

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

January 20, 2016

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

PAGE NO.

1. INTRODUCTIONS.....	2
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	2
A. Red Wetherill Passing	2
B. Co-Chairs Meeting with Port Staff	3
C. Acceptance of 3rd Qtr. 2015 Noise Report (Receive and File).....	3
3. CORRESPONDENCE.....	3
A. Deborah Ale Flint Thank You Note	4
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (October 21, 2015)	4
5. FAA INITIATIVE TO ADDRESS (METROPLEX) NOISE CONCERNS	4
A. Port Letter to FAA	4
B. SFO Community Roundtable Letter to FAA	7
C. Recent Noise Complaints Analysis	7
6. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	8
7. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE	12
A. H.R. 3384—Quiet Communities Act of 2015	12
B. H.R. 3965—FAA Community Accountability Act of 2015	12
C. Oakland Recycling Rule	12
8. NOISE OFFICE REPORT.....	13
A. Noise Office Staffing Update	13
B. Alameda Portable Noise Monitor Update.....	13
9. SUPERBOWL 50 UPDATE	13
10. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP REPORTS	14
A. Runway Safety Area Project Update.....	14
B. Main Runway Overlay Project	14
11. 2016 FORUM WORK PLAN	14
12. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE	15
13. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (APRIL 20, 2016).....	16
14. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....	16

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The January 20, 2016 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
Cindy Horvath, Alternate for Wilma Chan, Alameda County Supervisor
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Pat Mossburg, Alternate for Larry Reid, Council President pro tem, City of Oakland
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Kristi McKenney, Acting Director of Aviation
Matt Davis, Acting Assistant Director of Aviation

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Jesse Richardson, Jr., Noise and Environmental Affairs
Darron Evans, Acting Airport Operations Manager
Gene Reindel, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Rhia Gundry, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Harvey Hartmann, Consultant to the Port
Vince Mestre, Landrum & Brown
Don Kirby, FAA Air Traffic Manager, Northern California TRACON
Jim Baas, FedEx Flight Operations
Abegael Jakey, FedEx Flight Operations
Kathy Ornelas, City of San Leandro
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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Red Wetherill Passing

The facilitator noted that at the Forum's October meeting we honored a citizen advocate from the City of Alameda and CLASS. Red Wetherill had a tremendous influence on how things were done at the airport. He asked Co-Chair Benny Lee to say a few words in honor of Red. Mr. Lee said that Red was the first to welcome me to the Forum, and he shared a lot of great

limericks with him. Benny asked the Forum to observe a moment of silence for Red. Lee said we were fortunate to have him to be such a great advocate and, also, it was great that we could honor him in our last meeting. Barbara Tuleja said she first met Red many years ago, as chairman of the Harbor Bay Airport Committee, at a meeting where she was asking for volunteers and he volunteered. When she found about his knowledge of acoustics he became a valuable member of the committee. The two of them later founded CLASS. Throughout the years, he was very helpful with his knowledge and his tremendous intelligence, but also with the dedication to CLASS. She said she missed him greatly and that he was a very gentle man who carried a big stick of dedication and knowledge. She wished him eternal rest.

Walt Jacobs said he was associated with Red for more than the 17-years he'd been on the Forum,

and he was instrumental in teaching him everything there was to know about noise that a basic person could absorb. He was a sound engineer. He knew everything about it, and he was a tremendous driving force in a most appropriate way. He will really be missed. Kristi McKenney spoke on behalf of the airport and for the staff who worked with Red. She said he truly was a wonderful individual to engage with. He was always productive in terms of addressing issues, representing his community, and very active in terms of working with the airport and bringing information to us from the community and back to the community from us and from the meetings. She said that, she personally, worked with Red for the 20 years that she's worked at the Port, and that she was deeply saddened by the loss of him to all of us and as a community. Tony Daysog said he has had the privilege of knowing Red for over 10 years. He first met Red through the initial interaction between the City of Alameda and the Port of Oakland. He said Red was not only a guy who was an expert in his field, but he was always looking at things in a positive, funny way, and he would always have something literary to say too.

James Nelson said that he had the pleasure of working with Red 30 years ago, and that he had learned a lot from him. It's amazing what he contributed, going way back to the 1960s and 70s. The facilitator concluded by saying that he was pleased that the Forum was able to honor him for his contributions and his technical knowledge at its October meeting. We were all shocked to hear of his passing. As Barbara said, may he rest in peace.

B. Co-Chairs Meeting with Port Staff

The facilitator noted for the record that he, Co-Chairs Lee and Jacobs, and Kathy Ornelas met with Port staff on January 6 to talk about the agenda and some of the issues that were coming up. It was a good way to organize everything, until the issue of the Montclair overflights came up. Nonetheless, we appreciate the fact that the residents are here and have adjusted the agenda to hear from them tonight.

C. Acceptance of 3rd Qtr. 2015 Noise Report (Receive and File)

The facilitator said that the last item under announcements was the 3rd quarter 2015 noise report. Typically, this is received and filed unless there are questions or discussion. To the matter of the third quarter noise report, the facilitator said he would entertain a motion to receive and file. Co-Chair Jacobs so moved. Co-Chair Lee seconded. Motion carried.

