

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

July 19, 2017

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

1. INTRODUCTIONS	1
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS	2
A. Subru Bhat Resignation	2
B. Acceptance of 1st Qtr. 2017 Noise Report (Receive and File)	2
C. Annual Dues Notices	4
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (April 19, 2017)	4
4. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS.....	4
A. NextGen Subcommittee Report Update	4
5. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	4
6. CO-CHAIR ELECTIONS	6
7. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT	7
A. Tower Update	7
B. Runway 12/30 Rehabilitation Project	7
8. NOISE OFFICE REPORT	8
A. Fleet Week Update	8
B. NBA Finals	8
9. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATES	9
10. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (OCTOBER 18, 2017)	12
11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....	12

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The July 19, 2017 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:32 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, Councilmember, City of San Leandro
Walt Jacobs, Co-Chair and Citizen representative, Alameda
Trish Herrera Spencer, Mayor, City of Alameda
Cindy Horvath, Alternate for Wilma Chan, Alameda County Supervisor
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Laurel Strand, Citizen Representative, Oakland
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Gary Singh, Councilmember, City of Union City
Bryant Francis, Director of Aviation, Port of Oakland

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Jose Hernandez, Representing Honorable Barbara Lee
Angelica Gums, Representing Supervisor Nate Miley
Matt P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager
Doreen Stockdale, Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor
Jesse Richardson, Jr., Noise and Environmental Affairs
Diego Gonzalez, Port Governmental Affairs
Hugh Johnson, Aviation Planning and Development
David Ucota, City of Hayward
Adam R. Schotten, Harris Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Rhea Gundry, Harris Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Vince Mestre, Landrum & Brown
Christian Valdez, Landrum & Brown
Thann McLeod, Manager, Airspace & Procedures, Northern California TRACON
Jason Ralph, FAA ATCT Manager
CPT Ford Frazier, Southwest Airlines
Abegael Jakey, FedEx Corporation
Kathy Ornelas, City of San Leandro
Kathy Livermore, City of Alameda
Burt Ganoung, Noise Abatement Office, San Francisco International Airport
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, CSR, Court Reporter
Michael McClintock, Forum Facilitator

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Subru Bhat Resignation

Facilitator McClintock announced that the citizen representative from Union City, Subru Bhat, had submitted a letter of resignation to the Forum. McClintock said that the Co-Chairs had signed a commendation for Mr. Bhat, and asked that Councilmember Singh present it to Subru along with the appreciation of the Forum for his service to his community and to the Forum.

B. Acceptance of 1st Quarter 2017 Noise Report

The facilitator asked for a motion to receive and file the 1st Quarter 2017 Noise Report unless there were any questions or comments. Co-Chair Benny Lee said he had questions on three of the reports: Runway 10 L/R jet landing complaints; North Field Quiet Hours complaints; and Runway 12 nighttime departures. Looking at the numbers for Runway 10, he noted that the compliance rate had dropped from 91% to 72% and that there were 238 non-compliant operations. He said North Field Quiet Hours compliance had increased, but was still only 73% which means that there were still 27% non-compliant operations by 44 aircraft. Runway 12 showed a non-compliance rate of 14% (51 aircraft), and for the 100-degree radial turn jet landing complaints, there were 112 non-compliant aircraft. He said, his question was what is being done to mitigate these numbers. Matt P. Davis responded that he would have to take each of Benny's questions individually because he didn't think any one approach would be sufficient to address all the procedures. For example, Matt noted, the nighttime procedure is specifically related to nighttime compliance off the North Field, and that airport staff has been working with NorCal TRACON (NCT) in creating an RNAV overlay to improve the procedure. He said, they have identified a procedural issue that fails to instruct pilots to make a right turn as quickly as they otherwise might. The vast majority of pilots try to comply but they end up turning late. There's not really good charted references to have them turn by a certain point, so they end up turning a little later. He said, that's why we have such a large non-compliance rate with that procedure, but they are working with the FAA to mitigate this.

