

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

July 18, 2012

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTIONS.....	1
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	2
A. Recognition of Olden Henson’s Service	2
B. Acceptance of 1st Qtr. 2012 Noise report (Receive and File).....	3
C. Annual Forum Dues (July 2012 to June 2013)	3
3. CORRESPONDENCE	3
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (4/18/2012).....	3
5. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	4
6. CO-CHAIR ELECTION	4
7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT.....	4
A. SFO Roundtable Request for Joint TRACON Tour	5
B. Noise Forum Contracts Selection Results	5
8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE	5
9. STATUS REPORT-NORTH AND SOUTH FIELD WORKING GROUPS.....	11
A. North Field/South Field Appointments.....	11
B. Runway 27L Preferential Runway Analysis Results/Recommendation.....	11
10. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (OCT 17, 2012).....	12
11. ADJOURNMENT	12

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The July 18, 2012 Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum meeting was called to order at 6:34 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:

Doug DeHaan, Elected Representative, San Leandro
Barbara Tuleja, Alt. for Walt Jacobs, Co-Chair/Citizen Representative, Alameda
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Diana Souza, Elected Representative, San Leandro
Will Fernandez, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Emily Duncan, Elected Representative, Union City
Subru Bhat, Citizen Representative, Union City
Deborah Ale-Flint, Director of Aviation

Staff Members/Advisors:

Marilyn Mora, Assistant Director of Aviation
Rob Forester, Airside Operations Manager
Larry Galindo, Noise Office, Port of Oakland
Wayne Bryant, Noise Office, Port of Oakland
Jesse Richardson, Noise Office, Port of Oakland
Susan Fizzell, Noise and Environmental Office
Sean Cullinane, Acting Air Traffic Manager, Oakland Tower
David J. Dodd, FAA, NorCal TRACON
James Baas, FedEx Flight Operations (Telephone)
Jim Randel, Asst. Chief Pilot, Southwest Airlines
Gene Reindel, Acoustical consultant, HMMH
Vince Mestre, Acoustical Consultant, Landrum & Brown
Harvey Hartmann, Airspace Consultant
Luke Sims, Community Development Director, City of San Leandro
Red Wetherill, President, CLASS
Valerie E. Jensen, CSR, Stenographer
Mike McClintock, Forum Facilitator

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Recognition of Olden Henson for Service to Forum

Facilitator McClintock introduced Olden Henson, a long-time member of the Forum and Hayward's original appointee. McClintock said he was speaking on behalf of the Forum, the staff and other representatives when he said that Olden Henson had been an inspiration to all of us and that his contributions to the Bay Area -- particularly in aviation, air safety and noise -- have been remarkable. McClintock said that Olden and Director Ale Flint would still be affiliated with the Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission and that they would continue to do good work. McClintock presented a Forum Certificate of Appreciation to Olden Henson for "*his dedication and lasting contributions to the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum.*" Olden thanked the Forum and noted that when he first started

with the group that there was a learning curve, and he appreciated the work of all concerned to raise the level of consciousness about airport noise. He said he especially appreciated the presentations and had learned a lot from them. He was pleased to be able to take a lot of this information back to Hayward. He thanked Director Ale Flint for outreach to the communities and partnering with them on some really contentious issues that they worked through. He said he would continue to monitor the Forum's progress on the Work Plan.

B. Acceptance of 1st Qtr. 2012 Noise Report (Receive and File)

McClintock told the members that the first quarter 2012 noise report was included with their agenda materials. He said if there were no questions he would entertain a motion to receive and file. It was moved and seconded to receive and file the reports. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Motion carried unanimously.

C. Annual Forum Dues (July 2012 to June 2013)

McClintock said it was his understanding that dues notices would be forthcoming. Larry Galindo responded that the invoices would go out August 1 for the dues from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. McClintock added that for those who were new to the Forum, when the Forum was first organized it was felt it was important that not only the Port make a contribution to the operational costs of the Forum, but the communities should also be required to contribute. The annual budget for the Forum is around \$100,000, with each of the member communities contributing \$1,000 per year with the Port making up the difference. McClintock said that Jesse Richardson was the Port's point of contact for dues issues.