3. CORRESPONDENCE

A. Deborah Ale Flint Thank You note

The facilitator noted that at the Forum's October meeting a plaque recognizing former Aviation Director Deborah Ale Flint's support of the Forum was sent to her. Deborah responded with a note thanking the Forum for its sentiments.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (OCTOBER 21, 2015)

Facilitator McClintock noted that this item was for the approval of the draft minutes of the October 2015 Forum meeting. The facilitator noted that Forum members had received a copy of the draft minutes of the October meeting with their agenda packages. He asked if there were any comments, questions, or corrections. Co-Chair Lee moved approval. Co-Chair Jacobs seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions (Ms. Horvath and Ms. Mossburg).

5. FAA INITIATIVE TO ADDRESS [METROPLEX] NOISE CONCERNS

The facilitator said that, because of the interest in this subject, he was going to introduce this matter ahead of the Public Comment period.

A. PORT LETTER TO FAA

Facilitator McClintock said that a memorandum on this subject had gone out to Forum members in their agenda packages. He said he wanted to start with the memo because it provides an overview of not only the issue of the Metroplex, which is the source of many of the concerns and problems. These issues and concerns have been brought to the attention of the FAA and they have taken action to begin an initiative process to address the noise concerns of Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Francisco counties, primarily as a result of three peninsula Congressional representatives, who represent the area in and around San Francisco International Airport, who put pressure on the FAA and the FAA administrators. He asked for the Forum's forbearance while he recapped the substance of the January 8, 2015 memorandum for the benefit of the community members in attendance. He read that...

"This agenda item is very important to the Forum Communities because the attached FAA initiative has been undertaken at the request of Peninsula congressional representatives Farr, Eshoo, and Speier because of increased noise complaints associated with recent changes to Bay Area airspace procedures that affect their constituents. These changes have also been noticed by, and are the subject of an increasing number of noise complaints from East Bay communities, yet our congressional representatives apparently have not been made aware of this issue. Because the FAA's initiative came about as a result of noise complaints from San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz counties, its initial focus may have been directed primarily at their concerns. However, the Port of Oakland and the San Francisco International Airport/Community Roundtable are on record with correspondence ... to the FAA expressing their concerns. The Forum, and Forum member communities, also need to make the FAA aware of their concerns, and East Bay and Marin County congressional representatives need to be apprised of this situation..."

“[The FAA’s] initiative will be comprised of three phases. During the first phase, the FAA will conduct a detailed analysis and a preliminary feasibility study focusing on flight procedures criteria and overall fly-ability of the new Performance Based Navigation (PBN) procedures. During the second phase, FAA will consider any amendments and/or new procedures that are determined to be initially feasible, flyable, and operationally acceptable from a safety point of view. As part of this effort, FAA will conduct the formal environmental and safety reviews, coordinate and seek feedback from existing and/or new community roundtables, members of affected industry, and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA) before moving forward with the formal amendment process. During phase three, the FAA will implement procedures; conduct any required airspace changes and additional negotiated actions, as needed. Phase 1 was initiated in October 2015. Its completion date has yet to be determined...”

The facilitator concluded his remarks by noting that both the San Francisco International Airport Community Roundtable and the Port of Oakland have gone on record with the FAA expressing their concerns with the Metroplex and the problems with those procedures that are affecting local communities. McClintock said that he had prepared a letter to the FAA’s regional administrator, Mr. Glen Martin, for the Co-Chairs to sign. Copies of the signed letter will be sent to Representatives Barbara Lee, Eric Swalwell, and Jared Huffman. McClintock read from the letter as follows:

“...As Co-Chairs of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum (Forum) we are writing to you to express our concern over these issues and to appeal to the FAA to include the Forum in the coordination, consideration and evaluation of any amendments, modifications and/or new procedures associated with the FAA’s “Initiative to Address Noise Concerns of Santa Cruz/Santa Clara/San Mateo/San Francisco Counties” as requested by Peninsula Congressional Representatives Farr, Eshoo and Speier. We are concerned that the FAA will focus on evaluating and modifying only those procedures affecting the Peninsula and West Bay counties to the possible detriment of the East Bay Region. The Forum represents two counties and six East Bay cities with demonstrated aircraft noise and overflight problems. Over the seventeen-year history of the Forum we have worked successfully with the FAA and the Port of Oakland on a number of these issues and have had measurable success. We would like to continue this relationship...”