As for Runway 10 landing complaints, Davis noted that this is a relatively-difficult procedure to comply with because the aircraft are lined up to land on Runway 12. When they break out of the clouds during bad weather and can see the North Field, they request a visual approach to Runway 10. Because of the fact they're on approach, air traffic control doesn't have time to give them noise abatement procedures; they'll just grant the pilot's request. Davis said they are working with the carriers and FBOs to get out in front of this before the weather conditions change. As for wet weather operations, Matt said that Southeast flows happen only rarely and that they are working with NCT to issue the 140-degree heading absent any potential traffic conflicts. He also noted that education is an important part of their outreach to the FAA, and that in the fall, they double their efforts with NCT to make sure controllers are aware of this procedure. Co-Chair Lee thanked Matt and complimented him on the fact that the reports prepared for the Forum make it easy to understand. Benny suggested that it would be helpful to include an hourly count from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. because most of the issues were with nighttime departures, and that if more incidents tend to occur during the early hours, that's something we'll have to manage better. Matt agreed, allowing that it might be good idea to prepare a bar chart or graph that would highlight the peak activity periods. He said he would work with the NF/SF Group to come up with an operational report that we can look at. Co-Chair Lee moved to receive and file the first quarter 2017 noise report. The facilitator said that he would call for a second, but there would still be discussion before the question was called. Co-Chair Jacobs seconded.

Ernest DelliGatti commented that the issue with the 100-degree radial has been going on for more than two years and is a constant source for his complaints. He said he didn't understand why it couldn't be fixed. It's a very simple procedure that can be remedied with NorCal TRACON. He said he would appreciate knowing when it was going to be fixed, because San Lorenzo is in the bull's eye of all of the new approaches into the Oakland Airport, and each time that it occurs, the whole neighborhood is awakened, and this includes San Leandro too. He said that when he

checked these flights, neither weather or traffic had been a factor. The problem is getting worse, he said. The facilitator called for the question. The motion carried.

C. Annual Dues Notices

The facilitator announced that the notices for the Forum's annual dues have gone out. He said that Alameda and San Leandro have already paid. Thanks to Jesse and Rolanda in the Airport Noise Office for taking care of this.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (APRIL 19, 2017)

The facilitator noted that members of the Forum had received a copy of the draft minutes for the April 19, 2017 Forum meeting with their agenda materials. He said that he had made a correction to the draft minutes on page 7. The correction was necessary because some of the information on the percent increase of noise were misstated or miscalculated when they were presented at the meeting. He said he confirmed the data concerning these numbers, and that the draft minutes reflect the correct numbers and percentages. He noted also that it was brought to his attention that the word recently should be deleted from the sentence at the top of page 3, as the occurrence happened two years ago. Alameda Mayor Herrera Spencer, offered a correction to the last line on page 8 of the draft minutes. She said it should read "the Alameda School District Board does not meet in July." There being no other corrections to the draft minutes, the facilitator asked for a motion to approve the minutes with the above corrections. Mayor Herrera Spencer so moved. Seconded by Councilmember Singh. The motion carried.

4. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

A. NextGen Subcommittee Update

Facilitator McClintock said this item is a standing matter on the Forum's agenda. However, right now there is not a lot going on. He asked Jose Hernandez if Rep. Barbara Lee had heard anything from the FAA. Mr. Hernandez said that they had heard that the FAA was close to releasing its report to the Peninsula's Select Committee and the SFO Roundtable, but nothing on the Forum's recommendations. McClintock said that was about all that he was aware of, but that he had been in contact with Dennis Roberts, the FAA regional administrator, and that he was informed that when the FAA completed its report to the Select Committee/Roundtable it would turn its attention to the Forum's report and recommendations. Hernandez said that Rep. Lee had sent a letter supporting the Forum's recommendations to Administrator Roberts and had asked for a status report. Director Francis added that the Port had also reached out to the FAA to ask the question as to when the Noise Forum could expect to hear back from them. Like everyone else, he said they were told pretty much the same thing.

Ernie DelliGatti expressed his concern that because "San Francisco is first out of the box," Oakland doesn't come up short. He said this was a concern because some of the ATC procedures being implemented at SFO are "causing more traffic, more noise, for not only Hayward but, also, Fremont, Union City... and this is occurring not only during the daytime but, also, the nighttime." He said he hoped that before they go ahead and approve whatever they're going to approve for San Francisco, that they also take a look at what the Forum has submitted to mitigate any potential conflicts.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

This facilitator noted that this agenda item is an opportunity for members of the public to speak on issues not on the agenda. Matt Pourfarzaneh from CLASS stated that his organization had initiated a study of six years of roving noise trends with data that were provided by the noise office. He said what they found was that the data clearly indicate that the non-compliance has gone up by a factor of two since 2011. He said this does not appear to be a result of increased flights because the growth was only 11%. Nor is the increased non-compliance a result of NextGen. Moreover, because of a change in the classification or categorization of flights in 2014, the actual number of non-compliant operations may have quadrupled. He said these findings were discussed with the airport noise office and, because the data are preliminary, all agreed that a better way of reporting non-compliance was needed in order to show the actual numbers. Mr. Pourfarzaneh also reported that the North Field quiet hours policy and the SALAD procedure are ineffective because the rate of non-compliance is 90-99%. Doreen Stockdale acknowledged that the NFG/SFG is working on this.

