

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

January 18, 2017

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

1. INTRODUCTIONS	1
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS	3
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (October 19, 2016)	3
4. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS.....	3
A. NextGen Subcommittee Update	3
5. FORUM 2017 WORK PLAN	9
6. NOISE OFFICE REPORT	11
7. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT	11
A. Main Runway Overlay Project	12
8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATES	13
9. CORRESPONDENCE.....	13
10. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	14
11. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (APRIL 18, 2017).....	14
12. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....	14

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The January 18, 2017 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:45 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

Malia Vella, Vice-mayor, City of Alameda (Alternate for Mayor Trish Spencer)
Cindy Horvath, Alternate for Wilma Chan, Alameda County Supervisor
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Elisa Marquez, Councilmember, City of Hayward
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Laurel Strand, Citizen Representative, Oakland
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Gary Singh, Councilmember, City of Union City
Bryant L. Francis, Director of Aviation

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Vice-mayor Annie Campbell Washington, City of Oakland
Iowayna Peña, Policy Analyst & Community Liaison for Vice-mayor Washington
Quincy Washington
Jose P. Hernandez, Sr. Congressional Aide for Representative Barbara Lee
Darryl Stewart, Sr. Constituent Liaison, Office of Alameda Co. Supervisor Nate Miley
Jim Meyers, Alameda Health Care District
Dawn Jaeger, Executive Director, Community of Harbor Bay Isle Owners' Association, Inc.
Kristi McKenney, Assistant Director of Aviation
Matt P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager
Diego Gonzalez, Governmental Affairs, Port of Oakland
Doreen Stockdale, Airport Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor
Jesse Richardson, Jr., Noise and Environmental Affairs
Gene Reindel, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Rhea Gundry, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Harvey Hartmann, Hartmann & Associates
Vince Mestre, Landrum & Brown
Thann McLeod, Northern California TRACON
Carol Lozito, OAK FAA ATCT
Abegael Jakey, FedEx Corporation
Kathy Ornelas, City of San Leandro
Bert Ganoung, Aircraft Noise Abatement Manager, San Francisco International Airport
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, CSR, Court Reporter
Mike McClintock, Forum Facilitator

The facilitator recognized the presence of a number of distinguished visitors, including Jose Hernandez from Rep. Barbara Lee's office, Oakland Vice-mayor Annie Campbell Washington (and Son Quincy), Oakland Councilmember Desley Brooks, and Darryl Stewart from Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley's office. McClintock also welcomed Iowayna M. Pena, Vice-mayor Washington's policy analyst and community liaison, Dawn Jaeger, Executive Director of the Community of Harbor Bay Isle Owners' Association, Jim Meyers from the Alameda Health Care District, and several representatives from the Alameda Citizens League for Airport Safety and Serenity (C.L.A.S.S.) and Save Our Skies East Bay (SOSEB). The facilitator also announced that the Forum had three new members, including Councilmember Gary Singh from the City of Union City, Councilmember Susan Wengraf from Berkeley, and Mayor Trish Herrera

Spencer from Alameda. Mayor Spencer is represented tonight by Vice-mayor Malia Vella. Councilmember Wengraf was previously appointed to the Forum by the City of Berkeley.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. ACCEPTANCE OF 3RD QUARTER 2016 NOISE REPORT

The facilitator asked for a motion to receive and file the third quarter 2016 noise reports, which were included with the Forum's agenda packets, unless there were any questions. Co-Chair Benny Lee said he noticed an eight percent drop in the compliance rate for the North Field quiet hours noise abatement procedure from 71% in 3Q 2015 to 63% in 3Q 2016. Matt Davis replied that the North Field and South Field Groups had been reviewing this. It is related to the SALAD departure and they are still trying to determine whether aircraft fly straight or are performing a wide turn. He said they noticed the procedure itself does not give pilots explicit directions as to when to turn -- so they're making an attempt to turn right before they reach populated areas, but they're not turning sharply enough. He said the groups were looking at some options for further instructions to pilots to instruct them to make that right turn sooner. They are working with TRACON on this and hope to have more information in the near future. Co-Chair Lee said this caught his attention because of the low compliance ratio. He also asked that the quarterly noise reports include information on the time periods over which such discrepancies occur. He said "That way we'd have some metrics to work with in respect to trying to resolve some of the issues that folks are complaining about."

