

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

APRIL 15, 2015

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTIONS.....	1
A. Welcome to Marin County Citizen Representative Richard McCombs.....	2
B. New Alternate for Supervisor Chan.....	2
C. Welcome to SFO Roundtable Chairman – Cliff Lentz.....	2
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	3
A. Quarterly Noise Report 4Q 2014 (Receive and File).....	3
B. 2014 Annual Complaint Summary.....	3
3. CORRESPONDENCE.....	3
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (January 21, 2014)	3
5. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	4
6. CONSIDERATION OF TWO LETTERS.....	6
7. NOISE NEWS UPDATE.....	8
8. NOISE OFFICE REPORT.....	10
A. Review of 2014 Annual Noise Complaint Summary.....	10
B. Helicopter Operator’s Meeting Update.....	11
9. NF/SF GROUPS STATUS REPORTS.....	11
A. OAK Runway Safety Area Project Update.....	11
B. Technical Working Groups – NFG/SFG	11
10. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (JULY 15, 2015).....	12
11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT	12

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The April 15, 2015 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:36 p.m. by the Forum’s Facilitator, Michael McClintock. Mr. McClintock welcomed the Forum members and guests. He asked the Forum members and advisors to introduce themselves for the benefit of the audience:

Forum Members/Alternates Present:

Benny Lee, Co-Chair, Elected Representative, City of San Leandro
Walt Jacobs, Co-Chair, Citizen Representative, Alameda
Tony Daysog, Councilmember, City of Alameda
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Greg Jones, Elected Representative, City of Hayward
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Pat Gascocos, Elected Representative, City of Union City
Subru Bhat, Citizen Representative, Union City
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, County of Alameda
Cindy Horvath, Alternate, County of Alameda
Richard McCombs Citizen Representative, County of Marin,
Deborah Ale Flint, Director of Aviation, Port of Oakland

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Kristi McKenney, Assistant Director of Aviation
Matt Davis, Airside Operations Manager, Port of Oakland
Larry Galindo, Noise Abatement/Environmental Affairs Supervisor
Yolanda Rogers, Airport Noise Office, Port of Oakland
Vince Mestre, Acoustical Consultant, Landrum & Brown
Gene Reindel, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Jeff Dickinson, Southwest Airlines
Harvey Hartmann, Consultant to the Port
Don Kirby, FAA Air Traffic Manager, Northern California TRACON
Carole Lozito, FAA Oakland Air Traffic Manager
Jason Ralph, FAA Air Traffic District Office
Sean Moran, Noise Analyst, Hayward Executive Airport
Bert Ganoung, Aircraft Noise Abatement Manager, San Francisco International Airport
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, CSR, Stenographer
Mike McClintock, Forum Facilitator

A. Welcome Richard McCombs, Marin County

The Forum welcomed one of its newest appointees, Richard McCombs from Marin County.

B. New Appointee for Supervisor Chan – Cindy Horvath

McClintock announced that Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan had appointed Cindy Horvath as her alternate. MS Horvath is the senior transportation planner for Alameda County.

Although too late to make the agenda, McClintock introduced Mr. Tom Wagner as the new citizen representative from the City of San Leandro, replacing Will Fernandez.

C. Welcome to SFO Roundtable Chairman – Cliff Lentz, Mayor of Brisbane

Mayor Lentz was unable to attend the night's meeting.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Quarterly Noise Report 4Q 2014

The facilitator said the 4th Quarter 2014 noise report was distributed with the agenda packages and was ready to be received and filed unless there were any questions or discussion. Co-Chair Benny Lee asked for an explanation of why there was a marked increase from 2013 to 2014 on some of the arrival/departure procedures. Larry Galindo explained that the increased use of these procedures was due to weather differentials. Co-Chair Lee asked if such increases are anticipated in the future. Galindo explained that this is hard to forecast or predict. Although weather may be a determinative factor, other factors also influence the use of certain procedures. For example, increased or decreased schedules in the Portland-Seattle markets can also influence such use. Galindo noted that if the aircraft are above or beyond the ANOMS gate parameters they are not counted.

There being no further questions the facilitator asked for a motion to receive and file the 4Q 2014 noise report. Co-Chair Lee so moved. Seconded by Councilmember Daysog. Ms. Horvath said she would have to abstain. Motion approved.