Richard Grassetto, a resident of the Oakland-Berkeley hills, who lives directly under the NextGen flight path that comes from the northwest, said he was also an environmental consultant, but didn't do a lot of noise work. He has noticed that there are certain airplanes that are much louder than other airplanes, and that these noisier aircraft caused the bulk of the disturbance in his neighborhood. He said he conducted noise monitoring of these aircraft and determined that they were primarily older DC-10s and MD11s. He said they come in in large numbers between 8:30 p.m. and 9:00 p.m., and again between 10:20 p.m. and 10:40 p.m., and at 11:30 p.m. There is no escape from the nighttime noise. He said he has reported these aircraft to the airport Noise office and was referred to FedEx's general complaint number, but that's a number for lost packages. "I shouldn't have to be here tonight," he said, but was pleased to see that a FedEx representative was in attendance. He would like to have a FedEx representative come to his neighborhood for a conversation with his neighbors, who are being directly affected by these FedEx flights. He felt that the FedEx flights should not be on the same path with the other northwest arrivals; those flights should be on "a quiet path down the bay." The facilitator suggested that perhaps the FAA's analysis of the Forum subcommittee recommendation to move this flight path farther east might solve the problem, but that remains to be seen. Thann McLeod, from the FAA's NorCal TRACON explained that there would be no real way for Oakland Center to say, "Okay. This [plane] will go here and this [plane will go] here" because then it impacts every other route. She said they would need to look at this because the Bay Area airspace is very tight. Thann noted that the Forum has suggested we need to look at amending the WINDSR arrival as a whole, and get all the airplanes to where there will be fewer complaints. In the meantime, she added, there is no real way to take a single aircraft and put it on its own route. Mr. Grassetto said in which case FedEx should get quieter planes.

Kurt Peterson, a resident of the western end of Alameda, said that he was extremely disappointed that there wasn't a representative from the FAA here and hasn't been for the last... [the facilitator interjected to point out that there were two FAA representatives present at this meeting as well as at the last meeting. Mr. Peterson said that he had not heard them introduced]. Mr. Peterson thanked Doreen Stockdale for getting back to him concerning a possible permanent noise monitor on Alameda's west end at Encinal High School. He said he still did not understand why this can't be done. He said he would like to know the procedure for getting a permanent noise monitor at this location. He said he's asked, but has not been given an explanation. He also asked for the

address of the monitor located in the estuary, but did not think that was actually where it was at. He said his primary concern was that his neighborhood, which is subject to considerable noise and overflight, does not have a permanent noise monitor.

In addition, he would like to get the Ballena Bay monitoring data that he requested at the January meeting; and “what does the FAA do to its controllers “for possibly violating pilots or airlines or carriers?” Is there a fine? A letter of reprimand? Thann McLeod replied that if a controller doesn't abide by the noise abatement procedures, the airport noise office sends her the non-compliance information. She said they review each and every one of them. If it's a controller that doesn't do it, they get a written record of reprimand; it goes on their record. It is a performance record. Because we assume the first time around that this is performance. If this conduct continues it can escalate to a conduct issue. So, on the controller end, she said, we do look at that and document it. On the pilot end, if we have instructed a pilot to do something and they don't comply -- the 100-degree radial is a good example of that. If we're clearing an aircraft for visual approach, and the pilot does not do what we say, that is a pilot deviation, which is reported to Flight Standards, and they determine if anything needs to happen with that. So, we will report these incidents. From an air traffic control standpoint, it is often the case that the controller has just forgotten to do it. The facilitator thanked Ms. McLeod and noted that the bottom line is that there is still no citation or fine. But we now know that Thann works with the noise abatement office to follow up on these complaints.