Ernest DelliGatti concurred with Mr. Lee and suggested that because of all of the e-mailed comments that are being received and disseminated by the facilitator, that a graphic illustration and chart of "hot spots" of where the complaints are coming from. With this information, quarterly comparisons could be made the same as for noise abatement compliance, he said. Co-Chair Lee moved to receive and file the quarterly report, noting the recommendations for inclusion in future quarterly noise reports. Motion was seconded by Mr. DelliGatti. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (OCTOBER 19, 2016)

The facilitator noted that members of the Forum had received a copy of the draft minutes for the October 19, 2016 Forum meeting with their agenda materials. This was a very eventful meeting, at which FAA Regional Administrator Glen Martin was present to give the Forum the direction he would like to see the Forum go in recommending changes to the NextGen procedures that were affecting East Bay communities and neighborhoods. Having received and read copies of the draft meeting minutes, the facilitator asked the Forum for a motion to approve the draft minutes unless there were any corrections or additions. Co-Chair Lee moved approval of the draft minutes. Co-Chair Jacobs seconded the motion. There being no further discussion the facilitator called the question. Motion passed unanimously.

4. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

A. NextGen Subcommittee Update

The facilitator thanked those in attendance for coming out in spite of the stormy weather. He said he thought everyone would be pleased with the results of the work done by the Forum's NextGen subcommittee in response to issues raised over the past year in the form of community concerns,

and individual comments and complaints. McClintock introduced Leslie Ransbottom, the subcommittee chairperson, who would be making the presentation. He noted that under agenda items 4B and 4C, SOSEB and CLASS have deferred their time to her for her presentation. He confirmed that at the end of her presentation, Ms. Ransbottom would be asking the Forum to approve the subcommittee's findings and recommendations. She replied that at the end of her presentation she would take questions, then request the Forum to vote yes to forward the subcommittee report and recommendations to the FAA.

Ms. Ransbottom began by saying that the preparation of the document that she would be reviewing was driven by community concerns. In response to these concerns, and at the suggestion of the FAA, the Forum formed a subcommittee to review the adverse effects on East Bay communities and neighborhoods from the implementation of certain NextGen air traffic management procedures. The subcommittee was also charged with developing recommendations for mitigating these impacts. These recommendations will be submitted to the FAA for review and feasibility analysis. The subcommittee was composed of selected members of the Forum, and community members representing Keep Jets Over the Bay (KJOB), Alameda Citizens League for Airport Safety and Serenity (CLASS), and Save Our Skies East Bay (SOSEB). The Port of Oakland provided staff, and technical and consultant support. The report itself is called "*Supplemental Proposals to Revise the Northern California Metroplex for Alameda County/Contra Costa County.*"

She explained that when NextGen implementation came to the East Bay, it created new arrival and departure flight paths and procedures for both Oakland and San Francisco International Airports. The changes that NextGen brought significantly altered existing flight tracks, the dispersion of planes, their altitudes and how they were concentrated over Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. This resulted in significant noise impacts that negatively affected specific areas. She noted that the East Bay has always had planes over it, but they were never as loud or as concentrated. Leslie added that "We're not against NextGen. It brings a lot of opportunities for aviation that we agree with, but we do think there are ways to make it livable with us as well." NextGen implementation in the East Bay has resulted in a huge number of complaints. She thanked the Noise Forum and the Port of Oakland for stepping up and working with the communities in providing the means to produce the proposal and to get it to the FAA in order to get the problems fixed. The result is this supplemental report, which is based on the use of objective data and other information to produce reasonable ideas that are intended to maintain and enhance aviation safety, respect and improve efficient fuel and airspace use, and create a fairer distribution of noise. She said we think NextGen and people can live together really well. She thanked HMMH for its work in developing graphical depictions comparing pre-NextGen conditions with post-NextGen conditions. This really helped everyone to better understand what had happened. Prior to NextGen, most flights were what is called "vectored." Air traffic control would tell the airplane which direction to go as soon as they took off. There would be a sort of natural randomness in this that would disperse planes over a much broader area. What NextGen did was try to establish highways in the sky for airplanes instead of dispersing them. As a result, airplanes are flying in very concentrated, narrow trails now, thus concentrating flights over specific areas.

Leslie said that the subcommittee's proposal identified six NextGen procedures and related issues requiring mitigation. There were four from Oakland International Airport and two from San Francisco International Airport. She said each are explained individually in the proposal and that she would discuss each of them in the presentation tonight. She briefly explained some of the terminology she would be using. The first procedure she discussed was the "HUSSH departure," which

is an Oakland procedure. It is a nighttime NextGen RNAV (area navigation) track that's designed to overlay the old SILENT standard nighttime departure. Basically, she explained, HUSSH was designed for planes to take off from Oakland and then move out to the middle of the bay and then up the bay to Point Richmond where they would turn off to their destination. The idea was to keep planes over water as much as possible to keep it quieter for everybody in the East Bay. However, as it turned out after implementation, the planes were taking off and staying a little bit closer to Alameda and Bay Farm Island than they used to under the old standard departure. In addition, it was determined that air traffic control was granting early turns that resulted in the aircraft being at lower altitudes as they crossed over the East Bay. The recommended fixes to these problems are both short- and long-term. Proposed short-term solutions are: (1) air traffic control can assign a departure heading -- like telling an airplane which direction to fly -- which will better emulate what used to be done under SILENT; and (2) air traffic control should keep planes on that route all the way up to the REBAS intersection at Point Richmond, unless safety dictates otherwise, so they don't turn early.