The facilitator asked Acting Aviation Director Kristi McKenney to comment on the letter that the Port sent to the FAA requesting information with respect to participation in the FAA’s initiative process. Ms. McKenney welcomed the many new community members who were present. She said she was very glad to see them and was happy to have their voices heard as part of this process. She provided the community members with a brief overview of the FAA’s Metroplex program, saying that this is work that the FAA is doing nationally in a variety of large urban areas around the country. They're calling each one of these larger areas "Metroplexes." So we here in the Bay Area, in Northern California, have our own Metroplex program. It is about the introduction of modern technology into the air navigation system of the FAA to supplant some of the much older technology that the system had previously relied upon. In earlier phases of the FAA’s attempts to upgrade the regional air traffic control system there was a community outreach process and environmental documentation. However, today most of this work is occurring at relatively-high altitudes, so it's very different from what you may have experienced in engaging the typical state CEQA or federal NEPA process. For example, the procedures that were being implemented were, in many cases, simply overlays of existing procedures that did not require extensive environmental review. In all cases

with the implementation of new satellite based technology these have been FAA initiatives entirely. So the three principal airports in the Bay Area—San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose International Airports—have engaged the FAA to have input into this process on behalf of our respective communities. Nevertheless, the Metroplex is still an FAA project and it is their process that we've been participating in.

The Metroplex process was started in November 2014 and there were fairly-quick concerns registered on the peninsula and a little later from the Santa Cruz county hills and South Bay areas. More recently, we really started to see the uptick in the emergence of concerns in the East Bay areas, initially among the shoreline communities and now the East Bay Hills. The Port and the Forum have been working with the bayside communities on more localized concerns, but it has become a much broader issue over the last few months. The Port has become extremely concerned about this issue and has been studying it very closely and being very active in pursuing potential solutions, and the Forum has certainly been very focused on this issue over the past number of meetings as the implementation of the Metroplex has continued. As a result of this, we have raised this issue, at various levels and through various means with the FAA, saying that these more recent concerns need to be looked at in a similar manner to the other concerns they have already started to look at. Representatives of the Port recently met with the associate administrator of the FAA for airports -- he reports directly to the FAA administrator -- and shared with him the east bay communities' concerns and advise him that they should anticipate a request to be more fully engaged with us than they have been to date, and that our Congressional representatives will certainly be increasingly aware and concerned about this issue.

The Port has also notified the local FAA offices, including the airport district office, as well as the regional administrator, Glenn Martin, who's been charged with overseeing the Metroplex for our area and coordinating it. Ms. McKenney said that she has e-mailed the regional administrator and prepared a more detailed letter that does a couple of things: (1) it reaffirms the conversation she had with him that it is critical that Oakland and East Bay communities be involved even in the processes that are taking place on the peninsula and the South Bay, because any possible airspace changes they make in that area, while they may not be procedures for Oakland or on this side of the bay, they can have impact here. The airspace is so challenging in the Bay Area and tightly congested, with three airports here and so much traffic, that anything that happens in one area can have consequences elsewhere; and (2) we need to make sure we're able to look at everything in an objective manner and to work with the FAA's team of experts to help analyze procedures to make sure they will not adversely affect or negatively impact the Oakland Airport or the East Bay communities. Even more important are several areas that we have focused on where we are hearing a considerable amount of concern in the community. So we have outlined those for the FAA.

To this end, the Port has prepared documents that show flight tracks in the areas of concern that we are now hearing from the community about. Ms. McKenney said that she wanted to assure the community that this has all been put forward with the expectation that the FAA will engage us on this matter. She said this is why it was so important to hear from the community tonight in order to make sure we've got this matter covered as we continue to meet with the FAA. She said the FAA has shown a willingness to engage when asked to do so, and that she fully anticipates the same level of engagement with our community groups, as well as those from the peninsula.

B. SFO COMMUNITY ROUNDTABLE LETTER TO FAA

The facilitator noted that, as Kristi said, The Port and the Forum have always had a good working relationship with the local FAA offices, and we want to foster that relationship. There should be a place at the FAA's table for us to make sure the concerns of the East Bay residents are also heard. This is essentially what the SFO Airport Community Roundtable also wants, and they have communicated their concerns to the FAA as well. McClintock discussed the Roundtable's letter to the FAA, saying that the Roundtable was largely responsible for getting the ball rolling on having the FAA go back and look at the Metroplex procedures because of the number of noise complaints. But, he noted, just by the title of the FAA's initiative -- that is, the FAA Initiative to Address Noise Concerns of Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo, and San Francisco Counties -- it kind of makes us feel like, hey, we're here, too.

What about our concerns. So, part of the strategy here tonight is to make sure we get on record as wanting to be a part of this initiative process. McClintock read the letter for the benefit of the audience. He commented that we were taken aback by the fact that the FAA's initiative was focused on the complaints from San Mateo, Santa Cruz, San Francisco, and Santa Clara counties. Hence, the need to send our own letter to Mr. Martin to have this matter clarified. Co-Chair Benny Lee said he felt it was very important that we engage the FAA on this matter. He said the original intent was to enhance efficiencies and to save fuel, but it seems that little regard was given to community concerns over increased noise and overflights.