Heidi Martinez said she moved to Bay Farm Island in January. She said she has not slept very well since she moved. She acknowledged that she did not do her due diligence prior to buying the house by checking on the noise levels, especially since the open house hours were between 2:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. on a Saturday; which turned out to be not that bad in terms of the airplane noise. She said she has filed complaints with the noise office, but her other big concern is about air quality. She asked about what is being done to evaluate the air quality in her neighborhood. She said there were times that she could not open her windows. Her primary concern was for her children and that both noise and air quality are issues she would like to see resolved. She felt that the Port should monitor the noise and air quality in her neighborhood several times a day and provide a report to the community. McClintock asked if she had had an opportunity to discuss any of this with the airport noise abatement or environmental staff? She responded that she went to the meeting about the runway and that is how she found out about the Forum. She added that she was given the contact information for the regional air quality management district and Alameda County. She said if the Forum has other information that could put her on to the right people, that would be great. Matt P. Davis said his staff had spoken with her regarding noise, not about air quality. His office doesn't really have the expertise on air quality inhouse to do this kind of work. He encouraged her to speak with him after the meeting. Kathy Ornelas said she should contact the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, as they would be the ones that would study any air quality issues anywhere throughout the greater Bay Area.

There being no further individuals who wished to address the Forum, the facilitator closed the public comment period.

6. CO-CHAIR ELECTIONS

The facilitator commented that the Forum elects its officers once a year at the July meeting. There are only two elected officers: the Co-Chairs, one of whom is an elected official, the other a citizen representative. San Leandro Councilmember Benny Lee is the elected Co-Chair and Walt Jacobs from Alameda is the citizen Co-Chair. Both Co-Chairs have indicated that they would like to stand for re-election. The facilitator placed their names in nomination. Mayor Herrera Spencer moved the nomination. James Nelson seconded. The facilitator asked if there were any additional nominations. There being no additional nominations, the two Co-Chairs were re-elected by unanimous consent.

7. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

Regarding the North Field/South Field research group meeting, Matt P. Davis said that they reviewed NextGen/Metroplex status and the noise office report. They also discussed issues related to Runway 30 jet operations, and very-light jet takeoffs on Runway 33 (which is not part of the settlement agreement with Alameda, but which was raised as an issue by Alameda). He said they also discussed how to continue to provide effective noise abatement advisories to pilots flying out of Oakland, and that some modifications were made to the phraseology used by the tower controllers to help make it clear what the procedures are and who's requesting the noise abatement procedures. They will continue to evaluate this issue. Further discussions were held concerning non-compliance rates and how to characterize non-compliance versus compliance. Matt said every operation off of North Field is categorized as either compliant or not compliant. This information is contained in the quarterly noise reports. Every jet departure is reviewed to see what the specific air traffic control instructions were. This allows the noise office to do specific research on each operation, which gets back Co-Chair Lee's data collection requests. The raw data are there, and the why and how of each operation can be analyzed.

A. Tower Update

Matt announced that Carol Lozito, the former FAA OAK tower manager, has moved to SFO. Jason Ralph is acting in her capacity as the tower manager while a selection process is undertaken to get a new tower manager.

B. Runway 12/30 Rehabilitation Project

Hugh Johnson said he was available for any questions that might come up regarding the runway rehabilitation project as he began his update on the status of the construction of the project. He said that construction was scheduled to begin on September 11 and run through September 24. The time during the routine Monday morning runway closures is being used in preparation for the construction work, including the conversion of Taxi W (Whiskey) to a temporary runway and minor pavement repairs. Johnson said since the last Forum meeting he had met with the Alameda and San Leandro City Councils to brief them on the project details. He said they had also done other community outreach and were available to any group that's interested and would like to hear about the project. Ernie DelliGatti asked if the construction dates were going to be posted on the Port's website along with appropriate notice to airport users. Johnson replied that there will be a notice issued with the tower to get the information conveyed to pilots and air carriers. Ernie asked about notices in newspapers, on TV and radio. Hugh replied that there is no additional outreach contemplated outside of the local communities, but said that this would be considered if it would be helpful. DelliGatti said that he'd like to make this a recommendation, especially in light of the fact of the narrowing of the flights

coming into Oakland. He said this would pay dividends in cutting down on noise complaints because the public will be aware of what's going on for the two-week period.

