

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

July 20, 2016

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

1. INTRODUCTIONS	2
A. Elisa Marquez, New Hayward Elected Representative	2
B. Doreen Stockdale, New Airport Noise/Environmental Affairs Supervisor	3
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	3
A. Co-Chairs Meeting with Port Staff	3
B. Acceptance of 1st Qtr. 2016 Noise Report (Receive and File).....	3
C. Member Dues.....	3
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (April 20, 2016).....	3
4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS.....	3
5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS.....	4
A. FAA Metroplex Initiative Update.....	4
B. SOSEB Update	4
6. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT	5
A. Main Runway Overlay Project	6
B. Central San Francisco Overflights	6
C. Fleet Week Update	7
7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT	7
A. Noise Complaint Form Update.....	7
8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE	8
9. CORRESPONDENCE.....	10
A. Jerry and Lynne B. Ostrander	10
10. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	10
11. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (OCTOBER 19, 2016).....	13
12. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....	13

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The July 20, 2016 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:40 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
Matt Pourfarzaneh, alternate for 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
Elisa Marquez, Councilmember, City of Hayward
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Pat Mossburg, Alternate for Larry Reid, Council President pro tem, City of Oakland
Laurel Strand, Citizen representative, Oakland
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Bryant L. Francis, Aviation Director

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Jose Hernandez, Representative Barbara Lee's office
David Takashima, senior advisor to San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee
Matt P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager
Matt Davis, Director of Government Affairs, Port of Oakland
Diego Gonzalez, Government Affairs, Port of Oakland
Doreen Stockdale, Airport Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor
Jesse Richardson, Jr., Noise and Environmental Affairs
Gene Reindel, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Rhea Gundry, Harris Miller Miller and Hansen, Inc.
Harvey Hartmann, Consultant to the Port
Vince Mestre, Landrum & Brown
Tony DiBernardo, FAA District Manager
Don Kirby, FAA Air Traffic Manager, Northern California TRACON
Abegael Jakey, FedEx Flight Operations
Kathleen Livermore, City of Alameda
Kathy Ornelas, City of San Leandro
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, CSR, Court Reporter
Mike McClintock, Forum Facilitator

A. Elisa Marquez, New Elected Representative from Hayward

Facilitator McClintock welcomed Ms. Marquez to the Forum. She said she was excited to be here.

B. Doreen Stockdale, Airport Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor

Facilitator McClintock introduced Ms. Stockdale as the Port's new Airport Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor. She said she was pleased to be here.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**A. Co-Chairs Agenda Meeting with Port Staff**

Facilitator McClintock noted that the Co-Chairs had a meeting with Port staff on July 13 to review the agenda. The facilitator apologized for the delay in getting the agenda materials out, but the meeting was very fruitful in that they had covered a lot of ground.

B. Acceptance of 1st Qtr. 2016 Noise Report (Receive and File)

The facilitator said that the last item under announcements was the 1st quarter 2016 noise report. Typically, this is received and filed unless there are questions or discussion. The facilitator said he would entertain a motion to receive and file. Co-Chair Lee asked about Runway 10R jet landings and why, with 3.5 times more flights, the complaints were only up by 8 percent? Matt P. Davis responded that he thought the improvement was primarily related to proactive outreach to the FAA. These operations only occurred in poor weather during the winter months, and are not typically performed in the spring and summer. Hence, air traffic controllers and pilots, do not have to use this runway, or Runway 12, during good weather. He said that the FAA outreach and pilot education was very helpful in reducing noise complaints and that educating them again this coming fall is what they plan to do to make sure they're ahead of the bad weather. Mr. Lee had no more questions. He moved to receive and file the 1st Quarter 2016 noise report. Seconded by Ernest DelliGatti. Motion carried.

C. Annual Membership Dues

The facilitator noted that Forum member communities are required to pay annual membership dues in the amount of \$1,000.00. These dues are paid annually in the month of August. He said he had been informed that the dues notices had already gone out and that Berkeley, San Leandro and Union City have paid their dues. He asked that the remaining members get this taken care of as soon as possible.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (APRIL 20, 2016)

Facilitator McClintock noted that this item was for the approval of the draft minutes of the April 2016 Forum meeting. The facilitator noted that Forum members had received a copy of the draft minutes of the April meeting with their agenda packages. He asked if there were any comments, questions, or corrections. Co-Chair Lee moved approval with the corrections. Ernie DelliGatti seconded.