B. Annual Noise Complaint Summary

Larry Galindo explained that this report is a total of the annual complaints and that he would delve into it in more detail under Agenda Item 8A. He summarized the report as showing that total complaints for 2014 were 2,465. This is down 220 complaints from 2013. He said the difference was that many of the serial complainants in 2013 made fewer calls in 2014. Benny Lee said he noted that North Field complaints had increased by 22%. Galindo said that this was due to having only one runway available at North Field. With Runway 27L under construction for the RSA project, the use of Runway 28R put more traffic over Davis West. Tony Daysog noted that in Alameda the number of callers was down, but the number of complaints was up. Larry said the problem was also related to the RSA project and that it destabilized the North Field Jet Departure procedure because such aircraft could not access the main runway at certain times.

Co-Chair Walt Jacobs asked when conditions would return to normal at North Field. Galindo answered that his office has been issuing community advisories in advance so the Alameda communities is aware of any changes to North Field activity. He said the project was due for completion by December 31, 2015, as mandated by Congress. Ernie DelliGatti asked about capturing noise complaints from San Lorenzo. He said that many of the complaints that he and his neighbors called in were not recorded. Galindo explained that he had looked into this and found only three errors. He said he felt the addition of another member to his staff should help the situation. Larry said that there are two primary ways to have complaints recorded and logged in to the website-- the hotline and the web site. If you send an e-mail or call my office direct, it may not get into the database. Mr. DelliGatti said it was important to know the correct telephone number. He said with the increased traffic over San Lorenzo, he finds it almost impossible to believe that only two noise complaints were received.

3. CORRESPONDENCE

McClintock said he had not received any specific correspondence, but that there is another item on the agenda, which is item 6-- consideration of two letters. He said that this will be addressed at the appropriate point in the agenda.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (JANUARY 21, 2015)

Facilitator McClintock noted that this item was for the approval of the draft minutes of the January 21, 2015 meeting. The facilitator noted that Forum members had received a copy of the draft minutes of the January 2015 meeting with their agenda packages. He asked if there were any comments, questions, or corrections. Ms. Horvath, Mr. Wagner and Mr. McCombs indicated they would be abstaining from the vote. Co-Chair Lee moved approval of the minutes as submitted. James Nelson seconded. The motion was approved with no opposition and three abstentions.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

The facilitator announced that this was the time for members of the public to speak on issues not on the agenda but relevant to airport noise and air quality at Oakland International Airport. Mr. Kurt Peterson, a resident of West Alameda, noted that almost twice as many of the 2014 noise complaint calls came from Alameda as opposed to San Leandro. He said he has been working with Larry on many different matters, but would really like to see a presentation by the FAA on Next Generation Air traffic Procedures. He also said that a presentation on regular daytime procedures would be worthwhile. Mr. Peterson also offered that it would be much more worthwhile in future flight track analyses to see three days of overlapping information as opposed to a single random day. He said the noise continues from overflight of his neighborhood and he doesn't understand why they are not utilizing the center of the Bay. He said he was disappointed with the lack of information put out by the FAA on the Metroplex changes, even though they said they would do so. The facilitator asked Mr. Peterson what he meant by a comparison of the daytime procedures. Peterson said what they were then and what they are now. Mr. Galindo offered that this would take some analysis. He said he would like to get some specifics from Mr. Peterson. Once he has these, he can then do the actual flight tracks. Galindo said this could get complicated because they would be doing two procedures, and one of them is still evolving. Matt Davis replied that some work has already been done in this regard. Director Ale-Flint said that maybe we can refresh and update the recent OAPM comparison analysis. Facilitator McClintock asked if these procedures were still being worked out. Harvey Hartmann said the procedures have been published, but to get the information will be extremely labor intensive if we are going to do it right.

Ernie DelliGatti offered that from his perspective he has definitely noticed a change in the arrivals stream over the past three to five years. He said if one were to check the flight tracks for the past one, three, and five years you would definitely see a change. McClintock said there a couple of issues here. First of all is the east shore departures, and then we've got the flights over Castro Valley and San Lorenzo. He said these have to be looked at individually and separately. He asked if Larry and his staff could work with Ernie and Kurt on these issues and report back at the July meeting. Director Ale-Flint said that she thought the Forum could benefit from revisiting and refreshing what the Metroplex project was and the time frame in which the project was taking place and what new procedures were implemented as part of the project. She said to the extent we have the data available, we can share what we see in regards to differences between pre- and post-, and then if there needs to be further, deeper, more complex analysis after we've gone through that process of reporting, we can discuss that as the Forum.