Alameda Mayor Herrera Spencer thanked Mr. Johnson for his informative presentation to the Alameda City Council. Ed Downing asked if there were incentives or penalties for early or late project completion. Hugh replied that there are liquidated damages associated with construction, but the real focus will be on maintaining the two-week construction window because if they miss their incremental deadlines it will become a three-week window. He said they are very focused on planning-- really minute by minute or 15-minute by 15-minute increments throughout the entire two-weeks, and that they have contingency plans in place. But, he was not aware of any unique incentives, or other punitive characteristics associated with this project as compared to other major construction projects. Leslie Ransbottom suggested that more outreach might be appropriate because of the noise complaints that might come up because people have not heard about the project, especially since the airport has been under such scrutiny over the year-and-a-half because of the Metroplex issue. She suggested setting up something like "Mailchimp," where people can register their e-mail addresses to receive updates on the project. The facilitator thanked Mr. Johnson for his presentation and all for their comments and suggestions.

8. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

A. Fleet Week Update

Doreen Stockdale reported that the dates for this year's Fleet Week are October 2 through October 9. The Blue Angels will arrive on Sunday, October 1. They will be flying media day on October 2, and will practice on October 5. The air shows will take place on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The Blues will depart OAK Monday, October 9. She said she has been working with Diego Gonzalez in government affairs to get onto the Alameda and San Leandro city calendars for presentations during fleet week.

B. NBA Finals

Ms. Stockdale recounted the details of business jet activity and complaints registered during the recent NBA finals for the North Field. For game one, there were 18 business jets that departed the North Field. This resulted in eight complaints from five callers. For game two, there were 31 business jets departures from the North Field. This resulted in four complaints from four callers. For game five, there were 35 business jet departures from the North Field, and this resulted in six complaints from six callers.

Ernest DelliGatti questioned the methodology used for accounting for noise complaints because 2016 noise complaints were up by 843 percent. He asked if each individual complaint was logged, i.e. if 20 calls come in from an individual, does that count as 20 complaints; or are the complaints aggregated by individual or household, e.g. 20 calls from one specific residence would only be logged as one complaint. Ms. Stockdale responded that each of the 20 complaints would be recorded as such. DelliGatti asked for the current noise complaint tally for 2017 to date. Stockdale replied that she would get the information as requested. Ernie asked does the noise office include any noise complaints that are handed off from the Hayward Airport. He said noise complaints from inbound OAK traffic were averaging 10% of Hayward's total noise complaints. Doreen replied that the only noise complaints they log-in are those received by the airport noise office, and that Hayward does not pass along any noise complaint information regarding OAK flights. DelliGatti said that in his capacity as a

member of the Hayward Airport Forum, he has seen their reports, and Hayward Airport staff has informed him that they break out this information in their quarterly reports. Stockdale replied that those reports are not passed on to the OAK noise office. Ernie suggested that matter should be the subject of further discussion. Lastly, Ernie said that he would like to have data plots of the locations of noise complaint activity made available to the Forum so they can keep track of hot spots within the immediate Bay Area. This way, he said, if we've got one area which is experiencing more noise over another, we can go ahead and find out what's the root cause.

Ed Downing asked Thann McLeod to comment on the requirement to depart 30-plus airplanes off of North Field after the NBA game, at an hour of the night when the traffic off the South Field was not particularly busy. He wondered why the aircraft could not use South Field to depart. Ms. McLeod replied that she could not answer the question because NorCal TRACON had no input on that decision. They don't tell the aircraft where to taxi. Ed said he was just asking her opinion, as an air traffic controller, to discuss whether there's a good air traffic control reason for those airplanes to be expedited off North Field runway. Jason Ralph replied that it was not a matter of expediency, but for each pilot that flies in the class Downing was referencing, they are directed to taxi to Runway 30 when they call ready for taxi, by default. If the pilot then requests Runway 28, they are advised that the preferred runway for noise abatement is 30. The pilot acknowledges this, but says, "Roger. We're aware. We would like 28," and then the controller grants the request. So, the decision is based solely on the pilot's request, and each pilot that makes that request gets a reminder of the noise abatement procedure. Downing said he was familiar with the procedure, which is a standard noise abatement procedure 24-hours a day for the North Field. However, he noted, the community was told that during the NBA Finals, they should expect the Oakland Airport to send out information to people on the e-mail list and the alert list that they should expect additional departures off North Field runways for air traffic control reasons. In other words, "we'll have a lot of corporate airplanes flying into the Oakland Airport, and air traffic controllers [will] need to use the North Field to get airplanes sequenced into regular traffic to depart." What you're telling me, he said, is it's the pilot's decision to depart North Field at 10:00 at night to get his corporate owner back as quickly as possible. So, I'm hearing mixed signals from the FAA regarding why it's necessary for those airplanes, after a Super Bowl or NBA game, to take off over his neighborhood at 10 o'clock at night when the South Field may be available.