C. RECENT NOISE COMPLAINTS ANALYSIS

The facilitator said that part of this agenda item was recent noise complaints. He asked Jesse Richardson to elaborate. Mr. Richardson said that the recent noise complaint analysis has shown that the Oakland Airport Noise Abatement Office has received about 44 percent more complaints in 2015 than in 2014. As an example he compared the 2014 flight tracks from the Pacific Northwest arrivals into Oakland with the same flight tracks from 2015. He said the concentrating of these flight tracks along the ridgeline in the Oakland Hills was largely responsible for the increased number of noise complaints. Co-Chair Benny Lee asked if any of these complaints were in other than English. Richardson replied that the Noise Office had received no non-English complaints. Lee replied that he has raised this question in the past, and will continue to do so, because there is a need to be able to handle complaints from people speaking other languages. Just because there have been no complaints from non-English speakers, that does not mean that they are not impacted by aircraft noise, particularly in San Leandro which now has a population with 40 percent non-English speaking people. He said this is why it's vital for us to actually outreach in other languages, so, that way, we can get a realistic number of what the impacts are.

James Nelson asked what the percent increase in noise complaints has been for Oakland and Montclair. Jesse responded that in 2014 there were 48 complaints from Oakland and 319 in 2015. In 2014 there were 20 separate callers and 87 in 2015. He said that in 2014 there were more complaints from San Leandro than 2015, which he primarily attributed to helicopter complaints in 2014. He said he is receiving more complaints from San Leandro now because of the Metroplex.

Councilmember Tony Daysog asked about complaints from Alameda. Richardson said that Alameda had been fairly stable, but complaints appear to be trending downward. Ernie Deligianni asked about complaints in San Lorenzo and Hayward. Richardson replied that they were up in San Lorenzo, but down slightly in Hayward. Ernie said that he had conflicting information from the Hayward Airport, with that airport recording complaints from Oakland flights. He said there are increasing numbers of Oakland aircraft coming over Castro Valley, San Lorenzo and Hayward. Kristi McKenney added that the slides showed by Jesse were representative of both past and current conditions, and show a stark contrast, which is why this same information was provided to the FAA, i.e., we're seeing this concentration over Kensington, Berkeley, the Oakland hills, Castro Valley, Bay Farm Island, Treasure Island, and San Leandro. There are also the separate issues of aircraft coming over from the San Francisco Airport and Union City's UPS arrivals. She said the actual list is even more comprehensive.

6. 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. However, because of the number of first-time Forum attendees, he explained how the Forum worked. He said that the Forum is an advisory body to the executive director of the Port of Oakland. The Forum does not have any power or control over the airport; nor does it have any power or authority over the FAA; it can only investigate and advise. He said one of the purposes of the letters prepared by the Forum is to develop information it can use to report back to the Port and suggest certain actions that could or should be taken. So far this has worked very, very well for the Forum and its member communities over the last 17 years on a smaller scale, especially for those issues affecting the airspace and the communities in and around the Oakland airport. The Forum has had a good working relationship with the FAA, both at the local tower level as well as at the regional air traffic control level. However, the Metroplex is an extremely large project. It affects all of the major airports in the Bay Area. It's part of the next generation (NextGen) of the FAA's air traffic control system. It's a satellite-based system and, obviously, there have been some problems with its implementation, particularly from communities finding themselves subject to more noise and overflight. So the FAA started an "Initiative" process in November to work with airports and affected communities. Hence, the Forum's approach is to get on board with the initiative process to find out what information it can get out of it and make recommendations as to what it thinks are the best solutions for our communities to mitigate any problems they have with aircraft noise or overflights.

So again, the Forum is an advisory body only, and for the record the airport has no more control over the operation of aircraft in flight than does the Forum. Both the Forum and the Port can engage the FAA, ask questions, and make suggestions. However, airspace and airspace utilization policies and decisions are made at a higher level than the local FAA, and the federal government has supremacy over the airspace in the United States as part of the national airport system. So, for those who have come here tonight to ask the Port or Forum to change things, you have to know that neither the Forum nor the Port has that power. However, we do want to hear from you; we want to know what your concerns are. He concluded by saying

that anyone who wished to receive Forum meeting notices, agendas and draft meeting minutes should send him an e-mail at glomike65@aol.com. You can also receive hard copies through the mail by leaving your name and address. The facilitator opened the public comment period.

Kurt Peterson from Alameda's west end said that the FAA's procedure used to come up with the Metroplex was flawed from the beginning. Public input was extremely limited and, probably, purposely so. He said he was pleased to see so many people in the audience. He said that contrary to the facilitator's statements, the Port does have control and is "pushing" for more FedEx flights at Oakland. He stated that the Port was not public, but a private entity whose primary objective was to make money. He cited the example of the new FedEx cargo facility. Acting Aviation Director Kristi McKenney said that she wanted to clarify the fact that the Port of Oakland is "100 percent a public agency." The Port is an independent department of the City of Oakland, and its employees are all public servants. Nina McKenzie said she was a 24-year resident of Montclair, which is in the Oakland Hills. She said she wished to share her personal perspective on Montclair's noise problem. She said she had 3 points to make: 1) the constant jet traffic over her home recently has become a real disruption in the quality of her life. She said she can't read the newspaper on Sunday mornings without having a plane roar through at three to five-minute intervals. Her family cannot sleep in their own home because of the noise disruptions, nor can they enjoy outdoor gardening activities, and her cats are stressed. Her ability to work from home is being disrupted and this is impacting her economically; 2) The disruptions caused by air traffic are affecting the ability of residents to enjoy the many parks and open spaces in the Oakland hills; and 3) because of the low ambient noise levels in Montclair, the noise from jet aircraft overflights is even more noticeable.