Edward Bogue said that he too has noticed more airspace interaction with the Hayward Airport, to the extent that it appears they're interfering with HWD operations more and more, and causing increased delays. It would be interesting to see really what the differences are. Red Wetherill, president of CLASS, said he gets confused with the changing terms, and that the FAA's finding of no significant impact was perplexing. James Nelson asked if a change in flight tracks would show up in the measured noise levels. Larry Galindo replied that where there is a shift in traffic there is also a shift in noise. For example, during the Southeast plan, you have greater impacts in San Leandro; when operations are to the north, you have Bay Farm Island and Alameda. Galindo continued by saying that he's been looking at the flight tracks very carefully since OAPM was implemented. As you know, there are only three Metroplex departure procedures that affected Oakland. He said they have analyzed the HUSSH and the Silent 8, and have provided specific comparisons on noise and flight tracks. He said the departure procedure for Runway 30, if you look at over a week's worth of tracks, doesn't look any different from last year, or from five years ago. It's completely impacted, because we have 130 departures that go 40 percent to the California corridor, about 50 percent over to the "Lynden" to the right eastbound and the rest go up to Portland and Seattle.

In order to find out what's going on, we will have to do something very specific and target the procedure, but at this point in time, I have nothing to report that's changed in terms of our departures. He said he wanted to make that clear right now, because they've been monitoring them. If there was something, I would bring it up now. As to what Mr. Nelson was referring to, our noise monitors measure the noise impact area for the Title 21 requirements. We're looking for the 65 dB CNEL and validation of that. That has receded in the last five years, but it does measure it accurately. We compare it to the integrated noise model that the FAA uses for our Title 21 report that HMMH prepares. James Nelson said his question had to do with whether there was a change in noise levels that might be attributed to the initiation of the OAPM procedures. Galindo replied that he did not think that, overall, there had been. If there has been an increase in cumulative noise levels, it is more likely attributable to increased operations. Nelson asked if traffic had increased. Director Ale-Flint replied that the traffic has increased, but that the recession caused a drop from 14 million annual passengers to less than 10 million, and that any current growth is associated with the recovery—on the order of about 30%.

Wafaa Aborashed, from the Davis West neighborhood expressed here concern with increasing flight activity over the Davis west area, both from fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters. She said this has been a constant concern of the neighborhood for many years, and it's really disruptive. It is seriously affecting their quality of life. She said air quality was another issues, especially from contrails. The facilitator said that contrails were not in the scope of the Forum's advisory role because the aircraft did not originate from OAK. Ms. Aborashed said she did not know what the Metroplex project was and what it means when it is being discussed. She said that noise affects health. McClintock said that there is a topic that should deal with this, in part, on tonight's agenda, and that's the consideration of the two letters we received from the SFO Roundtable. The second letter involves a change in the federal 65 DNL, which is the same as the 65 CNEL noise standard. He suggested that it might be worthwhile for her to stay around for that discussion. Lastly, he said, remember that the people around this table representing the various communities are certainly concerned about the impacts of noise and air quality on all those who may be affected. The question is what degree of license or author-

ity do we have to deal with any of this, beyond recommending certain measures or actions to the executive director.

Director Ale-Flint added that the Forum is for us to hear and for this body to hear what the communities concerns are. The Forum doesn't make plans or policy, but can and does provide information about specific concerns. These concerns are forwarded to the noise office for review and action. She recommended that Ms. Aborashed continue to work with the noise office as she has in the past. Ms. Aborashed expressed her concern that nothing has really been accomplished over the eighteen years that the Forum has been in existence. McClintock said that although she had made some good points, he could not accept her assessment of the Forum. He said she failed to understand the Forum's ability to deal with certain issues. The operation of aircraft in flight is the sole responsibility of the federal government. Neither the Forum, at its level and, certainly, not the Port has the ability to change anything in that regard unless it is something worked out by the airport with the FAA. Lastly, he said, I think part of your problem may stem from the fact they've been doing a considerable amount of construction on the runway safety areas at North Field. That, by definition, could mean you're seeing changes in the traffic patterns, and changes in the number of operations over the community. From that perspective, I tend to sympathize with you on that because it's out of the ordinary, something that's not normal. He said that Matt or Larry would be providing more information on the status of the North Field RSA project later in the meeting.