2. CORRESPONDENCE

The facilitator indicated that after the agenda packages were sent out he sent out a copy of a letter from Mr. Kirk Peterson from Alameda along with a copy of Larry Galindo's response to Mr. Peterson's complaint. Mr. Peterson subsequently thanked Larry for his due diligence and timely response.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (APRIL 18, 2012)

Facilitator McClintock said that there were some changes that had to be made in the draft minutes based on comments received from Susan Fizzell on the subject of biofuels. McClintock read the following correction into the record:

“McClintock asked for an update on biofuels. Mestre replied that virtually every airline is testing some kind of biofuel program, and the military has essentially turned it into a strategic program where they want to have the ability to produce biofuels on a rapid basis -- literally at any cost -- for strategic reasons so they don't get in a position anywhere in the world of running out of gas. Solena Fuels in Santa Clara County that has plans to develop a bio-refinery and provide bio-jet fuel to aircraft at Bay Area airports. Solena's proposal is to be operational by the end of this year, providing 16 million gallons each year by 2015. Susan Fizzell stated that Oakland International Airport has had a hydrant fueling system in place since 1983 for Jet A and that because the

existing jet fuel storage and distribution facilities at OAK are not currently compatible with bio-jet fuel, it may have to be trucked in to the Airport."

Okay. That's the correction. He asked if there any other corrections, additions to the Minutes. There being none he asked for a motion to approve the minutes with the corrections as noted. Barbara Tuleja moved approval? Second by Ernest DelliGatti. Motion carried.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

The facilitator announced that this was the time for members of the public to speak on issues not on the agenda but relevant to airport noise at Oakland International Airport. Red Wetherill, President of CLASS and resident of Alameda, said that he had the pleasure of serving on the Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission with Olden Henson. He said Olden was very helpful and very supportive, and he wanted to thank him. There being no one else who wished to address the Forum the facilitator closed the public comment period.

5. CO-CHAIR ELECTION

McClintock said that every July the Forum elects its officers. There are only two officers in the Forum. They are the "co-chairs" and share responsibilities in representing the Forum and carrying out Forum policies. There is an elected co-chair, and a citizen representative co-chair. Each co-chair is elected for a one-year term. For this year's election, with the appointment of Councilmember Souza from San Leandro, Jim Prola is no longer the City's elected representative and it is therefore necessary to replace him. Tonight's action will be to elect a new Elected Co-Chair, as well as to elect a new Citizen Representative Co-Chair for the 2012-2013 term.

First off, he said, with respect to the elected co-chair, nominations have been open since the Forum's April meeting. At the request of Diana Souza of San Leandro, he placed her name in nomination. Having made the nomination on Ms. Souza's behalf, McClintock asked if there was a second. Will Fernandez seconded. McClintock asked if there were any other nominations for the position of the elected co-chair. There being no addition nominations Ms. Souza was declared elected by unanimous consent.

McClintock said that nominations for the citizen co-chair, nominations have also been open since the April Forum meeting. He said that Walt Jacobs had asked that his name be placed in nomination for this position. Having done so, McClintock asked if there was a second. Subru Bhat seconded. McClintock called for additional nominations. There being no additional nominations Mr. Jacobs was deemed to be elected by unanimous consent. McClintock congratulated the two co-chairs and said he was looking forward to working with them.

6. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

The facilitator called upon Larry Galindo to give the Noise Office report. Mr. Galindo asked for a moment's indulgence to thank Olden Henson. He said that it was October of 2007 when he joined the airport was made supervisor. It was then that he first met Olden Henson, and found him to be a very warm and a generous individual to work with. He said in the last year

or so we had a very difficult noise issue in the Hayward-Castro Valley area that Olden was very, very helpful and committed to resolving. He said he wanted to thank Olden for that.