4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The Facilitator opened the floor to nominations for Co-Chairs. Matt Pourfarzaneh nominated Walt Jacobs for citizen Co-Chair. Facilitator McClintock placed Co-Chair Benny Lee's name into nomination per his request. Both nominations were seconded. There being no other nominations the Co-Chairs were re-elected.

5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

A. FAA Metroplex Initiative Update

The facilitator asked Matt P. Davis to provide an update on the FAA Metroplex initiative. Davis said that pursuant to the direction of the Noise Forum at the last meeting, the North Field/South Field Groups and the Forum created a subcommittee to address the NextGen procedures affecting Forum member communities. The committee met in the middle of June and produced a document advising the FAA of three specific procedures that were identified as issues to communities around the airport. These procedures were an arrival from the Pacific Northwest that impacts the Oakland hills region, departures from San Francisco that impact areas of San Leandro, as well as Alameda and Oakland, and a nighttime departure procedure. Based on advice from members of the committee, a letter was prepared to the FAA Regional Administrator, Glen A. Martin dated June 17, 2016. The letter requested that the FAA evaluate the three procedures and the alternatives suggested by the committee. Facilitator McClintock noted that Forum members had been provided with a copy of the letter. Co-Chair Lee thanked the committee for its efforts in producing the letter. Matt Pourfarzaneh asked when the Forum might expect an answer. McClintock said that he did not expect a timely response due to the FAA's commitment to the Peninsula Supercommittee. He said that he felt that the East Bay communities are not being fully respected in the sense that we've gotten no replies to any of the letters that the Forum has sent to the FAA even though we have been doing what the FAA has asked us to do; and that is, to form a subcommittee to consider the issues and make recommendations. Ernie DelliGatti asked who the members of the committee were. Mr. Davis replied that the committee was comprised of the Co-Chairs, Kathy Ornelas, James Nelson, Matt Pourfarzaneh, Leslie Ransbottom and Laurel Strand. Ernie requested that San Lorenzo, Castro Valley, and Hayward be included in any future deliberations.

B. SOSEB Activities Update

The facilitator said that Leslie Ransbottom would make the presentation on SOSEB activities said SOSEB has come a long way in learning about aircraft noise compared to what they knew in January. If nothing else, they believe that the technology that is smart enough to give us NextGen, is smart enough to give us a quieter NextGen. Hopefully, it is not the hardest of problems, but it is a significant issue to many communities across the U.S. She thanked the airport noise office for the portable noise monitors that are now in place at two homes in the Montclair hills area to measure real airplane noise. By making the noise measurements visible on the airport web track site clearly demonstrates just how quieter the hills are when airplanes aren't overhead. In the small hours of the morning, it's not uncommon for the ambient noise level to dip below 30 decibels, which is very, very quiet. But, when the planes come over noise levels can rise to the high seventies. She expressed SOSEB's concern that the recorded complaint numbers from the Oakland noise abatement office may not be complete. She said it is their understanding that the numbers only include complaints made through the Oakland web track site or direct contacts to the noise office. A consideration is to add Oakland flight complaints that are being filed using the smartphone Stop Jet Noise complaint application developed by peninsula groups to Oakland's web

track numbers. This is appropriate to demonstrate the significant and increasing rate of complaint traffic. She shared some numbers from the Stop Jet Noise site for January. There were 2,908 noise complaints for Oakland arriving and departing flights. In February, this rose to 3,528; in March, 4,347; in April, 5,365. By May, there were 7,135 complaints. She said there were conflicting information with regards to the value of noise complaints, but fewer complaint numbers should not be construed to be evidence of declining community interest. She thanked the Forum and airport for forming the NextGen subcommittee and providing the opportunity to address East bay noise issues. She thanked the Forum for its June letter to the FAA to open the necessary dialogue for the review and mitigation of NextGen procedures affecting the East Bay. She believed the Forum's approach is practical and, hopefully, will be effective. At this point, their communities are looking to the Oakland Noise Forum to act as the critical FAA conduit to address our area's NextGen noise issues. SOS East Bay considers itself an important voice for the community, as well as a primary source for community-driven noise solution proposals.