Thann McLeod offered that when looking ahead to projected air traffic volumes during high profile events, and it appears that there may be more departures than may be accommodated on Runway 30, then they should provide notice of the need to use Runway 28 for some departures the backlog of aircraft lining up for Runway 30 would start to cause delays at the airport. Ralph replied, such condition would be the exception rather than the rule. Downing replied that the point he was trying to make was that expedited departures can be accomplished off of Runway 30 at that time of night as easily as off of Runway 28. Airplanes can take the extra three or four minutes to go from 28 to 30 and be sequenced off as easily as to taxi out quickly to 28 and be sequenced off that. His point being that "the piece of concrete doesn't make a difference from an air traffic control standpoint. It's the extra time that people are not willing to take to go to the longer, quieter runway, that makes the difference in his neighborhood.

9. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

Vince Mestre began with two significant items: privatizing the air traffic control system; and the FAA reauthorization bill. There is a considerable amount of momentum to privatize the air traffic control system, he said. We have covered this before, but there really wasn't much of a description of what that meant in terms of the FAA's role versus a private air traffic control operation. In the FAA reauthorization bill, there is some discussion of what defines this a little better. Among the issues he had pointed out previously were if private corporations were to be responsible for designing procedures and did not have a federal role, they would not enjoy the preemption of federal environmental laws, which means a private corporation, acting in the State of California, could, in fact, be required to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, which is substantially stricter than the National Environmental Policy Act. There is a group called the Aviation Rule Making Advisory Committee. This is a group designed to review all of the FAA's regulations which the aviation industry felt was impeding their efficiency. Included are all of the federal noise regulations, including 14 CFR Part 150 (noise land/use planning), Part 161 (rules that prevent airports from adopting curfews or noise levels), Part 36 (which sets aircraft noise standards and airworthiness certifications, which is what a manufacturer needs to comply with to sell aircraft in the United States), and Part 16 rules (how federal money is spent on noise issues). He said, this wasn't a very targeted list because if they shoot down Part 161, airports would presumably have the authority to impose curfews and noise limits. So, this was a shotgun approach, and something to be very concerned about. A statement from the Koch Institute said that part of the motivation was to eliminate the prohibition of supersonic flight over land that was interfering with the process of developing supersonic aircraft.

The FAA Re-authorization Bill typically comes up every five years. However, funding ran out a year ago, which required passage of a continuing resolution to allow the FAA to continue to operate. Now there is a reauthorization bill going before Congress. This afternoon the American Association of Airport Executives sent out a blast saying they didn't think the bill would make it and there would be another continuing resolution to fund the FAA for another period of time. One of the items in the proposed reauthorization bill would be to phase out all stage 3 aircraft that cannot meet stage 4 noise standards. Apparently, this was very popular among community groups, but it gets you almost nothing because there are very, very few stage 3 aircraft that don't meet stage 4 noise standards and those that don't are gas hogs and are being eliminated from the fleet very fast. Vince said he would be surprised if any of them are operating at Oakland. The bill also spells out mechanisms for improving community engagement for Metroplex projects. In his opinion, he said, it's very good, in the sense the FAA has to engage early, but it's still murky language and doesn't define what "engagement" really means. He said he thought that the communities would like to have a more active role in the design of the procedures. Among other smaller items in the bill is a health study for five metropolitan airports where they're studying health effects of aircraft noise exposure, including sleep disturbance and hypertension. There is an amendment in the authorization bill that will eliminate the ban on supersonic flights over land. If the FAA does not adopt sonic boom regulations within the next 18 months, then, in 36 months, that ban would be eliminated. This is a problem because it directly conflicts with NASA's scheduling for doing their sonic boom study over land. Lockheed is building test aircraft to be flown in the U.S., and surveys will be done to assess peoples' response to those modified sonic booms. So, if this bill would go into effect, it would actually eliminate the ban of supersonic flight prior to the NASA study and the effects of these new supersonic aircraft.