A. SFO Roundtable Request for Joint TRACON Tour

Galindo said that he had gotten a call from the SFO noise office a few weeks ago. They expressed interest a joint tour of the NorCal TRACON (NCT) facility in Rancho Cordova. He said they had had a conference call Dennis Green from NCT, and he graciously accepted the request and they had set the date of the tour for Wednesday, August 22. He said he would be sending out an invitation to all Forum members. The schedule begins with departure from the Oakland Airport at 5:00 a.m. and is followed by a two hour session with NCT beginning at 8:30 a.m. After that is a hosted lunch and return to the Airport by 3:00 p.m. He asked that anyone interested in participating let him know ASAP.

B. Noise Forum Contracts Selection Results

Larry said that at the last Forum meeting he announced that the Port was in the process of making selections for the Noise Forum facilitator and community noise consultant. On June 7 the Board of Port Commissioners approved the selection of URS (Mike McClintock) and Landrum & Brown (Vince Mestre) for five-year agreements to serve the Noise Forum. Both Mestre and McClintock expressed their appreciation to the selection committee and said they were looking forward to working with the Forum.

7. NOISE NEWS UPDATE

Vince Mestre began his presentation with an update on biofuels. The question came up as to what is happening on the regular use of biofuels. Mestre said there have been numerous articles in the media about many first flight biofuel operations. In fact, just two weeks ago the ICAO chief of environmental issues flew from Montreal to Rio de Janeiro for the biofuel committee. Both his initial and return flights were biofuel. The question is: How long until regular biofuel flights are in service? When will you be on a plane that's bio fueled. To answer this he discussed what the requirements are. Right now the FAA currently permits any air carrier or air cargo flight to use biofuels, provided the biofuel make up no more than 50 percent of the fuel mixture. So that's in place. Any airline can operate tomorrow on a 50/50 biofuel jet fuel basis.

What's limiting this is the cost and the availability of the fuel. Another issue is the comparative costs between regular jet fuel and biofuel. He showed a table that is published every month that gives a summary of fuel prices across the country. This is the fuel price that you or I would pay if we rolled our airplane up to the tanker and filled it up. The airlines have all sorts of contracts and deals, but this is the basic price. Southwest and Western Pacific region Jet A fuel ranges from a low of \$3.65 a gallon to 7.30. Western Pacific is 3.87 to 7.95, with an average of around \$4.24 for a gallon of jet A fuel. That's a pretty large range, four dollars to eight dollars. He said he did a very quick survey of fixed base operators in the Bay Area and how much jet fuel costs here. At the three Oakland fixed base operators, it averages about \$5.25 for a gallon of jet A fuel. At Hayward, it's in the same range. But if you fly all the way to San Francisco, you can pay \$8.00 a gallon for jet fuel. So that's what biofuel is

competing against, and that's the problem. I searched for biofuel prices across the U.S., and they were pretty uniform whether you were buying it for a truck or car, and the average price was around \$20.00 a gallon.

In December, the U.S. Navy made a major purchase of biofuels at about \$20.00 a gallon. At 50 percent blend, that would mean that the fuel for the airline would be about \$10.00 a gallon, which is not quite twice what they're paying on average. That's the problem with introducing biofuels is you have a pretty severe cost structure that's got to come down. Now, clearly, part of that high cost is a lack of refining facilities and a lack of a distribution system. As that scales up, those biofuel costs will come down. But he thought it would also take an increase in jet fuel prices, and where those two meet, then you'll start to see biofuels as a practical fuel for air carriers. Unless jet fuel costs increase rapidly in the near future, it's not going to happen. But it will happen eventually. He noted that the Air Force just last week took a world of grief for paying \$59.00 a gallon for biofuel. He said he thought that this price was for a test fuel that was created specifically for them and for their specific purposes... a very low-production, highly-specialized fuel. On the same note, the airlines lobbying organization, which used to be the Air Transport Association of America, is now Airlines for America. Airlines for America are quite excited about the U.S. government spending for development of biofuels. There's a great deal of interest in it, but the cost is still quite prohibitive for regular use of biofuels in jet aircraft.