As for the long-term solutions, she said they will be similar to the short-term solutions, but the idea is to make them permanent by adjusting the HUSSH waypoint to get a permanent track that replicates the old SILENT procedure. Along with this we would ask the FAA to consider issuing a directive that planes always fly to REBAS before turning unless safety is an issue. In addition, it is recommended to move the location of REBAS closer to the Bay to better mitigate noise at Point Richmond. It is also recommended to adjust the nighttime hours, when planes have to fly noise abatement procedures, to give a few more hours of noise relief. Lastly, as OAK departures over Berkeley and Oakland are lower in altitude and significantly louder than SFO departures, implement the adjusted HUSSH procedure by routing all the departures directly to REBAS and then onto the next fix for all northerly OAK departures from Runway 30 so that the HUSSH departure procedure is in effect 24 hours a day for these flights instead of only at night to decrease the noise burden on the East Bay Hills areas.

The next procedure Leslie discussed was the WNDSR arrival track for planes coming into Oakland from the north and northeast. Prior to NextGen arriving aircraft were dispersed over a wide corridor—anywhere from 3 miles to about 7 miles wide. Post-NextGen that corridor has been narrowed significantly. What the FAA did was to take all of that previously dispersed air traffic and concentrate it into a smaller corridor about half a mile wide and moved it over the topographically highest part of the East Bay--the East Bay hills. WNDSR shifted and concentrated traffic from a seven-mile wide corridor to a half-mile corridor over the East Bay hills, and that immediately turned on the noise for everybody living in the vicinity of the summit—an area with ambient noise levels less than 45 decibels. The big problem with WNDSR is the procedure itself, she said. It requires San Francisco and Oakland to share some complicated airspace, where Oakland traffic drops down and San Francisco goes over it. This forces the Oakland bound flights into level flight under power for over 23 nautical miles, with altitudes ranging anywhere from 6,000 down to 3,000 feet above ground level (AGL). This is not only noisy, but it requires excessive fuel burn and it creates a lot of pollutant emissions. The current location of WNDSR can never deliver the fuel efficient, idle power, quiet glide descents that NextGen trumpeted and what they were selling it on—the things we applaud about NextGen. So, she said, if we can redesign WNDSR, we can get what NextGen promises us. It's a win-win situation.

She next discussed some of the ideas recommended to fix this situation. The subcommittee asked itself why it was necessary to restrict these operations to such a narrow corridor, and a heavily

populated one at that. The subcommittee's proposal actually has two alternatives for relocating the north and northeast arrivals, but is looking to the FAA to see if there might be a better location. The subcommittee's preferred alternative is to move WNDSR traffic to sparsely populated areas in the Central Valley to join the established OAK MADWIN and OAKES arrival tracks. This alternative moves the arrivals farther east where there aren't people living at higher elevations and where aircraft can actually descend under near idle, quiet flight descents instead of under power zooming over us at low altitude. One of the good things about the preferred proposal is that it uses some of the flight tracks that Oakland arrivals have been flying for many years. In addition, there's fuel efficiency, the freeing up of close-in airspace for easterly departures from Oakland and San Francisco and it may shorten the arrival track. This would also potentially increase safety by eliminating potential airspace conflicts over the East Bay. Leslie next described the second proposal to replace WNDSR, which also consisted of shifting north and northeast arrivals to the east over industrial areas and other low-lying areas below 400 feet MSL with aircraft flying at altitudes of more than 10,000 feet to join the established MADWIN and OAKES arrival tracks. This less preferred alternative would also allow more fuel efficient and quieter descents, free up airspace for easterly departures from SFO and OAK and could shorten flight paths. It would also enhance safety by eliminating potential airspace conflicts over the East Bay. However, because this alternative would potentially effect more people, it was the least preferred of the two alternatives.

The next procedure to be discussed was the OAKLAND NINE standard departure. This procedure is a standard daytime departure for aircraft headed north. The problem is that there isn't a consistent track that airplanes use when they take off and go north. The imprecise nature of the OAKLAND NINE departure creates excessive noise for BFI, Alameda, and other East Bay communities. So, one of the things that the subcommittee is asking for is a consistent track to provide noise relief for the people currently affected. The implementation of NextGen technology and procedures as they apply to this departure can be leveraged to provide a solution and bring noise relief to effected neighborhoods and communities. The subcommittee would like to see no turns below 5,000 feet on the basis of an RNAV track. Another problematic departure is the CNDL departure, which is for planes taking off from Oakland and making a U-turn and heading south. The noise issues here are very similar to what they are with the OAKLAND NINE procedure. Aircraft come close to Bay Farm Island and the Alameda shorelines. The subcommittee's idea is to get the aircraft farther offshore. The short-term recommendation is for air traffic control to issue a vector or a direction that get the planes offshore faster before making the U-turn. The longer-term recommendation is to establish a published, or charted track that eliminates the need for ATC vectoring.