He said his next item was very confusing, but nonetheless important because the original proposal was that the FAA would have exclusive authority to resolve disputes over aircraft noise and over NextGen air traffic procedures, but it is part of the proposed re-authorization bill because the privatized ATC corporation will not be responsible for airspace changes or airspace design; that that will still occur within the FAA and will fall under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. This is something we did not know the last time the privatized air traffic control program was proposed. Another interesting part of this is that, for noise complaints regarding airspace issues, the noise complaints would be handled by the FAA and not the privatized air traffic control corporation. The FAA will continue to control airspace changes.

Going back, he noted that NASA has issued the contract to Lockheed Martin to build a low boom demonstrator aircraft. This aircraft is to be flown in about 18 months. Surveys will be done under its flight path across the country. They haven't decided if they'll call it a "thump" instead of a "sonic boom." Sonic thump is probably a pretty good descriptor, because it would not be audible in most urban or suburban neighborhoods; it would be audible in rural areas and national parks, which is where the big concern is. There are orders for 76 of these supersonic business jets, and have identified their market for sales as primarily the New York to London market, so they feel they can build and sell this airplane profitably without having to fly supersonic over land. Forum members asked Mestre about the specifications and performance data for the proposed aircraft. The aircraft is still in design, but Vince felt that there still some significant technical problems that have yet to be resolved, including noise from sub-sonic flight. He offered that there's real concerns about whether this is really practical.

Vince next discussed shape-shifting wings, and the new engines for the Boeing B-777 (which are as wide as a B-737). He recapped previous information about the FAA's survey of 20 airports around the country to determine the annoyance response to aircraft noise for purposes of reviewing the 65 DNL noise standard. He said, this study is wrapping up and is scheduled to be available in October. So, he conjectured, if the FAA meets its schedule, we will be able to present to you what the results of the 20-airport survey at our October meeting. The Southern California Metroplex EA is the subject of extensive litigation. The lawsuits have been put on hold while the FAA attempts mediation with the communities that have sued them. Vince said that two of those communities are very close to coming to an agreement. He was not sure about the other two communities. But the FAA is working very hard to resolve the issues the communities have with the proposed RNAV procedures.

For air quality and Greenhouse gases he observed that the Trump administration is reviewing the ICAO CO₂ offsetting agreement. This is an ICAO program called Carbon Offset and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation. It is consistent with our pulling out of the Paris Accord, but we're now getting dangerously close to being in violation of the treaty agreements we have between nations to allow flights into each other's countries. We could see some countries start to reject applications from U.S. airlines to fly into certain foreign countries because we won't be in compliance with the ICAO regulations. So, we really are treading on some very thin ice when it comes to our relationships with, basically, the world, but in particular with respect to how airlines operate in foreign countries.

Drones... Vince noted that the FAA had registered over 700,000 drones before the court threw out the registration requirement. The court said that the FAA Modernization Act, which brought

you NextGen, included a statement that the FAA may not promulgate any rules or regulations regarding model aircraft, and the court applied that to drones. The White House is requesting permission to “track and destroy drones.” It’s proposed legislation that would allow any federal agency the right to track and possibly destroy unmanned aircraft over certain domestic facilities and events. For those of you who haven’t seen it, in one of the European countries -- I think it’s Norway -- they have been training bald eagles to detect and destroy drones. The Acoustical Society of America is trying to determine an acceptable level for drone noise. This turns out to be a major issue for Amazon’s proposed delivery drones—people just do not like them. In addition, drones are only efficient for the delivery of small or lightweight articles. As soon as you increase the weight, then the efficiency goes down. However, if you drive a truck into a neighborhood and launch a number of drones, it becomes much more efficient. Now there are proposals for unmanned aerial transportation. Uber seem particularly interested in this. Some of these are currently being built and tested in Dubai. McClintock thanked Vince for an excellent presentation.

10. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING – October 18, 2017

The next Forum meeting is scheduled for October 18, 2017.

11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

The facilitator asked if there was any new business. Benny Lee reminded staff that Kurt Peterson had asked to receive the results of the Ballena Bay noise monitoring. Doreen Stockdale said it was on her list of things to do.

Facilitator McClintock for a motion to adjourn. Mayor Herrera Spencer so moved. Seconded by Co-Chair Lee. Motion was approved. The meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

END