He next showed a number of slides on greenhouse gases and NOX emissions. He said, in terms of greenhouse gases, or CO₂, ICAO, through their Committee on Aviation for Environmental Protection, CAEP, had a very important meeting in Rio de Janeiro discussing how they were going to do the CO₂ limits. Part of the problem is how do you measure it? What metric will be used? There's been a great deal of controversy how to set up that metric. They finally agreed to agree on a basic methodology. The reason it's controversial is how you calculate CO₂ emissions can favor large aircraft versus small and favor short or long haul, depending how the rule is written on what and how you calculate CO₂ emissions for taxi, takeoff or climb, different kinds of cruise modes and different approaches. So it can be highly customized not only to a particular aircraft type but to an airline. Now that they have agreed on how to do the calculations, they can start talking about what those limits the limits will be. As a result of that, they had announced they would have recommended measures for greenhouse gases emissions by the end of 2012. They have now moved that to March 2013. Mestre said that he that that that was even optimistic. The member nations that have a big stake in this are the United States, France and partnered Airbus countries like Germany, Italy, Spain and Brazil and Canada. These are the major manufacturers in the world. How the rule is written can favor one or the other of those manufacturers, depending whether the rule favors large or small aircraft. There's a lot of politics involved before this will be done.

Within the next two years, we ought to see the ICAO-CAEP community, which is part of the United Nations, come up with their recommendations for member nations to adopt a greenhouse gas emission rule. In the meantime, the U.S. EPA says they will not issue a near-term rule on greenhouse gas emissions. Their media release on that said this is a two-year rule-making process. Interestingly, we don't have the funds to go through a two-year rulemaking process, so we're not going to do it, even though a court, in July of 2011, said that the Clean Air Act requires the EPA to make a finding relative to greenhouse gas emissions. Vince said he thought that this was a convenient way of saying we need to be in the lockstep with the rest

of the world, so we'll really wait for ICAO to come up with their methodology, and then we can work from there. In the meantime, the EPA has adopted new NO_x emissions standards for large jet engines, engines that would be used on commercial aircraft. It's a two-tiered system based on the size of the engine. The new rule for NO_x emissions goes into effect today. Those NO_x rules are in harmony with the ICAO rules for NO_x emissions. As an aside Mestre noted that we could actually reduce NO_x more if the EPA gave us a more relaxed rule on carbon monoxide emissions. Since carbon monoxide has been, essentially, an air pollutant problem that's been solved, our cars and others produce one tenth of the CO they did 20 years ago. And NO_x is a much more frightening pollutant than CO is. Lighten up on the CO rule, and we'll give you a better NO_x performance, because the two trade against each other. Unfortunately, the general feeling was that anybody who proposed that publicly would be vilified for suggesting any air pollutant standard be relaxed and made less stringent, even though it would be, from a scientific point of view, a very reasonable tradeoff. So those are the kinds of problems that ICAO and manufacturers and nations deal with in trying to set the standards.

Mestre said his next subject was a story of one step forward and one step back with respect to the FAA and leaded gas in piston-engine aircraft. The step forward was where the FAA basically said they would approve the use of a specific unleaded fuel in Lycoming engines. These engines are extremely popular in GA propeller aircraft. There are a lot of them. The American Society for Testing Materials -- ASTM -- actually has a standard that spells out the specification for the particular kind of fuel. That's the good news. The bad news is no one in the U.S. makes that fuel. The other bad news is that, even though the engine is approved to have that fuel, you cannot use it in an aircraft that has that engine until that specific aircraft has been approved to have unleaded fuel. One of the big problems with unleaded fuel is that there are hundreds of different models of aircraft. Many of the manufacturers who made the airplanes are no longer in business and the aircraft were certificated to be operated only on leaded fuel. You need a new type certification for the aircraft to use unleaded gas. If the manufacturer no longer exists, who will do the re-certification process for that specific aircraft? The FAA has a committee called the Unleaded Avgas Transition Advanced Rulemaking Committee. They came out with a report that says it'll take 11 years to figure out how to do this. That's the step backwards.