San Francisco departures have significant impacts on East Bay communities. There are two such procedures that the subcommittee looked into. The first is the NIITE departure procedure. Just as HUSSH is the night noise abatement departure procedure at the Oakland Airport, NIITE is the night noise abatement departure at SFO for aircraft departing to the north and northeast. NIITE was basically designed to reduce noise impacts by keeping planes offshore and away from populated areas. Aircraft departing SFO under the NIITE procedure are to fly to the center of the bay, then turn north to the NIITE waypoint and then up to Point Richmond where they turn toward their respective destinations. What the subcommittee found was that the overwhelming majority of the planes were making early turns over Oakland, Berkeley, and El Cerrito. An FAA study showed 35% of the flights were turning even before reaching the NIITE waypoint in June 2016. This is contrary to the stated purpose of this procedure. The subcommittee is asking that the FAA make sure that planes fly all the way to REBAS unless safety dictates otherwise. The feasibility of

relocating REBAS offshore should also be looked into, as should the feasibility of changing the nighttime noise abatement hours from 2100 (9:00 p.m.) to 0900 (9:00 a.m.).

The second SFO departure procedure affecting the East Bay is the TRUKN procedure. Before NextGen, aircraft departing to the east from SFO were vectored along dispersed flight tracks over the East Bay. Planes now take off along four very concentrated flight paths, not the big, wide, dispersed path as before NextGen. The subcommittee's report requests that the FAA consider breaking its assessment of the TRUKN procedure into two parts—TRUKN North and TRUKN East. The study also recommends that the FAA consider the WNSDR proposals as part of an overall noise mitigation strategy for TRUKN. For TRUKN North, the subcommittee recommends that the FAA restore the historical traffic concentrations in the topographically lower areas where it existed prior to NextGen and where communities grew and developed under. To accomplish this, the Forum requests the FAA reestablish and better restore historical patterns of SFO departing traffic in this area as the proposed mitigation. The Forum also requests the FAA adjust the TRUKN waypoint to better restore the legacy earlier turn northward over the Bay and keep the lower altitude portions of the climb occurring over water instead of communities in Alameda, East Oakland and San Leandro. Additionally, the subcommittee report requests that the FAA direct Air Traffic Control to vector traffic along all resulting tracks in the TRUKN East area to better echo and restore historical concentration and dispersion of SFO departing traffic.

Leslie noted that any and all of the subcommittee's recommendations would be reviewed by the FAA. She said that one of the things made very clear in the subcommittee proposal was that they'd like to see the FAA model the proposed solutions to see if they would provide any benefits or not. If not, then the subcommittee would not support them, and other alternatives would need to be considered. The Forum heard from FAA Regional Administrator Glen Martin at its October meeting. Administrator Martin said the Forum needed to "dive down" and figure out exactly what the problems are before you can come up with a solution. She said this is what the subcommittee did and its report is ready to be finalized before being submitted to the FAA. Facilitator McClintock thanked Ms. Ransbottom for a great presentation and the subcommittee for its hard work. He also thanked CLASS and SOSEB for allowing Leslie the extra time. He also asked the subcommittee members to raise their hands to be acknowledged. McClintock said he wanted to take questions from the Forum next, but first wanted to know if Leslie had a recommendation to the Forum for any actions to be taken tonight. Ms. Ransbottom replied that the subcommittee has reviewed the report and concurs in the recommendation that the Forum vote to accept the report and forward it to the FAA for action. Ms. Ransbottom thanked the Forum for its support, and thanked all the elected representatives for their support, especially Oakland Vice-mayor Annie Campbell Washington, Representative Barbara Lee and her staff, and all the other city and county representatives who came forth to support the communities. She also thanked the Forum and the Port of Oakland for the opportunity to be heard on the issues.

Laurel Strand, citizen representative for Oakland said that it was exactly one year ago that SOSEB brought this issue before the Forum and began to complain about the noise, and now, look at what has been accomplished. She said she was encouraged by the work that has been done so far, and that there is more yet to be done. Ernie DelliGatti asked Ms. Ransbottom how long it would take a departing airplane to get to REBAS. He said he estimated it to be 3 to 4 minutes. Leslie said she did not have that information. He said Alameda and Contra Costa Counties have a combined population of from 3 to 5 million people, and that he did not think that an extra 3 to 4 minutes flying time over the bay to get to REBAS would be of any real significance to the airlines because

the additional time could be made up with winds aloft enroute. The extra time over the bay would grant noise relief to a sizeable population. The facilitator said that there was a request for a motion, then the discussion would continue. Co-Chair Jacobs moved that the Forum adopt the proposed plan and move it forward to the FAA. Seconded by Co-Chair Lee. The discussion continued:

- Kurt Peterson thanked the subcommittee for its hard work, and was very appreciative of the idea of extending the hours of the HUSSH procedure to 9:00 a.m. He said he believed it would be of great benefit to move as many of the departure procedures over the bay as possible. Peterson said the subcommittee should also look at how things can be improved for people in the SOUTH Bay who are also subject to extensive overflight. He said if we are to do it right, we should ask the FAA “for the moon,” because the FAA will probably not give us all we ask for.
- Ms. Ellis from Berkeley said she wanted to say thank you for the extraordinary amount of work done on this report. It was pretty impressive. She was not in favor of the TRUKN North route because people in Berkeley were already impacted by aircraft noise.
- Richard Rosetti said he has been involved with Keep Jets Over the Bay for many years. His concern was with arrivals into SFO during southeast plan conditions, which brings planes over his house all day.
- Bill Harrison from Hayward thanked the subcommittee for its work, but noted that the proposed reroute of the WNDSR arrivals would bring even more aircraft over his already impacted neighborhood. He asked that the subcommittee review this part of the recommendation. Sandra Marburg asked for clarification of the number of flights that could overfly her area by the revised TRUKN East. Leslie Ransbottom said that there were two easterly departure tracks in this area prior to NextGen. The proposal is to ask the FAA to disperse the new NextGen track over a broader area to avoid concentrating the flights.
- Ms. Marburg said there were no flights over her area before NextGen. Historically, she said, it was not an area of overflight.
- Udetta Slesch said she lived between Redwood Road and Keller in the Oakland Hills and has experienced an increase in traffic. She asked what will happen to the proposed mitigation measures in the future when air passenger traffic increases.
- Jim Meyers, Alameda Health Care District Director, asked that the subcommittee consider the noise impacts of low level overflights by smaller commercial aircraft over Alameda.
- Jessica James said she purchased her home in Montclair in April and wanted to know if the FAA had given residents of her area prior notice before implementing the NextGen procedures. She asked if her real estate disclosure documents should have included this information. She also asked about the health consequences of living under an aircraft flight track and what the effect of such overflight would be on her property value. The facilitator answered that the Forum could not address all of her concerns because they were outside the scope of the discussion, but, yes, the FAA maintains that it fulfilled the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act in terms of notification and public meetings.
- Mr. Art Dovy [sp?] said he lived on Hemlock Street in Montclair and has owned his house for over 10 years, but did not buy it in anticipation increased aircraft overflight and noise. He believes this is having an adverse effect on his family’s health. He said he would support a lawsuit.
- Michael Bostick from Montclair acknowledged the amount of work done in putting together the report and the communities’ investment in hours of research into the problem. He said all the work and the evaluation that was done is something that should warrant the

FAA's serious attention. He said it was urgent to get this information the FAA as quickly as possible.

- Rick Bradfey [sp?] said he lives near Skyline High School at the top of Redwood Road off Skyline. He said he was heavily impacted by the convergence of TRUKN east and WINDSR to the extent that he believes the increased noise levels exceed the FAA's thresholds of significance.
- Alicia McKenzie from Bay Farm Island thanked everyone for their hard work. She said that 96% of the departures come over her house. Her house shakes and the pictures on the wall vibrate. The noise wakes her up in the middle of the night and it is disturbing and upsetting. She asked if she had to absorb the \$20,000 cost of installing double-pane windows.

Facilitator McClintock noted that the hour was getting late and there was considerable agenda material to get through. He said if anyone has something more to add to the discussion, he'd like to hear about it, but there is no benefit in repeating things over and over again. This is keeping us from our agenda tonight and our ability to move this item forward to the FAA. Additional speakers included:

- Reva Fabria [sp?] said that, in addition to Barbara Lee, we need the support of our two U.S. Senators in dealing with the FAA.
- Nina McKenzie offered that the letter to the FAA should include a deadline for a response from the FAA.

Leslie Ransbottom added the letter also require the FAA to set up a process with the Forum for them to get back to us through an open line of communication. Co-Chair Jacobs said we need to get this to the FAA as quickly as possible. Holding up the report and adding more to it at this point is not the right way to do it because you need to get the FAA started on its review. We need to get it in their hands if we want to get some action. Co-Chair Lee noted that the report addresses the major issues raised by the FAA, but some general aviation issues that have been raised are not related to NextGen. The Forum can work with the airport on these issues.