Carla Fried, a resident of Kensington, noted that Kensington is part of Contra Costa County, not Alameda County, and that for this reason felt that her community was not being adequately represented. She said the big problem in Kensington was east-west arrivals because Kensington is in the hills at an elevation of around 1,000 feet, and that around 3:00 to 4:00 a.m. both FedEx and UPS planes fly over at about 3,000 or 4,000 feet. The result is that many residents are awakened. During the day the problem is the planes departing to the east, which flyover Kensington at altitudes of from 6,000 to 7,000 feet. She asked why FedEx and UPS had to fly so low so early in the morning? David Cutler from Montclair said he felt that Oakland needed to have a seat at the table with the FAA, and if this did not produce the desired results, then they can always sue the FAA for invading their privacy and affected the economic value of the area. He played one of the noise events he was concerned with. Crystal Lee, a resident of Montclair in the Oakland hills, echoed the concerns of the people that spoke before her. She said she runs a business from her home and found the noise and overflights to be very interrupting to the activities that she's trying to perform. She said she was also concerned about air pollution from the planes flying over because of her young children.

Helen Kozoriz Shoemaker from Montclair read that Save Our Skies East Bay is a coalition of residents in the East Bay that are adversely and disproportionately impacted by excessive noise pollution as a result of the Federal Aviation Administration's NextGeneration air transport system. She SOSEB applauds the Forum's efforts to have a voice in the FAA's new initiative to consider recommendations from local communities to adjust the current published procedures of the Northern California optimization of airspace and procedures in the Metroplex project. She noted that SOSEB would like to go on record and add its voice re-

garding the egregious issues the FAA implemented and to respectfully ask the Forum to make it a high priority in addressing these issues. SOSEB has petitioned for immediate corrective action regarding the FAA's NextGen flight paths over the East Bay. The FAA's NextGen program has taken an already-busy airspace and further concentrated arriving and departing SFO and Oakland overflights over certain East Bay neighborhoods. Rather than acting to disperse overflights to distribute and minimize the cumulative impacts over neighborhoods, the FAA has assured maximum disturbance of certain areas without analyzing feasible alternatives.

Frequent and recurring low altitude and high decibel overflight noise rattles our homes, awakens us and startles us out of deep sleep at night, interrupts our conversations and interferes with family time, work and recreation each and every day. For all practical purposes, we have been deprived of the quiet and peaceful use and enjoyment of our property. This level and frequency of noise is unprecedented in our neighborhoods and is utterly inconsistent with residential zoning miles away from area airports. She cited the fact that numerous medical studies have documented the significant and cumulative physical and mental health impacts of the kinds of high decibel, single-event noise impacts we are now experiencing, including sleep deprivation, functional impairment, and even trauma. She said the FAA does not acknowledge intense single-event noise as a significant environmental impact, yet nearly 15 years ago the State of California formally recognized the environmental significance of such single-event impacts in the Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Committee versus the Board of Port Commissioners. It is unconscionable that the FAA be allowed to deny California residents environmental analysis based on the same scientifically-supported noise standards.

SOSEB urges the Forum to increase its efforts to press for immediate relief regarding the FAA's NextGen flight paths and procedures over the East Bay. Therefore, we demand that, (1) the implementation of the FAA's NextGen flight paths over the East Bay be rescinded and the prior SFO and OAK arrival and departure flight paths be restored; (2) that the FAA acknowledge, monitor and make a serious study of how to disperse and minimize single event overflight noise over East Bay neighborhoods with full public participation; (3) that no further NextGen flight path determinations be made without the preparation of a full environmental impact statement analyzing the actual single-event noise impacts of any proposal, with full public participation; (4) that no discretionary SFO or Oakland Airport project be undertaken without the preparation of a full environmental impact report analyzing the actual single-event noise impacts of any proposal, with full public participation; and (5) the Forum is urged to press the FAA to adjust flight altitudes and braking procedures of the East Bay hills area to account for elevation changes and to mitigate nighttime noise impacts by moving all the possible air traffic to corridors over the bay. The FAA must accept certain tradeoffs in efficiency and optimization to meaningfully address and solve the noise issues they have created. Commerce must be balanced with community, quality of life and environmental concerns, not just fuel efficiency. Ms. Shoemaker concluded by saying that SOSEB is confident that the new technology, safety, and effective community noise considerations are not mutually exclusive. SOSEB also recognize that the assurance of quieter engines to solve the issue is a deceptive answer, as anticipated growth in total air traffic, together with precision navigation that increases flight frequency at lower altitudes during approach and departure, can only result in increased noise. Co-Chair Jacobs thanked Ms. Helen Kozoriz Shoemaker for a well prepared presentation, as did the facilitator.