McClintock asked if anybody else wished to address the Forum on items not on the agenda. Seeing no one, he closed the public comment period.

6. CONSIDERATION OF TWO LETTERS

This agenda item is the consideration of two letters provided to the Co-Chairs by president of the San Francisco Airport-Community Roundtable.

A. Formation of Regional Bay Area Noise Organization

The first letter is about the formation of a regional Bay Area noise organization. It is to the president of the Association of the Bay Area Governments, and it's basically a request on the part of the Roundtable to re-energize or invigorate the Regional Airport Planning Committee, which is part of ABAG. McClintock said that he believed a roundtable representative was to attend the January 30 RAPC meeting to present the proposal. Director Ale-Flint said she didn't think there was a RAPC meeting in January. Bert Ganoung said that it would be later this year before they hold their next meeting. McClintock asked Mr. McCombs if he had any comments on the issue. Mr. McCombs concurred that there was probably not much more the forum could do until we find out more about what RAPC is up to. Red Wetherill said he was not very impressed with RAPC after attending one of its meetings in which it was said that RAPC's only noise concern was with SFO. McClintock suggested that the matter be tabled until such time as we get more information on what RAPC is doing.

B. Change in Federal 65 DNL Noise Metric

McClintock said the second letter, to Michael Huerta, FAA Administrator, was a request for the FAA to look at the issues related to the DNL cumulative noise metric, the day-night noise

level and its effect on people and whether or not the 65 DNL, which is comparable to the California CNEL 65, is adequate to assess impacts on the community. McClintock noted that Gene Reindel of HMMH had looked at this issue. Mr. Reindel briefed the Forum on the evolution and implementation of the DNL 65 dB standard. By definition DNL is a 24-hour cumulative noise metric, referred to as the day-night average sound level. Reindel described the physics of the acoustics that went into the development of the DNL and 65 dB standard. It is an annual average of the 24 hour DNL used to evaluate noise exposure from aircraft operations. He noted that there is a 10 dB penalty assessed to any aircraft operation that occurs during the night, which is defined by the DNL metric as between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. He said one way to think about the 10 dB penalty is the same as having 10 dB higher noise levels than actually occurred because that's, from the human perspective, about twice as loud. So the aircraft are penalized as being twice as loud during the nighttime when things are quieter and people are trying to sleep.

Red Wetherill asked about the A-weighting. Reindel said A-weight is a recommendation for environmental or outdoor noise levels because it tends to simulate how the human ear perceives and understands noise levels at the level of which occurred in normal environmental situations. Reindel discussed the history of the DNL metric and its relationship to the California Airport Noise Standards and Part 150 of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations. He said the federal Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (ASNA) established a single system of measuring noise that tells us nationwide how we're to measure noise and, also, how we're to determine noise exposure from aircraft operations and, lastly, identified land uses normally compatible with various exposures of individuals to noise. Cumulative noise levels less the DNL 65 dB are normally compatible with residential use. Reindel spoke about the evolution of jet engines and the phase out of Stage 2 jets since ASNA was passed. He concluded by saying that part of the reason for describing DNL tonight and how it became the standard is because of letters the Forum has seen from various groups recommending lowering the FAA's noise threshold from DNL 65 dB down to 55 dB. He cited a quote from the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) supporting the FAA's research efforts in order to develop policies based on the best available science. The industry believes that it would be premature to make a decision to change the DNL metric or 65 dB criterion without a sound scientific basis. James Nelson asked about the status of the FAA's research. Gene replied that there have been a lot of studies done to correlate annoyance with DNL, including the seminal work of Ted Schultz. Other federal agencies also looked at this issue. So, while it wasn't quite arbitrary, he couldn't say that it was all based entirely on science. McClintock thanked Mr. Reindel for his presentation and brought the discussion back to the letter to Mr. Huerta. He said it sounded like the letter was in support of satellite-based procedures to reduce noise for communities around airports, as with NextGen, no transference or shifting of noise over communities, and verifying that the FAA is using the most appropriate noise metrics, whether they are cumulative or single event, to define noise threshold related to aircraft operations.