She said they have assembled a qualified technical team of aviation professionals, engineers, scientists and computer experts, and are currently working on and logging additional solution proposals to provide to the FAA. She thanked Oakland Vice Mayor Washington's office, which brought forward an Oakland city resolution requesting that the FAA address increased aircraft noise in the East Bay. Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley has collected over 50 e-mails from constituents across the county expressing the negative personal effects of NextGen noise and forwarded them though Representative Barbara Lee's office to the FAA. In addition, SOSEB has collected about 650 petition signatures from people adversely impacted by the noise in our communities and will deliver these to Representative Lee to further urge her support. She thanked the large contingency of SOSEB supporters present for their attention and for coming out and showing support for addressing this issue.

Facilitator McClintock thanked Ms. Ransbottom for her presentation. Co-Chair Lee thanked her for the numbers of complaints and the information on the stop jet noise site. He discussed the two House Resolutions currently pending in Congress—HR 3384 and HR 3965. He said we need more congressional reps to sign on to the two resolutions. When he was in Washington, D.C. last month on business, he brought this issue up with the chair of the House transportation committee, but he did not seem to be very well versed on these two House measures. Pat Mossburg gave an update on the resolution going to the full city council. She said it was co-sponsored by the vice-mayor and the president pro tem. A letter will go to the Congressional members, our two state Senators and the Forum, once it's approved. Kurt Peterson commented on the NextGen issue by saying that he “has a real problem with them actually complying to the NextGen operation as far as in regards to West Alameda.” He believed the “CNDEL” procedure was not being properly implemented and that FedEx was a “major culprit as far as [deviating] from it.” He says he hears it every morning. Delta is also a problem on their “quick” departure to Salt Lake City. He was concerned that NextGen was to eliminate deviations from published procedures, and this was not happening. The facilitator asked Mr. Davis if the “CNDEL” procedure was a Metroplex procedure, and if it is, why was it not included in the letter to the FAA. Davis replied that the procedure described by Mr. Peterson was not the CNDEL procedure, but the Oakland 8 departure, which is not a NextGen procedure, and not the “CNDEL.” McClintock suggested that Mr. Peterson work with the Noise Office to sort things out.

6. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

The facilitator asked Mr. Davis to continue with an update on the activities of the technical working groups in addition to the main runway overlay project that will be coming up in the summer of next year. Mr. Davis provided an overview of the meeting which focused on IFR departures off the North Field, which are consistent with the Port's noise program, but still clip the east end of Alameda. A resident of Alameda came to the meeting and asked why aircraft departing North Field couldn't use the VFR departure procedure which avoids Alameda Island. He said they did a lot of work on explaining why aircraft operating under IFR are required to fly a route that takes them over Alameda. This procedure has been around for a long time and the flight track has not changed, there were claims that aircraft have been flying lower than usual. He said he would have the noise office get back with some additional information on if there have been any changes. So much of the meeting was dedicated to the east end of Alameda. Another issue discussed was the need to improve compliance with noise abatement procedures. The NFG/SFG meetings typically review all the procedures and their compliance rates. Pilots are provided noise abatement information, but Davis said they want to go back and update this information and engage the fixed-base operators to help make sure that compliance rates do not slip. He said pilot education is an important part of this process, and that he would come back to the next meeting with some specific guidance on additional outreach for that group. There was some discussion of Metroplex, but this issue was in the hands of the Forum's committee.

Davis said that they reviewed the procedures that have shown decreased compliance. One of these is the nighttime departures off of Runways 28L and 28R, or what is termed the "SALAD" departure. Under this procedure departing aircraft are required to make a climbing right turn to avoid Alameda island and head in a southeasterly direction. Recent analyses have shown an increasing number of wider turns, and non-compliance with the procedure. So, he said, they will be performing additional analyses to bring back to the group.

A. Main Runway Overlay Project

Matt said, more information will be forthcoming as the project design progresses, but work will not begin until summer 2017. The project is a runway overlay, and is a process that needs to be repeated approximately every fifteen years. The last overlay was done in 2001. The plan is to utilize the parallel taxiway as a departure runway for a lot of the jet traffic. However, the taxiway is not capable of handling the traffic volume that the runway can, so some of this traffic will be going to North Field. He anticipates that the project will take two weeks.