Now, the State of California is quite active in seeing it doesn't take 11 years for this to happen. You'll recall that the California Attorney General filed suit in the State of California, under Proposition 65, requiring fixed base operators to stop selling leaded gas in the State of California. There's an environmental group here in the Bay Area, called the Center for Environmental Health, who also filed suit. Those two suits are pending. If successful, under Proposition 65, it would prohibit the sale of leaded Avgas gas in California. There is a coalition of fixed-base operators, called the California Avgas Coalition, who are charging five cents per gallon of aviation fuel that they sell to pilots to fund the defense of the sale of leaded fuel in California. The outcome of this issue is yet to be decided.

On another air quality topic, the EPA and the South Coast Air Quality Management District will conduct an air quality study at Long Beach Airport. It's similar to the ones they've done in Santa Monica and Van Nuys. In both studies they were able to identify the lead emissions associated with GA operations. They actually could measure an increase in lead during the times of busy activity, but it was still well below the EPA's lead standard. Again, with respect to air

quality, there's a company called WheelTug PLC that installed a WheelTug for a German airline. This was a demonstration system. It didn't fly. It's, basically, an electric motor on the front nose wheel which allows the aircraft to taxi to and from the runway to the gate without using their engines or a pull tug. Whether this turns out to be practical or not -- because you add weight to the aircraft and you carry this around. There's increased fuel burn -- it's hard to see this as being a practical solution because, as you'll see from a later article, aircraft weight is critical to fuel burn and CO₂ emissions. Ernie DelliGatti asked if the taxi demonstration was done with a full or empty airplane. Mestre replied it was empty. Susan Fizzel added that a company called WheelTug had contact with the Airport in June wanting to do the demo, but weren't able to give enough information for it to be cleared.

Mestre next discussed the anticipated growth in aviation activity. Boeing's 20-year forecast says, basically, the aircraft fleet will double in the next 20 years. That means they're going to add 34 thousand new airplanes in the next 20 years in the global airline market. That represents about a five percent annual rate of growth. The growth rate for Asia Pacific is projected to be considerably higher than that. Proportionately, there will probably be more passengers than operations because the aircraft that are going into service are larger aircraft carrying more passengers with higher load factors. This applies to the cargo carriers as well, with FedEx phasing out its wide body DC-10s and MD-11s. They're replacing those with larger and wider new technology aircraft. Councilmember Souza asked how soon this would take place. Mestre replied over the next several years. Jim Baas said that FedEx has no specific time frame in which to effect the transition. The incentive for this is primarily fuel burn, but there is also the benefit of reduced emissions and reduced noise. Jim Randel said that Southwest is looking at the B-737 Max primarily because of its fuel efficiency, but it will also be quieter. He said they would take their first delivery in 2016. Vince said that along with the B-737 Max, Airbus will produce the A320 Neo, also a quiet, fuel efficient aircraft. JetBlue will be a primary customer for the new A320 Neo.

On the general aviation side the propeller-driven piston-engine aircraft component is projected to decrease as fewer new aircraft are being produced, while the business side of the general aviation is projected to do quite well. NetJets just placed an order for 425 jets, which is the largest business jet order ever. These are not the small, little light jets we have talked about. This is the medium- and larger-sized jets like the Challenger 600, for example. So this is an indication that that portion of the general aviation business is growing and will continue to grow. So you should anticipate seeing more business jet operations. That's a fairly healthy industry.