Based on this, McClintock said that he was not sure that the Forum could not do much more than support the activities of the Quiet Skies Caucus. He said it had been suggested at a previous meeting that the Forum might want to let our elected officials in the East Bay at the Congressional level -- and, perhaps, even Marin County -- know that we support the peninsula, the Roundtable and Congressional Representatives Eshoo and Speier. Mr. McCombs said he believed the Forum should send a letter to Mr., Huerta in support of this. McClintock said

that if there were no objections he would send a letter to the Executive Director recommending this course of action. Ernie DelliGatti suggested that it would be important to copy our local elected representatives on the letter and to make sure they were up to speed on the issues. Ms. Ale-Flint offered that since there is an FAA-sponsored research study underway we should be very clear what it is we're asking for from our electeds. She said we want to be clear about the position we would want our elected to take in this matter and for them to have the best information to evaluate what we're asking for them to do, and at this point, that information is not yet known. Therefore, she said, we should support the fact that the research is ongoing and we are actively looking forward to the results and to raise awareness about the issue. She felt this approach was reasonable, but was concerned that the Forum not go too far without any additional information. Wafaa Aborashed asked if the Forum did advocacy. The facilitator said, yes, in the sense that we would be advocating that the FAA give consideration to the letters written by two Congress representatives from the peninsula with respect to continuing research into an appropriate aircraft noise metric.

7. NOISE NEWS UPDATE

Vince Mestre provided an update on current noise and regulatory issues, including the fact that there is a battle brewing between airports and the airlines about funding. The PFC is the passenger facility charge that passengers pay at the airport. The FAA budget proposes to raise it as high as \$8.00 to offset the \$450 million cut to the airport "aid" program. This is not a noise issue, but the Airport Cooperative Research Program, which is run by the National Academy of Sciences is funded through these dollars, and if the PFCs are not raised, there will be a cut in the noise research programs. There are two New Jersey Senators who have come on record saying they want FAA's noise level reduced to 55 DNL. The aviation industry said, "Wait a minute. Don't jump to conclusions," because the FAA announced a road mapping program for revising the DNL metric. Their recommendations are due in the year 2020, so they are telling everybody to back off for a little bit and stay with 65 DNL for now. Mestre said, with all the controversy over noise, he was not sure the FAA could hold off until 2020.

Vince said there were different metrics used for different types of noise. There have been research papers produced in the last few years, which I have been involved in, that have said that the response to road noise is different to the response to rail noise, which is different from the response to aircraft noise. The International Standards Organization is about to publish a document that says there are three different response curves, and the noise sources ought to be treated independently from each other because the rate of annoyance to each source is different. The Schultz curve Gene described lumped road, rail and aircraft noise surveys for determining the percent of population highly annoyed at a given noise level all into one curve. When you break them out independently, you get different answers. So there's very good reason to go back and review the policy. Vince said he was not sure that it's a good idea to just jump in and draw a conclusion when you haven't yet reviewed what that is.

A Massachusetts Congressman is threatening to remove his support for NextGen because of noise complaints in the Boston area. Secretary Huerta answered the Congressman by noting the performance of phased navigation in making operations in the Boston area much more efficient, but the Congressman cut him off, snapping "Complaints in Boston are going through the roof and it began with RNAV." So things are getting a little touchy. A number of com-

munity groups want to be heard during the hearings on the FAA reauthorization bill. Another issue related to the bill may have 4th Amendment issues. The proposed bill allows any public entity taking private residential property by eminent domain for airport purposes to pay the value of the property after its value has been diminished by the pendency of the project itself or by any delay by the public entity in purchasing it. We'll see how that proceeds.

Santa Monica, as we know, has been in a long fight with the FAA about their ability to close the airport. The airport was owned by the FAA and operated as the part of the Douglas aircraft plant for defense purposes. The FAA contends that because the government deeded the airport to the City, it must remain an airport. However, the City determined that not all Airport property was covered in the deed and has gone to all the leaseholder on the part of the property not covered by the federal transfer of deed and cut them down to a month-to-month market rate lease. So the battle goes on in Santa Monica. The East Hampton Airport has huge helicopter controversies because of the helicopter traffic between Manhattan and the Hamptons, particularly during summer. The helicopter industry has gone to court to block the restrictions and not have the impact it would have on their operations at the Hamptons. The board of the Town of East Hampton has backed off a little bit on their requirements. They have decided not to ban weekend helicopters, but they are going to go forward with their curfew and another curfew for very loud aircraft. It's interesting, because the back off on the weekend ban came from pressure from the cities around East Hampton where the traffic would be diverted. So they've suddenly become more regionally sensitive to the impact of their actions.