B. Central San Francisco Overflights

The facilitator said that the Forum is familiar with the "TRUKN" departure procedure from SFO which affects Oakland and the Oakland hills. Tonight we have two speakers from San Francisco who are concerned about OAK departures over San Francisco. The facilitator called upon David Takashima, who represents San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee and who is also the City's representative to the San Francisco Airport Community Roundtable. Mr. Takashima said there are residents in the inner part of San Francisco complaining about noise from airplanes coming out of Oakland. He said he wanted to start a conversation with the Oakland Airport to see if it was possible to come up with alternatives to present to the FAA to eliminate this problem. He noted that San Francisco did not have a representative on the Forum. He said he would like to have the Forum consider having a San Francisco representative on the Forum, and that he would bring up the idea of having

a Forum member appointed to the SFO Roundtable. Ms. Denise Dunn, a resident of San Francisco's Noe Valley area said she had recently counted 28 planes from Oakland flying over her neighborhood. She said the overflights were very noisy and her whole building shakes when they go over. She said it has had a detrimental effect on the quality of her life, and she is quite fatigued by it. This didn't happen until NextGen came in. All of a sudden, she said, we have a computer deciding where flight tracks are with no consciousness of what it's doing to the people under them. She said she would like to see things go back the way they were before NextGen.

Ernest DelliGatti said, that with respect to adding a San Francisco Roundtable member to the Oakland Forum, he would say that we should also entertain a reciprocal membership on the SFO Roundtable. He added that he was very familiar with the noise conditions in Noe Valley as a result of having grown up in the Twin Peaks/Noe Valley area. McClintock asked Matt Davis about the overflights of SFO. Davis replied that there has been an increase in complaints from San Francisco citing NextGen procedures, but the noise office has not yet evaluated the substance of these complaints. The facilitator queried the Forum, asking if they would like him to pursue this with staff and the Roundtable to see what we can work out in terms of a reciprocal relationship between the San Francisco Roundtable and the Oakland Forum? Co-Chair Lee replied "yes." There was further discussion among the Forum members on this topic. Mr. Takashima said that he would take this back to the Roundtable at their August meeting to see if it would be possible for the Roundtable to provide a place for a Forum member. McClintock said that the Forum will likely have an observer attend the Roundtable meeting.

C. Fleet Week Update

Matt gave a synopsis of the Fleet Week activities slated for October. The Blue Angels and others will be based at Oakland Airport. As a result, residents of Alameda and San Leandro can expect noise and overflights by military aircraft. There was a desire from the group to have the Port repeat the community outreach program that was used in 2015. This included getting the word out to local publications, reaching out to elected officials and other members of the communities to make sure that people were aware of what was going on. Co-Chair Benny Lee commented that, as with the Super Bowl, any unusual operational activity should be monitored and analyzed. Matt replied that he would recommend that the Port do that, so, that way, they can monitor their practices and look for best practices as well.

7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

A. Noise Complaint Form Update

The facilitator asked Mr. Davis to continue with the Noise Office report. Davis noted that there had been many comments on a need to modify or update the noise complaint form or reporting process. He said they would take this matter before the technical working groups and bring it back to the Forum with a recommendation and that the vendor, B&K, is currently working to streamline the application. An application built by B&K would allow for easier correlation by accepting information directly into the noise database and make it easier to track the complaints. Co-Chair Lee said that a mobile app would definitely be of help. He added that there was also a need to initiate a discussion between the Aviation Director and his staff and San Leandro City staff to move ahead with insulating the remaining 46 homes of the 200 home insulation program in San

Leandro. Director Francis replied that the Port was open to having that discussion, and will get something scheduled in the near future.

A question was asked about why the need to upgrade the noise reporting process? McClintock replied that it was because people had complained that the reporting process was very difficult, particularly if you're awakened at 2 a.m. and trying to put together detailed information so the noise office can follow up on the complaint. Matt Davis added that Jesse Richardson has been working with SOSEB and others to develop an alternative means of reporting noise events. Davis noted that the noise complaint reporting system was not developed to generate numbers, but to generate specific information so that the offending flights can be identified and evaluated to determine the basis for the complaint. The complaint form was set up to maximize the amount of information the airport gets. From an airport perspective, once you identify an issue, it's not the number of complaints that come in but the ability of the airport to understand the issue and take corrective action if necessary. Jesse Richardson said he's been working with the vendor and Save Our Skies East Bay, on some ways to streamline the complaint process; in particular, the complaint form. The plan is to go back and work with B&K to develop a streamlined method for return users to the site. Matt Pourfarzaneh added that CLASS had also been looking into this issue and automating the present way of entering complaints and putting in a reply didn't seem to be that complicated. He felt the present form was OK, but it was important to get the personal information into the system so that the next time around all that would be needed to enter the complaint would be the time and the nature of the complaint. McClintock said that the noise office is continuing its work on this issue, and we are looking forward to hearing back from them.