He discussed the topic of supersonic business jets and the intent of aircraft manufacturers, such as Boeing, Gulf Stream and Lockheed Martin, to market such an aircraft. The industry said it will only be practical if they get permission from the FAA to be able to fly over land at supersonic speeds. As an example, you can go from London to Sydney in four hours. The kind of noise reduction they're achieving in the sonic boom is pretty substantial. One of the Gulf Stream people described it as a sonic "puff" now. Unfortunately, he said, I think that came more from the marketing department than engineering because the engineers sort of cringe when they hear the term "sonic puff." There clearly is the science now to reduce sonic boom rather dramatically. These will be extraordinarily expensive aircraft owned by a handful of people in the world. When it comes down to processing the rulemaking change to permit

that flight over the U.S., he said he expects to see a complete free for all. This is actually -- in terms of supersonic aircraft, fairly significant news. Over the last 10 years, there has been virtually no work on developing a supersonic commercial aircraft to replace the Concorde because all the work that had been done suggested that it was going to be very difficult to achieve reduction in sonic boom in commercial-sized aircraft and the price of the aircraft would be so large that no airline could afford it and only those airlines that are owned by a country would be able to buy the aircraft. Now NASA has said we can scale up this technology to a commercial-sized airline. It would be a small commercial-sized airplane having a seating capacity similar to the Concorde and maybe slightly larger, which is only 120 to 140 passengers. This would be an airplane whose cost would be north of a billion dollars. There is however, a lot of doubt in the industry over creating an aircraft that no one can afford.

He gave an update on the Santa Monica Airport, which has proposed to pay flight schools to do their touch-and-go operations at other airports. He said Santa Monica is a very unique place. They are operating at about a third of the operations they had back in the 1960's. Probably only about 40 per day. Touch and goes are no longer allowed there. They have to fully land, taxi back and take off again. But Santa Monica has active flight schools. There are some wealthy people on the west side that are taking up flying. The neighborhoods just south of the airport, which are the Venice and Mar Vista communities, and which are not in the City of Santa Monica but in the City of Los Angeles, have wanted to curtail flight school activity. So, Santa Monica being Santa Monica, went every way around with the FAA to try to figure out if they could prohibit flight training in Santa Monica. They came up with the idea they could go to the flight schools and say "We'll pay you \$150 per flight to go someplace else and do your touch-and-goes." Because it's Santa Monica, the FAA regional office and headquarters get quite nervous about what they're doing, because the city would like to close the airport. In any event, the proposal went to the City Council and people not living close to the airport asked whose money was going to be used to subsidize the flight training restrictions, to the tune of about \$90,000 for six months. As it turned out, after a six month test period the City Council, could not agree on the program and it was dropped.

At Seattle-Tacoma International Airport they have a large scale test of Required Navigation Procedures (RNP). These are automated flight procedures, approaches into SEATAC, in complex airspace, at an airport surrounded by residential land uses. A lot of people are paying attention to how this test goes. It's called "Greener Skies Over Seattle." Boeing, the FAA and the Port of Seattle, and Alaska Airlines are doing a lot of work on this. HMMH may be doing the noise analyses. Some of what comes out of this study may be applicable to the Oakland Airport. So this is a program we want to watch. Earlier, in a presentation, we talked about proposals on Long Island to require helicopters to fly offshore. These are helicopter operations that primarily connect businessmen living in Manhattan with their vacation homes on Long Island. This was going nowhere until Senator Schumer got involved. With Congressional pressure, the FAA made the rule mandatory and that helicopter route be offshore. He said he did not believe the FAA was happy about having to make the rule, but there is a sunset clause in it. The rule will sunset in two years unless they can show that there was a significant noise benefit with the offshore flight tracks.

There was litigation in Philadelphia against the environmental document that was prepared for an airport expansion project. Citizens around the airport sued. The FAA and the EPA also submitted critical comments about the quality of the environmental analysis for this project.

