the 270-degree heading was also made a lot earlier, which resulted in a -20 dB noise difference from HUSSH. He said he had heard that HUSSH was implanted over SILENT7 because of the potential for interference with SFO departures. He said he had spent hours on WebTrak and did not see any significant potential for airspace conflicts during the hours HUSSH was in effect. James Nelson asked if the FAA was saying that the HUSSH procedure was intended to avoid interaction with the SFO departures? Walt Jacobs offered that it was also to reduce noise levels

over Brisbane, and that with the old turn to 270 degrees there were never any noise complaints. Now all the nighttime departures are concentrated along a narrow path.

Facilitator McClintock said that we have heard compelling comments and testimony from members of the public on the impacts of Metroplex. Others have different noise issues, which, for the Forum, says that there are two types of airspace and operational issues at and around this airport that we need to be concerned about. One is local noise and local issues, and the other one is the Metroplex issues. From the Metroplex, we have the HUSSH procedure along the shoreline that Matt just talked about. Then, for the folks in the Oakland hills, we've got the WNDSR arrivals as well as the TRUKN departures from SFO. We saw from the graphs that Gene Reindel prepared that some of these places get double jeopardy-- they get takeoffs from SFO and they're getting the northwest arrivals into OAK. It's interesting that SOSEB hit the nail on the head. They kind of got ahead of us on this in recommending that the Forum form a subcommittee to actually investigate these issues from a technical standpoint. This was part of the discussion that Walt and I had with Kristi, Matt and Jesse last week. I think we all agreed that, in terms of the Metroplex, there are some technical issues that need to be looked at. And in accordance with the letter from FAA Administrator Martin, he has actually asked the Forum to dig into these issues, investigate, analyze and recommend, which is pretty much in line with what SOSEB has requested we do.

So, McClintock, said, I'm proposing that the Forum needs to advise the Port's Executive Director that we think it's necessary to form a technical advisory subcommittee of members of the Forum and community groups that will work with the airport noise office, as well as the consultants for the Forum. He said he thought that with this the Forum can be much more responsive and come to some findings and conclusions much quicker than we could if we were to be part of the peninsula's supercommittee, which is comprised entirely of elected officials. Walt Jacobs asked what kind of support can this committee expect. Will the Forum's consultants be doing the technical work? The facilitator said the first thing is to get the committee going and then we can focus on what it is that needs to be done. But to get to that point, we need make a formal recommendation to executive director that we, as the Forum, as his advisors, need to look into these issues so that we can effectively report back to the FAA with regard to possible solutions. Benny Lee moved to advise the executive director of the need for the subcommittee. Councilmember Daysog seconded. Matt Davis offered that the Port supports this approach and that we can talk about the technical expertise and how we should proceed. McClintock said this is the way we typically operated in the past. The Forum identifies an issue and lays it on the table, and we request the Port and its resources to investigate this. However, it needs to be understood this is really not so much an airport problem as much as it is an FAA problem. The Forum and the Port should not be spear catchers for the FAA. But the communities came to us and said, we have these problems and you have the technical resources to deal with them. Walt Jacobs said make it happen because the translation into action means absolutely everything. If the airport and Port are willing to support us in all this, it just points out where we've come from a long time ago. The facilitator called for the question. Motion carried.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

The facilitator announced that this was the time for members of the public to speak on issues not on the agenda but relevant to airport noise and air quality at Oakland International Airport. He apologized to those whom he asked to hold their questions. He asked Jose Hernandez from Rep-

representative Lee's office to speak to the Forum. Mr. Hernandez read from a note prepared by Rep. Lee as follows:

"I'd like to briefly add we are working on addressing some other requests Ms. Shoemaker brought up recently, and we look forward to working with both the constituents present here, as well as Forum members, to address the concerns of our constituents."

Facilitator McClintock Thanked Mr. Hernandez for coming, and asked that he thank Rep. Lee for her support of the two House bills we talked about. This was greatly appreciated, along with the fact that she's now a member of the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus.