8. NOISE NEWS & UPDATE

Vince Mestre reported that the last time he was here, he was optimistic that the FAA re-authorization bill would pass. It did not pass. He explained that every five years, Congress re-authorizes the FAA and provides funding for its activities and operations. On July 15, the FAA would have run out of money. A couple days before the 15th, Congress passed a continuation to their existing funding that carries on until September of 2017. This is not good news because, in the re-authorization bill, there were at least five or six provisions for noise issues that have been brought to the FAA as a result of complaints from communities living around airports and, in particular, those in response to Metroplex issues. None of those legislative items made it into the re-authorization bill. The only thing that's in the re-authorization bill, beyond continuing their existing funding levels, are some management things about hiring and "medical stuff and drone things," but none of the noise provisions. So, as was described the last time, one of those bills called the Quiet Communities Act had been introduced as separate legislation and then went into a dormant state while the re-authorization was considered. We probably will see the Quiet Communities Act come back to life after the first of the year, he said, because nothing happens between now and January 1.

Vince noted there had been a couple of additions to the re-authorization bill before it died. The last time, he had a description of all those noise provisions that were in re-authorization. This one is one that was added. Of course, it's not going to happen now until 2017, if it makes it through the House and Senate or unless it is re-introduced as separate legislation, which is always a possibility. This would require the FAA to study the impact on health of NextGen flight paths. This is very specific to people who live near the airport under a high-density route for flights under 10 thousand feet. That was introduced by representatives from Massachusetts. Separate from the re-authorization bill is legislation to re-establish the EPA's office of noise abatement and control. He

noted that technically, that's not exactly right, because the EPA office of noise control has existed since the Noise Control Act was passed in 1969, one of the three big environmental legislations that were passed in the three-year period: The Noise Control Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act, along with the establishment of the EPA. In the 1980s, there were about 120 people in the EPA office in noise control. In the early 1990s, they de-funded the EPA office of noise control, and it had zero employees. He said there are some myths about the relationship between the EPA and FAA, but the FAA and the EPA were getting along well at that time. It was, in fact, the EPA who recommended to the FAA they use DNL as their noise metric and dB 65 DNL their land use compatibility standard.

Mestre continued with every few months, there is a new study that says high blood pressure and heart damage is related to aircraft noise. Most recent is a study from Poland. It doesn't have specific noise levels: does it occur at, above or below 65 dB? This is one piece of information that's going to feed into the process that the FAA has begun, which is their noise policy roadmapping process, which will go public at the end of this year. Another one of those items that was added to the re-authorization bill that didn't make it was the evaluation of residential acoustical insulation criteria. This is because Chicago has opened a new runway and has had Metroplex kinds of flight tracks introduced. There is much unhappiness around Chicago O'Hare as a result of that, and they want to reevaluate how you qualify for sound insulation for homes. Depending on whom you listen to, the FAA has either radically changed the policy on who qualifies or merely tweaked the rules. Whichever it is, he was certain neither of those insulation programs would have qualified for insulation if the current FAA rules were in place.

With respect to NextGen issues, Vince said he wanted to let you know what was going on in a couple of airports who are a little farther along in the process than we are in the Bay Area. As he mentioned, Chicago O'Hare has a new runway and NextGen procedures are in place, and O'Hare is beginning a nighttime flight rotation to spread noise. Historically, the spread-the-noise concept hasn't worked well. There has been a very adverse response from the affected communities. But in the Chicago area, because there are so many runways and the flight tracks cover such a large area, this is actually going to be very interesting. This began a few days ago as an experiment and the test will run through the end of year. He said that by the October meeting, we'll have a better feel for how the spread-the-noise concept is working there. At Charlotte Douglas Airport there are efforts underway to implement a procedure to "scatter" the jet noise. The FAA is committed to developing a program to scatter the noise rather than concentrate them on a single, dense path like WNDSR. This is very relevant to the concerns of the folks from Montclair. Mestre commented on the Noise Advisory Committee that was developed by industry representatives and N.O.I.S.E. N.O.I.S.E. is a subcommittee of the National League of Cities which represents communities on airport noise issues. It has done a lot of work to develop a better outreach program for the FAA by introducing new procedures. The goal is to have the FAA better engage communities, and if, as a result of comments from the community, the FAA can do a better job of balancing noise versus efficiency, then this could go someplace, but that discussion has not occurred. In London, they implemented a test period for NextGen procedures, and it went over very poorly, similar to what happened in Sydney where it also went over very poorly. Sydney, Australia simply stopped and said you can't implement it until you come up with a dispersing plan to simulate what happened before the concentration of flight tracks.