Aviation Director Francis asked Vince Mestre if he had any comments. Mr. Mestre replied that he had reviewed the report and that the first few proposals are very straight forward. However, when it comes to moving flight tracks from one location to another he felt it was very important to include those communities or area that may be affected to be included in the discussion. Vince asked that the Forum consider those that might potentially be affected. He said informed consent or even informed non-consent is far better than what we have now, and which is where the current controversy came from. Edward Bogue added that this very point was brought up by a Hayward resident tonight who was concerned with how the relocated WINDSR track would add to the impact of that last leg that comes over Hayward. The solution will not be easy. Cindy Horvath encouraged the Forum members to get resolutions or letters of support from their respective jurisdictions, and this can take some time. Walt Jacobs reminded everyone that this is a top-down issue. It's extremely political, and communities that are involved in this process need to support the Forum. The strength of the cities backing up what we're doing is really important, but we've got to get the process moving. Benny Lee concurred with Walt. The question was called and the motion to approve the subcommittee report and forward it to the FAA Regional Administrator was approved unanimously.

5. FORUM 2017 WORK PLAN

The facilitator noted that the Forum updates its annual work plan every year in January, and that he had provided Forum members with a copy of the proposed updates to the 2017 Forum Work Plan. McClintock said the work plan consists of three sections: Legislative and regulatory initiatives; studies; and presentations. He reviewed the proposed changes and additions to the legislative and regulatory initiatives, including to review and establish a Forum position on the *Quiet Communities Act* and the *FAA Community Responsibility Act*. He said he proposed the addition of the *Airplane Impact and Mitigation Act of 2016* (H.R. 5075) and the *FAA Community Accountability Act of 2016* (S.2761). He said he added a new initiative to “To support and maintain the Forum’s subcommittee to address NextGen implementation issues affecting East Bay communities,” and another initiative “To support expanding opportunity for community engagement, review and eliminate categorical exclusions (CATEX) when implementing performance-based navigation. He noted that people would like to see this categorical exclusion eliminated because much of the problems that have been created are as a result of the use of CATEXs in lieu of adequate environmental review. He said that this is also an initiative of the National Organization to Ensure a Sound Controlled Environment (N.O.I.S.E.), which continues to lobby for measures to ensure adequate community engagement and require the FAA to include environmental review to ensure that community concerns are represented in the FAA decision-making process. As a part of efforts to ensure adequate community engagement, the Forum supports N.O.I.S.E. in believing that both regulatory and legislative Categorical Exclusions or “CATEXs” in current NEPA regulation are not appropriate for the implementation of significant changes to our airspace system. The Forum supports N.O.I.S.E. in backing efforts by the FAA and Congress to develop, implement and maintain a more robust community impacts process, in addition to or outside of the traditional NEPA process. This process should insure that ground impacts are considered and community concerns are not only heard, but also incorporated into PBN and traditional track changes that will change noise exposure, even if it does not reach the current FAA threshold of “measurable impacts.”

Initiative No. 4 is a N.O.I.S.E. legislative priority because PBN has the potential to bring significant changes to flight tracks. Although N.O.I.S.E. supports NextGen and its goal of modernizing the air traffic control system, it also contends that the community impacts of aviation noise should be considered as a crucial part of the calculation that determines the overall benefits of the proposed changes. Hence, the community impacts of aviation noise should be considered a crucial part of the calculation that determines the potential benefits of any proposed airspace utilization changes in addition to improved capacity and fuel savings. Changes should not be solely based on improved capacity and fuel savings. With the increased concentration of overflights due to the narrowing of flight paths and the decrease in separation between aircraft enabled by PBN, air traffic changes have become even more closely tied to impacts on the ground. The Forum supports N.O.I.S.E. on this issue and encourages the FAA to engage with affected communities to ensure that the impact and concerns of these communities are heard and incorporated into the final design of new airspace as much as fuel savings and efficiency of airspace. This would allow communities under a new or concentrated flight path guaranteed participation and due process during the implementation of PBN.

The facilitator said that he had added additional language to Initiative No. 5 concerning the FAA’s investigation and review of the DNL noise metric. He recommended the Forum adopt this initiative in support of N.O.I.S.E., because to be able to fully understand and address the impacts of aviation

noise, it is first necessary to establish suitable metrics to measure such impacts. N.O.I.S.E. advocates that the FAA consider alternative metrics to supplement or even replace DNL (CNEL in California). The Forum concurs with N.O.I.S.E. that lowering the DNL level may allow for further mitigation for impacted communities, however; this alone will not address impacts that are caused by concentrated flight paths as characterized by PBN procedures. As DNL is an average and humans do not perceive noise in averages but rather as individual events, the Forum supports N.O.I.S.E. in its belief that it is time to investigate alternative metrics for assessing noise impacts such as:

- The psychological impact of concentrated, extended noise
- The physiological impact of infrequent, significant noise spikes during nighttime hours
- Impact of less audible low frequency noise and vibration
- The length of each period of frequent, regular noise spikes “rush hours” due to over-flights
- The number of rush hours per day
- The average dB of a rush hour’s noise—not day-night average
- The intensity of spikes above the average dB of a rush hour’s noise
- The intensity and number of spikes above the average, for non-rush hours from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.