Amy Best, a 29-year resident of Montclair, said that when she purchased her home, she did not buy a home in a flight path, and one of the things she has treasured about her home all these years has been the quiet, but now to have these jets flying over all the time is absolutely unacceptable. The planes are flying way too low, and she doesn't want them over her house. Asher Langton from Montclair said that the economic cost of the noise and overflights, which could add up to billions of dollars of lost real estate value in the Oakland hills. He said Oakland hills homeowners were paying substantial amounts for a relatively-small financial gain on the part of the airlines. Leslie Ransbottom (sp?) thanked Jesse Richardson for showing the new flight tracks over the East Bay Hills. She said her community was being "slammed" by two 24-hour international airports. She asked why aircraft had to overfly her area when the San Francisco Bay makes the perfect place for the application of NextGen technology. She reiterated that the SOSEB letter says that there has to be a balance between humans and commerce, and that the airports bear a big responsibility in being good neighbors. Phil Weisberg said that the upside to this situation is that he has met a lot of new people; unfortunately, they have been in windows in airplanes going by his house. He said when you buy a house near an airport you know what to expect, but that is not the case with living in the hills. He asked Jesse Richardson for copies of the exhibits that were shown earlier. He said Barbara Lee's office had expressed interest in learning more about this issue.

Laurel Strand, a 25-year resident of Montclair and an 18-year real estate agent in the area. She said she often works at home where it is usually beautiful and quiet. Last summer she started hearing more and more aircraft noise, saying it "sounded like a war zone." She said Montclair has always been a destination for peace and quiet, and she is pleased to hear how important this is to her neighbors, as well. She said she would like to stay in touch with the noise office and find out more about the aircraft flight tracking and noise monitoring equipment. It is very important that the community knows they are being heard. A representative of District 4 Oakland Councilmember Annie Templeton Washington addressed the Forum. Councilmember Washington represents Montclair and her aide said that she agreed with everything that has been said on this issue tonight, and that this is a "huge" issue for the residents of this area. She asked who Ms. Washington should contact to voice her perspective on the seriousness of this matter. The facilitator asked if the Port had a legislative outreach contact that the councilmember could talk to to get information as to who to communicate with? Ms. McKenney said that Matt Davis, the Port's government affairs specialist has been doing some outreach as this issue has developed over the past weeks and months. Kristi suggested that some more detailed sit-down meetings would be appropriate in order to go over the more detailed information with the council so they can better understand what the various community members are concerned about, and the redress they are seeking.

Katherine Mayrin, a 26-year resident of Montclair, reiterated how quiet the Montclair district has been. She said people moved there for the peace and quiet. She suggested boycotting FedEx and UPS because their flights are disrupting people's sleep cycles and affecting their work schedules. Jeanne McKenzie, a resident of Montclair and a teacher, said the noise is affecting her life and the lives of her students. Larry Rosenthal of Montclair said he has had the same problems as the previous speakers. He asked the Forum to take note of how many people are here compared to a normal meeting. Michael Hood from Montclair echoed the previous sentiments, but added that this problem is a very recent and a very serious problem judging by the number of people in attendance. He added that SOSEB is growing rapidly because this is not just a Montclair problem. Steve Berndorf, a member of the Board of the Oakland

Parks and Recreation Foundation, said that there are a number of beautiful parks in the Oakland hills, including Joaquin Miller, Leona Canyon, and others, and this air traffic impacts the scenic beauty and enjoyment of the parks. Carmen Borg, representing CLASS from Alameda, said the Noise Office staffing situation right now is not sustainable. Historically, that office has had three to four people working there and was kept busy. She said CLASS is very concerned that the Noise Office is not fully staffed, and requested replacement of staff positions happen quickly and efficiently. McClintock closed the public comment period and thanked all for their comments. Co-Chair Jacobs asked if anyone had gotten a head count of those in the audience. It was suggested that the security guard downstairs would have a log of the attendees.

7. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Facilitator McClintock said that some of the information contained in two recent federal legislative proposals are directly related to the issues brought before the Forum tonight. He noted that the Peninsula congressional representatives--in particular, Eshoo, Farr and Speier -- have been the tip of the spear on the issue of Metrolplex noise and the effects on the communities over there. They were very quick to sign on to a couple of pieces of legislation that he wanted to discuss.

A. H.R. 3384—the Quiet Communities Act of 2015

H.R. 3384, the Quiet Communities Act of 2015, is a bill to re-establish the Office of Noise Abatement and Control and the Environmental Protection Agency. It was introduced in the House of Representatives in July 2015 by Grace Meng, (D-New York). The Bill has 21 co-sponsors, including the three Peninsula representatives mentioned. McClintock said he had letters signed by the Co-Chairs for Reps. Barbara Lee, Eric Swalwell and Jared Huffman asking them to get onboard with this and support this particular piece of legislation, as well as the second one he would be discussing next. He gave a brief overview of the proposed legislation.

If anyone wishes to read the full text they can Google H.R. 3384, the Quiet Communities Act of 2015.