Mestre next addressed the topics of air quality and greenhouse gases. He said the aviation industry is the first to set a global CO₂ reduction target. This is a big deal, and he felt it was important to remind the Forum that there are two conflicting opinions on this. Emissions go down when the use of airspace is more efficient. If the sole goal is greenhouse gas reduction, the kinds of efficiencies and impacts that NextGen generates are justified. The question is: Are the benefits that occur, under NextGen, for greenhouse gas emissions and reduced fuel burn worth the cost of the increased noise? What are you trading between the two? Are you ignoring noise entirely and all of the routes are designed simply to be the most efficient? Mestre spent a moment on a new specification for the production of alcohol to jet fuel. It takes corn and makes alcohol, and then alcohol is turned into kerosene, which is jet fuel. Alaska Airlines made the first flight from Seattle to San Francisco using a corn-based jet fuel. He said we talked last time about the global carbon offset and the pressure for the International Civil Aviation Organization to adopt rules so there would be one international rule for carbon reduction as opposed to having individual countries adopt their own rules. At the October meeting, we should have some idea what they adopted. NASA has developed a wing to cut emissions by 50 percent. It's interesting because the wing essentially reduces weight, which allows the wing to be much longer. It's about 50 percent longer than the existing wing. Mestre said he had very little information on noise for drones. The FAA has a new rule for the commercial drone industry that was adopted. The American Association of Airport executives, AAE, has developed a web page to help coordinate all the rules and regulations and inform people and airports about drone regulations in the vicinity of their airport. There is a company in the Bay Area that has developed an app -- actually one of many, called Air Map for iPhone and iPad. If a drone operator uses this app, he can identify where he can and cannot fly. The interesting question is: Why isn't something like this built into the software drones operate by? Lastly, Vince showed an example of a very small drone. It weighs half an ounce. It's built in Norway. It has three high definition cameras, but don't expect to see it soon. They cost \$195,000.

James Nelson asked about a possible revision to the noise insulation criteria. Mestre replied that the current rule, which the FAA argues has always been the rule, is that, in order to qualify for sound insulation, you have an interior noise level in excess of DNL/CNEL 45 dB. Now, you have to not only be above 45 dB in the interior, but also above 65 on the exterior. If you look at the homes on Bay Farm Island that were built in the late 70s, early 80s, under the California Building Code, which contains energy insulation standards, he doubted whether we would have found any homes there that would have had an interior sound level above 45, which would have disqualified them from eligibility for the sound insulation program.

9. CORRESPONDENCE

A. Letter from Jerry and Lynne B. Ostrander

The facilitator noted that Forum members had received a copy of a letter from Mr. And Mrs. Ostrander to Laurel Strand. The Ostranders are residents of the Montclair area, where they've lived for more than 15 years. The letter talked about the impact the NextGen procedures are having on their daily life and concluded with the prayer for a return to the old aircraft patterns to regain some peace and quiet for them and their neighborhood.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Antonia Burlingame from Montclair explained that because of the implementation of NextGen her neighborhood is now being subjected to low overflights and noise. She said this has made a big difference in the quality of her life and for that of the neighborhood. Andrew Saga (sp?) from Montclair compared the implementation of NextGen to building a new rail line through the Oakland hills. He said if the FAA's policy of enhancing efficiency were to be applied it would result in train tracks across Lake Merritt and through Oakland neighborhoods and other sensitive areas. What would happen if such a plan were proposed, he asked? You can imagine the public outcry. No transportation planner would ever suggest such an idea. Not only would they realize it would never happen, but it would create tremendous animosity and public outcry, but that's effectively what the FAA did with NextGen; the FAA engineers and planners chose the most efficient route for airplanes going into and out of major airports. But efficiency is not and cannot be the sole consideration. If the FAA's plans were subject to the kind of scrutiny other transportation planning faces, it would never have proposed the current procedures. The next speaker said he didn't know where the planes were coming from. All he knew was that when he moved here, he heard two or three airplanes a day. That was okay. He cited the number planes currently coming over his neighborhood on a daily basis, which was significantly greater than before, and at all hours. He asked, since when was the FAA given the right to deny us sleep? Do they have the right to make a few suffer on behalf of the many? Everybody benefits from airplanes, so why do only a few of us have to and live under airplane freeways. How dare the FAA tell me in their EA that there's no adverse impact from their changing the flight paths? He'd like one of them to move into his house and tell him there's no adverse impact. In conclusion, he said, shame on the FAA for being so callous and not working with the community to develop less-impacting flight paths. He said he and his community needs to do more than just write letters.