Ms. Wendy Partry (sp?) from SOSEB said she was very hopeful because tonight was a milestone in this long journey we are together in. She said the complaint process is very difficult and people are very angry about it. She asked if it were possible to stop making complaints and just focus on aircraft noise. Co-Chair Jacobs responded that although it sounds like a wonderful idea, the problem with it is that the FAA goes to the noise office and says, "How many complaints are you getting from Alameda, and how many complaints are you getting from Montclair?" If the answer is fewer complaints the impression is that people must have gotten used to the noise because they have stopped calling. The facilitator offered that excessive complaints from serial callers may have the opposite effect. When there are incessant complaints, that is over and over again, the system becomes overwhelmed and the information becomes meaningless. The facilitator asked the Forum members for their thoughts. Laurel Strand she had been meeting with Port staff to see if there was a way to streamline the process of filing a complaint, because it is a very difficult process and her neighbors often don't file complaints because of this. She said it would be great if a new form could be developed that will provide the same information, but in a much easier way, for the neighbors who are having problems. Matt Davis offered that there is no right approach. He said from the Port's perspective they are well aware of the issue. They understand the issue and are looking to move forward with the FAA. So a noise complaint on every flight track doesn't necessarily provide any additional direction for the Port to look at this issue or look at the concerns. General complaints from time to time that problems are still out there are appropriate, but if we stop getting them tomorrow, we're not going to assume the issue went away. We know the issues are there, and we will continue to pursue them. He said he did not want to discourage anybody from a noise complaint ever -- it's everyone's prerogative -- but from our perspective, it's not as critical at this point. Walt Jacobs said perhaps the noise complaints could be consolidated, for example, after a community meeting you can tell the Port "Hundreds of people came to this meeting and complained." You're giving the Port an actual fact, and that that provides more than trying to get Jesse to answer the phone, because I know the stress he's under when he has to answer a lot of those phone calls. But if you can develop a system, where we can say, "We had a CLASS meeting on the subject, a meeting at the Harbor Bay Isle Homeowners Association, and hundreds of people showed up complaining about what's going on around here and use that as the criteria, I think it might work well. Walt suggested this might be an appropriate subject for the proposed subcommittee.

Co-Chair Benny Lee added that he was very supportive of the need for a workable noise complaint process. However, as unwieldy as the current process may be, it is even more difficult for non-English speakers. Because of this, any statistical data derived from the noise complaint process is incomplete. He said this may also be a subject the proposed subcommittee can discuss and find possibilities of what can be done to improve the communication process. Andrew Segal

(sp?) said he wished to speak to the FAA through the Forum. He said the Oakland Airport and the community have been having a conversation about the impacts of aircraft noise for a very long time. Then suddenly, without warning, the FAA, began to route planes over areas that used to be quiet as part of the implementation of the NextGen air traffic control system. These are the very places where the most noise-sensitive residents have settled. He said, our communities have had an ongoing relationship with our airport, and one wonders how the FAA can ignore that. He faults the FAA's mission statement, which reads "Our continuing mission is to provide the safest and most efficient aerospace system in the world," Herein lies the root of the problem. With NextGen, it is mission accomplished. He said he believes it was the wrong mission. He suggested the first step in ending the problem would be to change the FAA's mission statement, i.e., "Our mission is to create and maintain an aerospace system that best serves the people of the United States." If this had been the mission of the FAA, NextGen would have been designed differently. It would have taken into account the people on the ground as well as the people in the air. He believes we need to remind the FAA that we are their ultimate customers and we are the arbiters of their success or failure in this regard. The FAA, continued, exists for the benefit of the American people, not for the benefit of abstract notions of efficiency and safety. If we change the FAA's mission statement, NextGen will naturally change to serve a new mission, one which enhances the lives of all Americans on the ground and in the air.