Investigating more appropriate metrics to measure aviation noise impacts is crucial and will supplement efforts to greater engage the community and to understand their concerns regarding impacts. Initiative No. 6 is to support the N.O.I.S.E. legislative priority to lower the FAA DNL standard from 65 decibels and pursue a change in FAA Order 5010.1F “Environmental Impacts,” to reconsider what defines a “significant impact. Continuing on through minor date and text changes, McClintock noted that Initiative No. 15 has been an ongoing Forum initiative. He recommended that the Forum request a report on the status of stage 3 HUSSH kitted air carrier or cargo aircraft operating at Oakland. However, it was also noted that there may not be any such aircraft currently operating at OAK. Benny Lee commented that on Initiative 17, “Formalize the Forum's coalition building and outreach with other regional/national noise forums,” N.O.I.S.E. has adjunct sessions at the National League of Cities conferences.

Facilitator McClintock next reviewed the list of studies. He noted that Laurel Strand asked for a study session on helicopter operations. Ernie DelliGatti offered that he was on the Hayward Airport noise forum for helicopters, and extended an invitation to Forum members to join with Hayward to help get this issue resolved. McClintock noted that the Oakland Airport held a joint meeting with helicopter operators last year, and that maybe it was time to hold another such meeting. In response to Laurel’s request he said he moved Presentation No. 5 up to No. 8 under Studies. He said he added a new number 7 under Studies, “Study potential for optimized ascent procedures as noise abatement measure.” He said he also added an updated link to N.O.I.S.E.'s legislative priorities. Walt Jacobs moved for adoption of the draft Forum Work plan 2017. Seconded by Co-Chair Lee. Motion approved unanimously.

6. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

Doreen Stockdale reported on the pilot outreach meeting held on November 16. All of the North Field tenants were invited, including Kaiser Air and Signature. Five pilots attended, but it ended up being a good meeting. Lots of community questions were answered. This will be a semiannual event going forward. She said that she and Jesse Richardson had been working with B&K, the

vendor for the Airport's ANOMS noise reporting system in response to a comment from the North Field/South Field Research Group about their complaints not being received. The result was the development of an auto response to the complainant that their complaint had been received. Each complainant now gets a specified paragraph that tells them their complaint was received, gives their complaint number, tells them their complaints will be tallied and counted in the quarterly reports, and gives them the noise program's e-mail and phone number in case they have anything additional to provide. Lastly, she said, they are working on a Northern California TRACON tour for the first quarter of this year. It will most likely be in March. As soon as she has a firm date, she will let the Forum members and research group members know. Co-Chair Lee asked how many notices were sent out for the pilots meeting if only five attended. Ms. Stockdale said the e-mail went out to well over a hundred people/businesses. Mr. Lee asked for future reports on outreach activities and the success rate.

7. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

A. Main Runway Overlay Project

Matt P. Davis said that a lot of NextGen-related items were discussed at the North Field/South Field Research Group meeting. He said concerns were raised over GA airplanes departing from the North Field on a heading of 315 degrees—the NIMITZ departure, which takes them directly over Alameda. The group also discussed the issue of noise complaints not being recognized, as was just discussed by Doreen. Matt said the group spent a lot of time on the Metroplex report and the Noise Office report. The SALAD departure and its compliance rate was also discussed. He said the focus is on providing pilots additional instructions to make the turn quickly enough, because they tend to make the turn too wide. Another issue discussed was the “ATC Instruction” category that is used in ANOMS to exempt noncompliant aircraft—for instance, if an aircraft turns below 3,000 feet over Alameda, it's important to know if the pilot did that because he wanted to do it or if ATC gave him that instruction. Matt noted that there are exceptions to the category of “ATC Instruction,” such as the recent Super Bowl or Fleet Week which generate an exceptional number of North Field departures. Due to the confusion with the category, the noise office worked with the vendor to create a “Special Events” category. This will allow the noise office to perform better analysis for events like the Super Bowl and NBA Finals in the future. Again, he noted, staff is tracking this to get more data in order to provide more detail in the noise reports.

Another issue discussed was straight-out departures from Runway 30. This was discussed somewhat in the NextGen report relative to the Oakland 9 departure, and asking for an RNAV departure for this procedure. This could alleviate some of the issues that Alameda is experiencing. Davis said the noise office was analyzing straight-out departures off of Runway 30 pre-Metroplex and post-Metroplex, which are, basically, the Oakland 9 departures and the CANDL. Walt Jacobs suggested taking this issue directly to the NorCal TRACON. Davis responded that the noise office can look at this, but that this has been difficult in the past because TRACON has said that any left turn off of Runway 30 conflicts with San Francisco traffic. Matt also spoke about an issue that occurred over the holidays when an older model Convair turboprop had generated a lot of noise complaints from over a broad area of Alameda. He said according to noise abatement procedures aircraft over 17 thousand pounds should not be using the North Field. This is old airplane weighed over 50 thousand pounds. The pilot was contacted and agreed not to use North Field in the future.