In the federal process, under the National Environmental Policy Act, the federal agency that is the lead agency and does the environmental document has something called "deference." That means when there's a disagreement about the technical analysis that's in the environmental document, the courts defer to the federal agency. In this particular case, you had EPA, as a federal agency, arguing that deference should apply to them and not the FAA. The court ruled no, the way the law is written, the FAA is the lead agency and they get the deference, not the EPA. So the environmental document was upheld as okay. What's interesting about this case is that the judge wrote sort of an editorial about the whole process in which he said this law, NEPA, has big loopholes in it and the loophole is that the lead federal agency, essentially, gets final say. Even when a lawsuit successfully shows something was inadequate, basically, it's just a fix-it ticket; and the agency goes back, fixes it and moves on. This can't happen in California, because of the California Environmental Quality Act. For environmental documents that are done in the State of California, those loopholes don't exist. For example, when CLASS and Keep Jets Over the Bay filed a lawsuit in state court under California environmental regulations, they were able to prevail. If that had been a NEPA document, it would not have failed. For those of us who do environmental documents, we recognize meeting NEPA requirements is relatively easy compared to meeting the CEQA requirements. There are only a few other states that have environmental regulations on a par with California.

Lastly, Vince wrapped thing up with a discussion on the status drones. He said there was a lawsuit filed by the Electric Frontier Foundation, which was filed under the Freedom of Information Act, requiring the FAA to tell the world all the people who have been issued permits by the FAA to fly drones. The result was a web site that shows all the places that the FAA has issued drone permits. The military has some, but there were a number of universities that have permits. Cornell and Georgia Tech have permits to operate drones. The FAA has tweaked their drone rules. For law enforcement agencies, the weight limit was 4.4 pounds. That's now been raised to 25 pounds. That's not an airplane, but on the other hand, in terms of a small aircraft, that's pretty beefy. They also have to fly less than 400 feet above the ground during daylight conditions, inside uncontrolled airspace and more than five miles from any airport.

He showed a slide where there is now an association of drone manufacturers and operators who turn out to have quite a heavy bit of lobbying power. He said he was sure that within a year or so, we will see a relaxing of these requirements. On the other hand, the idea of drones flying around is not too popular with ordinary folks. One survey asked "What if drones are used for routine policing?" The majority responded saying "No, we do not want drones used for routine policing. If there's an emergency, okay, but not for regular flights." There's a lot of skepticism from the public about drone operations. So the drone industry -- they are now called the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International -- adopted a code of conduct. In what he thought might be the understatement of the year, Mestre said the quote was "We understand, as an industry, that we've got a public relations problem." He said that Forbes magazine carried an article about this, and the headline is priceless: "Drone industry promises not to be evil." He went on to discuss the various size of drones and their potential use in the London Olympics. He raised the point that almost all of the controversy over drones has been about privacy and not environmental issues. He said he has yet to see anyone raise the issue of how loud are the drones, what are the manufacturing specifications, and are there going to be noise standards?

As an aside, and on a lighter note, Vince commented on the airline that has removed all of its in-flight entertainment systems and replaced them with iPads. This reduced the weight of the aircraft by two tons. So the fuel savings they are going to achieve by getting rid of all the little video screens and the big, old entertainment box and all that will, in fact, be a significant fuel savings strategy. A Swiss airline has also done this. Red Wetherill asked if this could be classified as “light” entertainment. Lastly, he said the University of Texas, Austin demonstrated that they had the ability to electronically take control of drones operated by others. McClintock said he saw this demonstrated. It was a legitimate experiment with TSA and the FAA. They did it in the stadium at UT Austin. The students and their professor were actually able to hack into and take over the control of a drone. It was actually rather chilling. Mestre said that this just goes to show you that if you give college students a thousand dollars in electronic parts and with a few very intelligent electrical engineering majors and the brainpower focused on the particular problem, it can be done. McClintock said “You can bet, if students in Texas are doing that, then there are students all over the world doing the same thing. Some of them, perhaps not so friendly to our interests. Regardless, drones do have their value. Firefighting is but one example. However, the issues of noise and privacy remain significant. Ernie DelliGatti asked Vince about Delta Airlines buying a refinery in an attempt to corner the biofuel market. Mestre replied that Delta’s intent is not to resell any of the fuel they refine.