Kurt Peterson interjected, saying he wanted to apologize to Don Kirby and it was not his intent to put him on the spot. He said the proposed subcommittee was great idea, but someone from the FAA should be on it to give us their reasoning why they made the change besides efficiency, because that's all they ever said. He said they need to come up with an explanation. He opined on FAA funding. He thanked the Port for the Ballena Bay noise monitoring, and said that he hoped it would serve Montclair very well too. He said he wanted to state some facts about the Ballena Bay monitoring which was about an eighth of a mile from Encinal High School. During the period January 7 through March 22, there were over 1700 flights that registered 70 dB or higher. Of these flights, 258 occurred during school hours. Using a duration of 18 seconds per flight, this results in 4,644 seconds, or about 77 minutes. He said this was taking up from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of a school day away from student's ability to learn. He asked why this was happening, and answered that it is part of our vision to allow corporations to make money. So that's our problem. Ms. Leigh Fine said she wanted to make sure that everyone at the Forum is aware that the Metroplex problem is not exclusively a Montclair problem. She said she too had hundreds of flights over her house and had been averaging only a few hours' sleep a night. She no longer works from home because it is so loud. She said it would be a good thing to have noise monitors in locations outside Montclair, as well. Dr. Kate Skowl (sp?) said she wanted to speak about public health concerns, not just from a quality-of-life perspective. She said she was thinking about the FAA's mission statement and its emphasis on safety, but public health safety is impaired by jet fuel emissions. She said she thought we can all agree that your chances of dying from jet fuel emission pollution is higher than dying in an airplane crash. That's not really well understood. There are lead emissions, particularly from Avgas, nitrogen, sulfur mixes, but, more importantly particulate, matter. It's the particulate matter, fine pieces of emissions, that lodges in your lungs and your blood vessels, and that is the major cause of increased mortality for people who are the recipients of the lead emissions. [NB: Jet A fuel does not contain lead]. She commented that the FAA's OAPM EA determined that an EIS was not required. She said this did not make sense to her in light of the history of public health issues related aircraft pollutant emissions, and the fact that the EA said there would be a slight increase in emissions. So, now Montclair has more flights, at lower altitudes, confined to a narrow band over their homes, and

he possibility of human health problems as a result. She made a formal request that the Forum advise that a full study be done.

James Nelson said that he was concerned about Encinal High School. There is an ANSI -- American National Standards Institute -- standard on classroom noise. He said it would be interesting to see what the aircraft noise impacts in the classrooms are relative to that standard. He suggested that the Port take a look at this. Ms. Waafa Aborashed, with the Davis West neighborhood in San Leandro, expressed her concerns over her lack of sleep because of aircraft noise, and that the business ethos of the airport is why “a lot of our children are being impacted by all this pollution.” She was at the Bay Area Air Quality Management District recently, and was shown how polluted the area is around the Oakland Airport. The pollution is outrageous. If we don’t do something we will lose our children. Carmen Borg, representing CLASS said, she believed that CLASS would be supportive of the subcommittee and would be happy to participate in it. However, she also thought it would be a good idea, as Matt suggested, that these issues be taken directly to the FAA sooner, rather than later, because they are important issues that shouldn't wait until a lot more studies are done, and, in some of the cases, the FAA might be able to make minor adjustments that will result in a lot of relief to some people. She didn't know what those might be, but thought that it would be a good idea to take a two-pronged approach – go directly to the FAA and get done what we can get done that way and also form the subcommittee and move forward.

Ms. Sandra Marberg said she wanted to reinforce the idea presented earlier that Montclair is not the only area of Oakland that's been impacted. She lives near the Knowland Park Zoo, and in the last three or four months, the amount of aircraft has been so extreme that she started wearing ear plugs 24 hours a day, and now has moved to noise cancelling headphones on top of the ear plugs. She was surprised to find out that most of the impact on her area was San Francisco departures, but she also lives under that little convergence area in the south part of Oakland and there are some flights that are arriving into Oakland. She said she makes a lot of complaints to both OAK and SFO, but one of the problems with discouraging complaints is that a lot of neighborhoods are new to this and they don't know what's happening. They can't figure out what airport to complain to. She said this is a Congressional issue, and that educating people is important. She was pleased that the Port wants to deal with the San Francisco and Oakland issues together because she thought they are, obviously, convergent. Mr. Davis Brutolla (sp?) suggested that the field noise monitoring may be impacted by construction on Highway 13 during June and July. He said they will also be cutting eucalyptus trees in the Oakland hills about the same time. Co-Chair Lee said when a crime happens everyone knows to call 911. For those who are not aware of the Forum, they can contact their local elected representative and that information usually makes its way back to the Port and Forum. It is always a good idea to call your Congressional representative as well.

6. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

The facilitator called upon Matt Davis, acting assistant aviation director give the update on noise office staffing.

A. Noise Office Staffing Update

Mr. Davis said they have completed the interviews for the supervisor position. He said they were hoping to have the selection done by now. He anticipates having someone in Larry Galindo's old position by the July Forum meeting. He thanked the individuals who participated in the process. He thought it was a very good process, and that he was looking forward to bringing the selected individual onboard quickly. He said the Port already has an environmental person on board, and that individual is going to perform noise duties for the noise office. These duties start on May 9.

B. SUPER BOWL 50 RECAP

Matt Davis provided the Forum with a recap of Super Bowl 50, noting that it came and went in February. He said a large increase in corporate jet activity was expected all throughout the Bay region, from Santa Rosa down to Monterey. There was a large increase in traffic, but that traffic was managed very effectively. There was a reservation system put in place by the FAA to prevent gridlock from occurring. We didn't want hundreds of jets trying to occupy the same piece of sky, which would have stopped everything on the ground. Overall, things worked out fairly well at OAK— staff worked with FAA air traffic controllers to reduce North Field departures to only those that were absolutely necessary. During slower periods, when controllers could accommodate traffic on the South Field, they brought jets down there for takeoff. During late night hours, those aircraft were also put on the South Field. There were North Field jet departures, but given the magnitude of the Super Bowl event, he felt the FAA managed things very well. Co-Chair Lee asked about any lessons learned. Matt replied that the community outreach was good, but they can do better and will continue to refine their outreach and communications efforts. Again, he said, because this event was so unprecedented in terms of the number of aircraft that showed up, he didn't necessarily see anything on this scale occurring in the near future. Don Kirby said it was a pleasure to work with Matt and his staff. Even with an extra thousand planes in the Bay Area, everything went very well. Tony Daysog said on behalf of Mayor Chris Spencer and the other Alameda councilmembers, he wished to thank Mr. Davis for his recent presentation to the City Council.

7. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

The facilitator asked Mr. Davis to continue with an update on the activities of the technical working groups with respect to the main runway overlay project that will be coming up in the summer of next year.

A. Main Runway Overlay Project

As for the overlay project, Davis said, more information will be forthcoming as the project progresses, but it won't actually start until summer 2017. He said it is necessary to repair the entire runway surface every fifteen years. The reason for this is that asphalt break down over time. They are considering using Taxiway Whiskey for takeoffs while the main runway is closed, much like what was done in 2000. Benny Lee said he thought it would be very important to maintain the level of community outreach that was used for the Super Bowl because every time there's an overlay project, there are adverse noise impacts that happen to the communities.

For the technical working groups Matt continued by saying that the Metroplex was a topic of significant discussion, as it has been at the Forum. The NFG/SFG looked into the HUSSH and

WNDSR procedures, as well as the Ballena Bay noise monitors being moved to Montclair. Compliance rates were an issue, but there were some dips in the number of North Field jet departures thanks to Jesse's outreach to the FBOs. The numbers are trending towards compliance.

8. NOISE NEWS & UPDATE

Vince Mestre reported that the main topic for tonight would be the FAA reauthorization act, which in his estimation was created in a "sausage" factory. This reauthorization for funding the FAA should come up every five years in Congress, but this process can go on months at a time or even for years. In fact, the FAA should have run out of money last March 31, but they have been given an extension until July 15. Perhaps, when we meet in July, we'll have the results of the FAA authorization bill. Or it could get dragged on into September for all we know. The way things stand now, the Senate approved its version of the bill last night, but the House bill remains in process. Once the two bills are approved they will go to a joint House/Senate conference committee to be reconciled. The current House bill has a provision to separate air traffic control from the FAA into an independent corporation. This part of the House bill had a lot of momentum back in February. Its momentum has decreased considerably since. This is not in the Senate bill. It is not a part of the Senate bill. In any event both of these bills could change overnight because of amendments and riders. Senator Warren from Massachusetts has submitted proposals to require the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on the health effects of the NextGen implementation on communities surrounding airports. She has also proposed to require the FAA to re-examine recently-altered flight plans that cause unacceptable high noise, to mandate the role of communities in the drawing of flight paths by creating a community ombudsman and would advocate, within the FAA, to allow NextGen flights to follow preexisting flight paths that may affect fewer communities and mandate that the FAA not bypass the environmental review process of local communities for flight path information. That refers to the categorical exemption that, for some air traffic changes, can be "zipped" entirely.