The aviation subcommittee in the House of Representatives has now gone on record with the FAA that they want more action on helicopter noise. That's all part of an ongoing issue not only with the Hamptons but other places -- in particular, Los Angeles, where the FAA announced they have a helicopter noise complaint system for LA County. This is a central number where they're collecting flight tracks and complaint data. The purpose is to correlate compliance to specific flight tracks to study the problem and try to develop mechanisms for reducing the impact of helicopters on LA County. The citizens' group that put this together was very happy. They put out a press release, and as things would go, they put the wrong phone number. NASA is now working on low-boom supersonic business jets. This is the first time we've seen NASA come out and say, well, this technology, which they didn't believe was going to be scalable to larger aircraft, can perhaps be supplemented by other technology---And now we are talking about supersonic commercial air carrier operations. This is many years in the future, but it is back on the table.

In the United Kingdom, the Heathrow and Gatwick Airport controversies are back in full swing again. The attempt to put a new runway at Heathrow was dropped about five years ago. Now they're back to wanting to build a new runway at either Heathrow or Gatwick. Mestre said he brought this up because they list a number of mitigation measures for noise. One of these would be the establishment of an airport-community engagement forum. The head of the noise office in the UK actually called and talked to me about the forums here and, specifically, the Oakland Forum. So this Forum was given to the UK as a model of this community engagement forum. So we're now internationally renowned. Mestre next described a variety of new technological innovations on the part of NASA, and other international research agencies, including geared turbofans.

Lastly he presented a series of air quality and greenhouse gas slides. The federal government has been given the direction to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 40 percent. This is not specific to aviation but does give us kind of an idea what the federal government's goal is, and we could see policies related to aviation that have these kinds of goals for reduction of greenhouse gases. He noted that cheap oil is not expected to impact biofuel development, but could slow commercialization efforts. As oil prices increase, biofuel becomes more desirable biofuel becomes. Mestre also presented information on the development of an electric airplane by NASA and the latest in drone technology and regulation.

He said the potential for drones to be annoying is very high, given that about 200,000 drones are sold to hobbyists each month. The FAA is concerned about drones operating in the near vicinity of airports and is developing drone no fly zones. There is also a drone no-fly zone web site where you can register your house on the internet. Lastly, Amazon is still hot to deliver products by drone. They are very critical of the FAA's process for approving their drone experimental program. In fact, the approval they got for their last drone was obsolete before they actually got to test it, because they actually now have another type of drone they want to use and they have to start the process over again. So there is this disconnect between how fast the technology is developing and the ability of the FAA to regulate the impact.

8. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

A. Review of 2014 Annual Noise Complaints Report

Larry Galindo reviewed the noise complaint report for 2014. He focused on the noise complaints by city, by caller, and by aircraft category. He said the majority of the Bay Farm Island complaints were the result of the runway safety area project and the fact that the South Field runway was not readily available. In Alameda Central there were 10 callers who generated 227 reports for a combined total for Alameda and Bay Farm Island. In Berkeley, the complaints were largely directed at helicopters and some GA activity, many from Buchanan Field in Concord. Castro Valley was a primary source of complaints during Southeast plan (inclement weather). Fremont was impacted by arrivals to the main air carrier runway. There were 47 noise complaints from Fremont. Hayward generated 107 complaints. Hayward is located in an area that generates complaints relative to general aviation and helicopters and, also, the 100-degree radial procedure that catches aircraft that are below 3,000 feet turning a short, final visual approach to our main runway. There were 48 reports from Oakland. These were primarily helicopters that were associated with some civil disturbances that have occurred and plagued the city, as well as the Port. Piedmont had no complaints registered this year. San Francisco had five and Marin County two. There were 1,221 complaints from San Leandro. San Leandro is subject to the 100-degree radial arrivals. Southeast plan departures, when they occur, helicopters and our regular arrivals are to the North Field. So there's quite a lot going on. With respect Wafaa's concerns, remember that, in 2014, for most of the year, we did not have use of Runway 27 left. This runway is the primary training runway. Without 27 left, aircraft training has been performed on the right runway. Some of those flights have extended over to Davis West. But primarily what's happened here is, without parallel runways, we have to use one runway for all operations arriving, and that's the reason for the increase in traffic, unfortunately, over Davis West. San Lorenzo had three complaints. There were individual complaints for a number of other communities, as well, but the total number of complaints was 2,468 for 2014. Larry next reviewed the number of complaints by individ-