McClintock thanked Mr. Mestre for an excellent presentation.

8. STATUS REPORT—NORTH AND SOUTH FIELD WORKING GROUPS

A. North Field/South Field Appointments

The facilitator called upon Rob Forester to give the status report for the North and South Field Working Groups. Forester said that there were two main points that came out of the latest North and South Field Working Groups meeting. His first point was procedural and dealt with appointments to the two groups. He said the structure of the groups made it difficult at times to determine who was an actual group member versus a member of the public. He said that they had a good discussion at the last meeting and have agreed upon an agenda format that better recognizes the members, but also allows for protocols for non-members, i.e., members of the public who want to attend the meetings and still be able to comment effectively on items on the agenda. He noted that official notice was received from the City of Alameda on their appointments to the groups. San Leandro has also confirmed its appointments. This information has been updated and is on the Port’s web site. He said the web site also contains information on meeting dates.

B. Runway 27L Preferential Runway Analysis Results/Recommendations

Rob’s second report was on the Runway 27L preferential runway analysis results. He said the group, after some give and take, received the final report at its last meeting. The report recommended to not change the preferential arrival runway at the North Field. San Leandro, which requested the study, accepted the recommendation and was onboard with it. So that item was closed out and moved into our completed reports section for the group.

He discussed the community advisory program and the community advisors. He said anytime the Port has an unusual noise pattern -- construction work that's going to cause jet operations on the North Field, for example -- they have a program to send out community advisories via e-mail. Rob said they have a new system that came onboard recently, called "Gov delivery," that allows them to streamline that process. Moreover, because they have a new system onboard, which is being commissioned right now by a vendor called "Send Word Now," that will allow us to get the community advisories out even quicker. The big advantage of this new system is that it has text-to-voice ability. Right now community advisories are sent via e-mail. In order for the recipients to get that information and be aware of the operations that are upcoming, they have to check their e-mail. Barbara Tuleja mentioned she's just about ready to get her e-mail address but is not quite up to speed on it yet. We have other folks who don't have e-mail addresses or don't get a chance to check the e-mail as often as others who may have e-mail access on a smart phone. This will give the option for recipients of our community advisories, if they elect, to have those messages come directly to their phone as a voice message. If you happen to be out and about and we have an emergency situation where we have to immediately redirect traffic, we can send a message out immediately, and you would get a call on your cell phone that would advise you with an automated message of what the condition is. The other thing that this will allow us to do is to notify certain airport stakeholders of emergency situations. So we should be able to get those out instantaneously 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Diana Souza said that she had received a complaint from John Manuel that there were no FAA or FedEx reps at the North Field/South Field Group meetings, and he was hoping that they would be in attendance in the future. Forester replied that Jim Baas from FedEx regularly attends via teleconference. However, today he was not able to participate. But that was an anomaly. He should be able to participate in future meetings. He said that the FAA is a regular attendee. Ernie DelliGatti asked if there was any chance, on some of the abnormal airport operations, you could post a crawler on the web site in addition to the other forms of notification. Forester said he would look into it. However, the problem is that the noise office does not maintain the web site. Director Ale Flint offered that the Port has had to make some strategic decisions. One was to defer a modernization of its web site. She said they absolutely recognize that the web site needs to be modernized for a number of reasons. This is a very good example of one of those reasons. She said they were hoping to achieve the modernization in FY 2014.

9. NEXT MEETING – October 17, 2012

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.