

OAKLAND AIRPORT-COMMUNITY NOISE MANAGEMENT FORUM

An Advisory Body to the Executive Director of the Port of Oakland

Co-Chairs

4 December 2020

Mr. Benny Lee,
Elected-
Representative
City of San Leandro

Ms. Raquel Girvin
Regional Administrator, AWP-1
FAA Western-Pacific Region
777 S. Aviation Blvd

Mr. Walt Jacobs,
Citizen-
Representative
City of Alameda

Suite 150
El Segundo, CA 90245

Via E-Mail

Members

RE: Request for Update on WNSDR TWO Arrival Procedure

City of Alameda

Dear Regional Administrator Girvin:

City of Berkeley

The Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum has questions about some of the issues and concerns that were raised by the FAA during its briefing on the WNSDR TWO approach to the Forum on October 21, 2020.

City of Hayward

City of Oakland

The Forum's NextGen Subcommittee requests the opportunity to meet with the FAA technical experts who develops these procedures to review alternative flight paths. The Forum would also like the FAA to address in detail many of its concerns about the current WNSDR TWO Arrival and why the track of the current WNSDR TWO Arrival needs to shift to the west. Following are just some of the main Forum concerns and questions:

City of Richmond

City of San Leandro

County of Alameda

Port of Oakland

Forum Facilitator

1. The FAA explained that the current WNSDR TWO Arrival procedure interferes with Travis AFB approach airspace in the northwestern area.
 - Why not shift the WNSDR TWO Arrival track east more into Travis airspace and hand off aircraft to Travis Approach for control? Travis controls other General Aviation traffic every day (such as on airway V6 Northeast bound from OAK). Why not develop an arrival to the east of Mount Diablo (maybe southbound along V334) and hand-off aircraft to Travis from the north to monitor through their airspace? Other routes taking the OAK arrivals slightly further east and joining the OAKES TWO Arrival between TOOOL and FFIST to RWY 30 could also be developed.

Michael R.
McClintock

Technical Advisors

Federal Aviation
Administration

Federal Express

KaiserAir, Inc.

Southwest Airlines

Harris Miller Miller &
Hanson, Inc.

Landrum & Brown

2. The FAA stated that the current WNSDR arrival blocks departures from climbing out of the Bay Area.

- We were confused by this. If the current WNSDR arrival blocks departure aircraft from climbing, would not moving it to the East instead of the West allow those departing aircraft to climb sooner. Would you please provide some radar track examples of aircraft that are blocked by the arrival? Were the departing aircraft on the HUSSH or NIITE departures?

4 December 2020
Ms. Raquel Girvin
Regional Administrator, AWP-1
FAA Western-Pacific Region
Page Two

Were they on the daytime departure routes (OAKLAND FIVE or TRUKN)? We had a difficult time discerning those departing aircraft and how they interfered with the current WNDSR. Again, moving the WNDSR east (not west) would allow those departing aircraft to climb over the WNDSR arrivals. Please provide a graphic display of how this occurs.

3. The FAA stated the Hayward Airport Departures interfered with the OAK WNDSR Arrivals to RWY 30 from the north.

- A statement was made that the Hayward departures interfered with the WNDSR Arrivals. Would the FAA please explain how this is different from the procedures used by the FAA prior to implementation of NextGen procedures. We do not understand how this is different under NextGen procedures. Please provide a graphic display of how this is different from pre-NextGen operations.

These are a few of the major questions that the Forum has with reference to the briefing given for the WNDSR Arrival on October 21, 2020. If, in fact, these issues have been a safety factor for the last 5 years of Next Gen, we wonder why the FAA is choosing to impact MORE people by their proposed shift of the WNDSR arrival to the west instead of FEWER people by a shift to the East. At the VERY least, if the FAA wants to move the WNDSR as they desire, the FAA should have a higher and a wider nighttime arrival route for nighttime noise hours the same as they had pre-NextGen. These nighttime hours would be for the same time period as the HUSSH/NIITE procedures hours.

The Forum's NextGen Subcommittee is ready to meet with FAA technical specialists to review these and other procedures. Please let us know when specialists are available for a collaborative meeting. We look forward to meeting with them prior to, or on the day of the next Forum Meeting on January 20, 2021.

Thank you for your consideration, we look forward to scheduling meetings with your technical representatives soon.

Respectfully submitted:

By: Michael R. McClintock for Mr. Marcuzzo

Peter Marcuzzo, Chair
Forum NextGen/Metroplex Subcommittee

Authorized and Approved:

By: Michael R. McClintock for Mr. Lee

Benny Lee, Co-Chair

By: Michael R. McClintock for Mr. Jacobs

Walt Jacobs, Co-Chair

Cc: Honorable Barbara Lee, CA-13
Forum Members
Michael R. McClintock, Forum Facilitator