ual callers by community and complaints by type of aircraft. He said that his office investigates all complaints and records them. For those that involve a noise abatement procedure, they identify the aircraft operator, and send letters when it's appropriate. They also keep an eye on trends and do all they can to get compliance with the procedures. Councilmember Lee asked for an additional breakdown on the San Leandro data for purposes of outreach to ethnic neighborhoods. Galindo said he would research it and get to him.

B. Helicopter Operators Meeting Update

Larry Galindo said that it was very evident at the last meeting that the Forum wanted staff to take some measures to help curtail or address the helicopter issues impacting Noise Forum neighborhoods and communities. He said in this regard, we are planning a special helicopter operators noise abatement meeting on June 18. He thanked Hayward Councilman Greg Jones and Sean Moran from the Hayward Airport for assisting his office to get this date set. It will be at the Hayward Executive Airport and Hayward Airport Manager, Doug McNeeley and Sean Moran are assisting to make sure we get as much participation as we can from helicopter operators that are based at the Hayward and Oakland Airports. He said they would address helicopter noise issues, discuss helicopter mitigation measures that are recommended by the National Helicopter Association. He said they will consider local community concerns and review the current established Oakland and Hayward noise procedures for helicopters. This meeting will be sponsored by the Forum, as well as the Hayward Executive Airport. He said all parties are looking forward to the meeting. The discussion continued off-topic on matters related to the noise complaint report.

9. NF/SF GROUPS STATUS REPORTS

A. OAK Runway Safety Area Project Update

Matt Davis reported that the significant portion of the project is the closure of the two North Field runways. Basically, for the first six months of the year, we closed Runway 28L/10R right. We're doing work to shift traffic onto the north two runways. He said they will continue to work on the North Field RSA until June when they expect to reopen Runway 28L/10R. At that point the plan is to close Runway 28R/10L. The entire project is expected to be completed by December 31, as mandated by Congress. He noted that the main runway, 30/12, needed to be closed for additional maintenance and rehabilitation back in March. There were no other unanticipated closures of the main runway, on at least one occasion it was necessary to close both North Field runways for a short period. He noted that it would be necessary to close Taxiway Bravo for short periods of time. Bravo is the taxiway that connects North and South Fields. When they have to do work associated with Taxiway Bravo, they need eight to 12 hours to work on that. When that happens, there's no way for aircraft to go from North to South Field, so the noise abatement procedures for North Field are suspended at that point. They try to do this work at night and, of course, issue community advisories.

B. Technical Working Groups – NFG/SFG

At the last meeting discussions were held concerning the RSA project, runway closures and etc. They talked about maintenance and the need to do it between 2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. on Mondays because that is least heavily trafficked period. He discussed the flight schedules and FedEx's early morning operations. One matter of particular interest was the preparations for the Superbowl. This could mean an additional 1,400 to 1,600 additional aircraft utilizing Bay Area airports. He said they have started

meeting with NFL officials. Although the game will be played in Santa Clara, the majority of events will be in San Francisco. The problem will be to determine where all these additional aircraft will be parked, and how to get the out of the local airspace once the game is over. Matt discussed other elated logistical and security issues related to the game. Members of the Forum and public asked a number of questions concerning the impacts of so many additional aircraft in the local airspace, where they would takeoff and land, and at what hours. Matt said that these issues were being addressed and that he would report back to the Forum on this matter in July. Allen Tai said that all this brings back memories of Fleet Week in 2014. He asked this matter be discussed at the July meeting. Benny Lee reminded staff that one of his concerns was outreach to minority communities to ensure they have access to information about what is happening at the Airport, and how to report noise and other issues.

10. NEXT MEETING – July 15, 2015

11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

Cindy Horvath provided information on the Airport Landuse Consortium, which is a group that was formed in the last four years as a way to facilitate more conversation between ALUCs, their staff and the rest of the industry -- for example, aviation attorneys, landuse attorneys, and aviation organizations. There being no additional new business the meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.