B. H.R. 3965-COMMUNITY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

McClintock said, equally important, if not more so, is H.R. 3965, the FAA Community Accountability Act of 2015. This is a bill that would direct the administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to improve the process for establishing and revising flight paths and procedures and other purposes. Both these bills have been in committees since they were initially introduced in 2015. There are no East Bay or Marin co-sponsors, so the letters that went out to the East Bay Congressional representatives asked them to support these two bills. A key element of this proposed legislation is that it provides for the establishment of a community ombudsman, community engagement, and reconsideration of certain flight paths and procedures. He said interested parties should contact their congressional representatives and ask them to support the two pieces of legislation. Benny Lee said Mark DeSaulnier should be contacted as well. The facilitator said that with the interests of the Forum and the interests of the communities, maybe we can move these two bills forward. As he noted, they have been stuck in committee, and there is little likelihood of their approval unless there is some kind of ground swell with the elected representatives feeling the pressure to support them.

C. OAKLAND RECYCLING RULE

The facilitator said there was one more thing under legislative update-- the Oakland recycling rule. He said, not too long ago there was legislation passed requiring all businesses and the like, companies and corporations, within the City of Oakland to implement a recycling program. The recycling program applies to the Port of Oakland as well as the Oakland International Airport.

8. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

The facilitator called upon Matt Davis, acting assistant aviation director give the update on noise office staffing.

A. Noise Office Staffing Update

Mr. Davis said, that in terms of the staffing update, staff met with the co-chairs about a week ago regarding one of the two recruitments in the Noise and Environmental Office; and that is, for the noise supervisor position formerly held by Larry Galindo. That position has been posted. He asked the Forum to recommend a person or persons to be part of the selection process. Co-Chair Jacobs said that in the previous process of hiring, the two Co-Chairs represented the Forum on the selection committee. Mr. Jacobs volunteered himself as did Co-Chair Lee. Davis said that there is another recruitment underway as a result of some restructuring in the Noise and Environmental Office. The recruitment for the environmental planner position actually includes in it noise duties. He said this selection will run concurrently with the supervisor hiring as well. As a result, the noise office organization chart may look a little different, but the second position will have associated noise duties. He agreed with CLASS that the current staffing levels are short, but they are attempting to rectify the situation as quickly as they can.

B. Alameda Portable Noise Monitoring Update

Jesse Richardson provided an update of the status of the Alameda portable noise monitoring project. He said they are collecting data at two sites. One of the portables is at Balena Isle Marina; the second portable is at Bay Farm Island. He said they have been collecting data for a little over a week, and it looks promising for being able to compare the straight-out departure data. Alameda Councilmember Tony Daysog thanked Jesse and staff for placing the two portable noise monitors in Alameda. Kurt Peterson thanked Jesse and Larry Galindo for their work on this project.

9. SUPERBOWL 50 UPDATE

Matt Davis provided the Forum with an update on the upcoming Super Bowl. When Super Bowl 50 comes to town, the bay region will receive a large amount of general aviation traffic. There will be some commercial traffic increases, but most is anticipated to be general aviation traffic. These are private airplanes that will be operating not just at Oakland, but across the Bay Area. The NFL and the FAA have provided estimates in the 1200-plus range for private

jets coming to the game. So no one airport would be able to handle that much traffic, planes will be going to San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland, and everywhere else where there is room. Oakland is expecting hundreds of additional airplanes to arrive starting the week before the game and departing immediately after the game. A mass exodus from all the airports is expected after the game and as a result of that, residents, especially close in to the airport, will experience an increased amount of traffic from the airport, including from the North Field as well. Co-Chair Lee said that this sounded like a good opportunity to collect a lot of good noise data for analysis. Davis said he would provide a report for the April meeting.

10. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

The facilitator asked Darron Evans to provide an update on the activities of the technical working groups, particularly with respect to the runway safety area project and the main runway overlay project that will be coming up in the summer of next year.

A. Runway Safety Area Project Update

Mr. Evans gave his report on the current status of the RSA project. He reported that the runway safety area project was concluded as of January. The deadline mandated by the FAA for all airports that had non-standard RSAs was met. Kristi McKenney said that the RSA project was quite an effort and the Port staff was commended by the FAA for its efforts. She said the community outreach and consultation figured prominently in the success of the project. It was noted that there will be some ongoing electrical work.

B. Main Runway Overlay Project

Mr. Evans reported that the project is in design phase, and that the staff is working on the design details. The project will start in 2017. As details develop they will be brought before the Forum to keep you apprised of what is happening. Part of the reason for doing this project is to forestall pavement failures as occurred last night, which required closing the runway. Benny Lee asked what would be done to lessen the impacts of the closure of Runway 12/30, particularly at night. Mr. Evans said they were looking at operations that will lessen the impact on communities to ensure that they will be able to continue to operate. Walt Jacobs said the last time this was done parallel Taxiway W was used as the runway. Evans said, yes, Taxiway W was being considered as one of the alternatives.