The Senate has, as one of its proposed amendments, an Airspace Management Advisory Committee. This amendment was proposed by the two Senators from Arizona: Jeff Flake and John McCain. The amendment adds representatives from air traffic controllers and general aviation to the membership of this advisory committee, which at first looked like a community advisory committee and now involves more stakeholders. In the Flake and McCain bill, they have language that would force the FAA to improve their coordination internally within the agency and externally with stakeholders on these proposals for airspace changes. The good news is maybe that means earlier interaction, and more meaningful engagement with the community about the development of tracks, or it might mean – and this is what he feared it actually does mean -- that, within the industry, there is a feeling "If we just told them more about it beforehand, they would like it instead of dislike it." He said he didn't mean to be cynical, but honestly believes most of the people who are talking about better communication with the community are talking about the latter, not meaningful engagement. Representative Grace Meng from New York has also introduced an amendment to the House bill to increase funding for FAA programs that address aircraft noise, and the opportunity for increased community involvement in determining flight paths. This is the only place we found where somebody actually said, "Hey, the way they determine a significant versus a non-significant impact needs to be looked at more closely." Maybe that's where this whole problem comes from, because all of the people in this room describe an impact that the FAA has, in their environmental document, determined to be not significant.

Vince noted that another proposed amendment comes from a representative from Texas, not often known as a leader in environmental legislation. Representative Sam Johnson has provided an amendment to the House bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out a review of federal government research programs on aircraft noise levels and the use of such research to inform the Department of Transportation noise evaluation processes adjustments to noise metrics and development of noise abatement procedures. So this says we're not going to tell the FAA to go out and do this research; we'll tell the comptroller to review and report to the FAA. So the thread here is that, around the country, there's more than one group dealing with the kind of problems we've been talking about tonight. Vince concluded with a reading of the language currently in the Senate bill:

“The FAA would be required to be requested by the active community to review significant effects on the human environment in the community in which the airport is located. If it is determined there was such an impact, the FAA must "confer" the use of alternative flight paths that do not substantially degrade the efficiencies achieved by the implementation of the procedure being reviewed.”

Mestre touched on Greenhouse Gases, saying that at the Paris meeting on Reduction of Greenhouse Gases Worldwide, aviation was not included. He said we talked about this last time, but it was not included in the goal for greenhouse gas reductions because the emissions from aircraft are governed by international treaty, all governed by the United Nations through the International Civil Aviation Organization. UN Secretary Van Ki Moon stated that the eyes of the world are now on ICAO for development of greenhouse emission limits for aviation. These hearings and discussions should occur in December, and we may have results at that point which could be stricter than those adopted at Paris, or not. Lastly, on the subject of drones, Vince had two comments: (1) it has been projected that there will be 4.3 million hobbyist drones sold by 2020; and (2) The FAA has doubled the blanket altitude for exempted hobbyist aircraft from 200 to 400 feet.

9. CORRESPONDENCE

A. Press Release—New Aviation Director

Forum members received a press release on Bryant L. Francis, the new aviation director. We were pleased to welcome him here tonight and look forward to working with him.

B. Letter to Barbara Lee from Laurel Strand

The facilitator applauded Ms. Strand for preparing a great letter, which was distributed to the Forum

10. NEXT MEETING – July 20, 2016

14. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

Facilitator McClintock thanked all those who came to tonight's meeting. There being no additional new business the meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

END