Shirley Potsch (sp?), from Piedmont Pines described noise conditions from February 1976. She said her husband and a group of neighbors put together a campaign, and interacted with the FAA, the Bay TRACON, the Department of Transportation in Washington, D.C., state officials, city officials, and county officials. It took a year, but the plan that the FAA had instituted suddenly, and without any kind of engagement with the community was changed, and up until now her community enjoyed relative quiet. She offered her file and records to SOSEB. She said they fought hard and got results. She left with the hope SOSEB and others could do the same. Ronnie Marks from Oakland commented on the public health issues associated with aircraft noise. She said she had written to the Forum and elected officials to voice her extreme dismay of NextGen and the effect on her personally and her family and community. She said she had a letter from Glen Martin of the FAA responding to her complaint about NextGen. In the letter, she is assured that the correct procedures for noticing and public comment were followed; that the FAA issued a finding of no significant impact; that existing aircraft noise has been an ongoing issue in this area for many years; and that they [the FAA] are not aware of any scientific evidence that conclusively attributes certain health effects solely to aircraft noise exposure. She said she did not believe that the FAA's noticing requirements were either efficient or sufficient. We also don't need a high level degree to conduct a side-by-side comparison of the number of frequency and elevation of jets in specific geographic locales before and after NextGen to conclude there might be some effect on the community below. "No significant impact" is completely disingenuous. She said it was time for the FAA to take responsibility for this most ill-conceived intervention. Paul Diffgolding (sp?) from Montclair said he was seething over all of this. It is affecting him and his family. This is a bad plan. Kurt Peterson, a resident of Alameda expressed his opinions on the subject. He said we have a natural buffer in a lot of ways, and it's called the San Francisco Bay. It's not being utilized. Flights used to come up higher, and then they would circle down south and utilize the bay upon

approach. And there's one reason it's changed, folks; it's called money, and it's called the FAA not looking out for our best interests but looking out for the air carriers' best interests. He suggested writing to the airlines and saying "Hey, I don't have to fly you. I don't have to ship anything FedEx, UPS," whatever. Hit them where it matters. That's what you need to do. Barbara Kaplan from Montclair said she does not have air conditioning by choice. She keeps her windows open 24/7. At night, when she was up, she could hear crickets. She hasn't heard a cricket in the last nine months. She iterated the number and times that aircraft overflights have interrupted her sleep. She added that they were not 1500 feet above her head. This is not acceptable for quality of life of citizens. Besides noise she expressed additional concern with the health issues that come with particulate matter and the increase in filth inside and outside their homes. Katherine Neer complained about sleep disturbance. She said people should petition to have their property taxes reduced because of the diminution of value because of the overflights. She said it all comes down to money, and to think about whether you really need that book from Amazon that comes in on FedEx or UPS. Judith Ditry (sp?) from Rockridge in Oakland read a letter into the record:

"I live under Lake Temescal near 24 and 13. All of this has been said before. First we were advised, at a meeting in April, that we must file an airline noise complaint on the web site identifying one flight at a time. It's clearly an impossible task to record all of the flights constantly in the sky and from the south SFO late at night. The jets are so low over my terrace -- because I'm near the freeway above -- I can identify them by the colors and sometimes almost by the logos. Many smaller planes fly even lower and are especially prevalent during the day on weekends. Regarding the NextGen web site. I have logs by my bed every night like this. Regarding the NextGen web site, it is stated that the flight patterns chosen will be on the web site; that they would not affect the ambient sound on the ground. However, even with the double-paned windows -- even with the windows that I mentioned, the noise, is deafening. It drowns out the television programming, as well as conversations, and wakes me up constantly, as you all said, during the night. The rumbling in the sky never ceases; it varies in intensity. Sleep deprivation is one major unrelenting result and is my -- you can tell I'm shaking -- is my major concern in pleading that the FAA change the narrow flight patterns over the East Bay hills. In addition, health problems -- I have bad asthma. Two of my neighbors have cancer. They retired a couple -- I retired a couple years ago from teaching many years. The rumbling -- I said that. In addition to health problems caused by sleep deprivation, research has shown other health issues ensue under these constant noise conditions. Before one sound recedes, another begins, day and night."