11. 2016 FORUM WORK PLAN

The facilitator gave a brief overview of the changes and additions proposed in the draft 2016 Forum Work Plan. Forum members received both a hard copy and an electronic copy with their agenda packages. Co-Chair Lee asked that the Work Plan recommend a program or programs to the Port that would facilitate community outreach and noise complaint reporting from minority communities. He cited "Wei Bo," which is a Chinese version of Facebook or Twitter, and is currently in use in San Leandro. He said they have had over 200,000 followers who use the app to ask questions about how to report crimes to the police. Vince Mestre reminded the facilitator to include asking the FAA to include a review of the significant threshold the FAA uses, which is that the change has to exceed one and a half dB inside the 65 DNL

contour. Areas outside the 65 DNL noise contour are not subject to this criterion. The Metroplex noise increases outside the 65 DNL contour are substantially greater than one and a half dB, but not considered significant because they were outside the 65 DNL contour. Cindy Horvath said to make sure that the presentation on the role and function of the Airport Land Use Commission remains in the Presentations section. She suggested contacting the State Division of Aeronautics to arrange for a presentation. Ernest DelliGatti requested that under studies, San Lorenzo be added to "Request for NFG, SFG overflights of Hayward, Castro Valley corridor." There being no more comments or questions, the facilitator asked for a motion to approve the draft 2016 Work Plan with the above discussed changes, including additional comments by Edward Bogue and Benny Lee. Co-Chair Lee so moved. The motion was seconded. Motion carried.

12. NOISE NEWS & UPDATE

Vince Mestre reported that the FAA has proposed Stage 5 aircraft noise standards for new aircraft designs. These will surpass the Stage 4 standards that were set in 2004. The proposed Stage 5 noise standard will go into effect in the year 2017 for aircraft over 121,000 pounds, and in 2020 for aircraft under 121,000 pounds. The difference when they go into effect is the large aircraft manufacturers, like Boeing and Airbus have been tracking Stage 5 noise standards and prepared for them. The smaller regional jet designers were not, so they were given an extra three years for compliance. The proposed Stage 5 standards do not include any provisions for phase-out of Stage 3 or Stage 4 aircraft. However, there is proposed legislation to require the phase-out of Stage 3 aircraft by the year 2037... Vince commented that it is obvious from the number of people at tonight's meeting that the rollout of the FAA's performance-based navigation and Metroplex, and other RNAV changes throughout the country have not been well received, not only in this community but all across the U.S. Congress went to the FAA and, as part of its funding bill, has required them to redesign their public outreach program. They have 60 days, which he believed gives them another month. They have to report back to Congress about how they're going to do a better job of communicating with the public on these navigation changes.

The FAA is also required to review its process for granting categorical exclusions for new airspace procedures. The NorCal Metroplex was a part of an environmental assessment, but some of the navigation changes made in other parts of the country were approved under categorical exclusions. So the FAA has updated its environmental order to include two new categorical exclusions in their procedures. These two categorical exclusions are called CATEX 1 and CATEX 2. CATEX 1 applies to the FAA's Airports Division for airport improvement projects, things like runway extensions, terminal changes, taxiway improvement, and things like that. There's a list of projects that are categorically excluded from requiring environmental analysis. CATEX 2 applies to navigation changes. It's the one that is causing a great deal of consternation within Congress and a number of communities, it gives the FAA the ability to do a navigation change without doing an environmental analysis.

Mestre commented on the recent Paris summit on climate change. He said The Paris Climate Agreement initially included aviation, but after a couple of days it was dropped because aviation was felt to be under the purview of the International Civil Aviation Agency. ICAO will meet in September this year to adopt its greenhouse gas regulations for aviation. The EU was very unhappy it was not part of the Paris Agreement, but the ICAO assembly in September

should finalize the greenhouse gas rules for civil aviation across the world. He said this could get quite controversial. On the subject of unleaded aviation gas, he said that unless one lives near a battery manufacturing plant the only other source for lead exposure is from piston-driven propeller aircraft. Recent developments indicate that an unleaded substitute for all piston-driven aircraft will be available soon, and in place by 2018.

On the issue of drones, Vince said he could have had a hundred articles just on drones alone, because there's so much media coverage. He showed a flyer from the U.S. Forest Service which said "if you fly (your drone) over a forest fire, then the Forest Service can't fly its helicopters." There have been numerous instances where unauthorized drones flying over forest fires have grounded firefighting aircraft because of the drone activity. The FAA has also adopted rules that you have to register your drone by a certain date. Restrictions on the use of drones are being implemented by all manner of jurisdictions, to the extent that we are almost to the point that the FAA rules are going to conflict with local rules and exemption issues jump up. Drones have interfered with police helicopter operations and Coast Guard helicopter rescue operations. The FAA is taking this problem very seriously. They've got a big problem on their hands since almost a million drones were purchased at Christmas last year. A recent survey to determine how people felt about drones found that people don't like drones; they just don't like them for all sorts of reasons. But as cities start to adopt their own regulations or cities start to use their own noise ordinances to enforce against drone operators, we are likely to see a conflict as to who actually is in charge of these things and what authority the city has versus the FAA.

13. NEXT MEETING – April 20, 2016

14. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

Facilitator McClintock thanked all those who came to tonight's meeting. There being no additional new business the meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

END