There was some concern about the ANOMS equipment and its compatibility with NextGen. The noise equipment doesn't care whether or not it's a NextGen or legacy procedure; it just tracks airplanes. If there's any questions on this new stuff, it's the same whether or not on a NextGen or legacy procedure. The community asked for the FAA ATCT to change its phraseology given to pilots off the North Field to increase compliance for Runway 28R/28L departures by reinforcing the need to use Runway 30. The tower agreed to make this change and brief their personnel. CLASS gave a good presentation on the number of planes that are being allowed to use Runways 28L and 28R that are exempted from the noise abatement policy. There are some valid reasons for this. For example, when Runway 30 is undergoing maintenance, or for Lifeguard flights, but, generally speaking, unless there is an absolute need, they should be using Runway 30. Again, here were a few times in 2015 -- Super Bowl and other events -- that really impacted the compliance numbers. There were some corridors where it looked like ATC was, for weeks at a time, not utilizing the noise abatement procedures out of Oakland. More recently, the data show a return to more normal conditions.

Another issue was that the community advisories were often vague and people didn't know what was going on. Matt said they would endeavor to do a better job at providing more detail in the community advisories. When they have runway closures or issues, they will try their best to get additional details to folks. Sometimes, on the mass notification, he said, they can't give much detail because it's a phone call or a text, but they can provide more detail on the web site. He said the next technical group meeting will be in March.

8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

The facilitator asked Vince Mestre to forego his presentation because of the lateness of the meeting. James Nelson asked for an update on Phoenix's NextGen lawsuit. McClintock asked Mr. Mestre for a quick update. Vince gave background information leading up to Phoenix's decision to sue the FAA, i.e. under NextGen the FAA changed a historical departure procedure that moved it over a residential community. This was done without an EA or an EIS, just a CATEX. A CATEX is not published, and to access it requires a Freedom of Information Act request. This action resulted in a huge adverse response from the affected community, and the litigation has been in effect for over a year. On December 23rd, Senators John McCain and Jeff Flake from Arizona added a rider on a defense spending bill signed into law by President Obama. The purpose of the legislation was to ensure airports have an opportunity to fully engage with the FAA before any future flight path changes are made. He said the new law reflects a significant change in policy for the FAA, including a requirement for the FAA to consult with the airport and the community within 90 days. In addition, the law requires the FAA administrator to go back to February 14, 2012 and review all airspace changes that have been made since that time by CATEX. The law says if there were any material changes from procedures previously in effect at the airport, to determine if that procedure had a significant effect on the human environment in the community in which the airport is located.

Mestre noted that what the law does not say is more important than what it does say. It does not say the FAA will review it according to the FAA's adopted policies on what is a significant change in noise level; it says whether it has a significant effect on the human environment. The fact that it didn't refer to existing FAA regulations for determining significant noise impacts (Order 1050.1F), he thought was a very positive thing. Vince said he also thought that the most important thing in the whole document is that the FAA has to consider alternatives that do not substantially

degrade the efficiencies achieved by the implementation of the procedure. He said this was very important language, because in dealing with the RNAV procedures that have been adopted so far, any change, any improvement in efficiency, however small, trumped any noise impact, however large. This basically says, the FAA may not get everything it may want in the way of efficiencies, but any improvements are acceptable. He cited a separate statement from FAA Administrator Michael Huerta, which basically says that the FAA is not going to go for every little bit of efficiency if it means a fight. He's implying there is a tradeoff between efficiency and noise; and efficiency doesn't always trump noise. The bad news is that the legislation only applies to CATEX determinations, and, unfortunately, neither the NorCal Metroplex nor the SoCal Metroplex were done by CATEX. Ernie DelliGatti asked why the FAA failed to consult with the East Bay communities before implementing the Metroplex, but now wants to reach out to Contra Costa County with respect to any proposed changes to the Metroplex. Mestre replied that they have probably learned their lesson by now because they are not winning the Metroplex battle in Southern California. Mestre said he would go into more detail about the lawsuits at the Forum's April meeting.

9. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Kurt Peterson asked why, after coming back from a seven week vacation, WebTrak no longer lists airline of flight numbers. He added that the west end of Alameda had lost its noise monitor to Montclair and he has missed seeing its data. He said they would love to have it back. In addition, he commented that he could see no reason why CANDL could not be moved farther to the south and west over the bay. He said he has observed no flights departing up the bay from San Francisco during daylight hours. There being no further comments from the public, the facilitator closed the public comment period.

11. NEXT MEETING – April 19, 2017

The next Forum meeting is scheduled for April 19, 2017.

12. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

END