Kathy Ditmer (sp?) from Claremont Canyon said sleep deprivation was a major problem for her. She believes that most of the healing for the body happens during sleep. So there are significant health risks associated with lack of sleep. David Farner (sp?) said he lives under two intersecting flight paths in Montclair. He asked if airports could raise gate fees for airplanes with older technology (noisier) engines? Aviation Director Francis responded that in terms of engine technology, the FAA has regulated that within the industry, and we're now where all engines for scheduled passenger service must meet what's called Stage 3 requirements. That is already in place in terms of there not being aircraft that don't meet the more stringent requirement as set forth by the FAA. Farner asked if older aircraft can be charged more to land? Director Francis replied that there is no precedent for that...aircraft are either in compliance or not regardless of their age. Mr. Farner asked about state regulatory authority. Matt P. Davis responded that the state does not have the authority to regulate jet engine noise. Farner asked if it was feasible to see if anything could be changed in this regard. Facilitator McClintock responded that this issue was resolved as long ago as 1970, so the answer to the question is no. Nina McKenzie from Montclair she said that she had been here before to report that her daughter could not sleep at night when she came to visit. She is back home now and "all she does is walk around the house and say, 'I can't hear you, Mom. I can't hear a word you're saying because of the plane noise.'" She said she was really dismayed

that the letters and the work that everyone has done for the past seven months has not been met with any response from the FAA. She applauded the efforts to treat this as a regional issue. She said she stopped reporting noise complaints because the process confusing and convoluted. She said the proposed app should have one button and two responses—here's where I am and I'm reporting noise.

The facilitator closed the public comment period. He acknowledged that Jose Hernandez from Barbara Lee's office had been present but had to leave. Matt Davis thanked Barbara Lee and her staff for being engaged on the NextGen issue. He said Port staff will continue to work with Rep. Lee, as well as other Congressional reps and the FAA, and he did not want anyone to think that lack of immediate action meant that community concerns were not being heard by policy makers. Benny Lee added that Barbara Lee has also signed on as a co-sponsor to House Resolutions 3384 and 3965. He said that when he was in Washington, DC recently, he spoke with Congressman Dan Lapinski, a senior member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and brought these issues up to him. He did not acknowledge the issues and referred him to his staff. For those making comments tonight, he recommended reaching out to friends in other districts to write their representatives and get them to sign on to these two bills.

11. NEXT MEETING – October 19, 2016

12. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

The facilitator noted that the last item on the agenda is new business before adjournment. He asked Co-Chair Lee if he had anything he wanted to bring up under new business? He said he wanted to address the matter of adding San Lorenzo, Castro Valley and Hayward to the Forum's NextGen committee. He said he was supportive of this, but was somewhat concerned about making the committee too big. He said he listened when Kurt Peterson talked about two specific flights. He recommended that the noise office do an analysis of those flights to see what the deviations were just to get some empirical information. If there are large deviations, then we have to educate the offending carriers. He noted also that it would be a good idea for the members of the committee to attend Noise 101, as well as visit the NorCal TRACON. As for the noise complaint app, he said he agreed that it should be as simple as one button, so that, when the app is designed, folks fill out their information and put in all the information -- address, location -- but the phone app itself can capture the location so, when you press the one button, you can submit it. He felt that this would be something the subcommittee should discuss but with feedback from the community.

Councilmember Daysog said he would like to see the members of the committee decide among themselves about the addition of three new members from a logistical standpoint. The facilitator said that the three areas are in unincorporated Alameda County and could probably be represented by one individual. He said either of the two Alameda County Forum members would be appropriate for the appointment. Matt Davis said he did not know if there would be anymore committee meetings. There are none currently scheduled. McClintock added that the subcommittee was formed to deal with NextGen issues, so maybe some thought ought to be given to expanding its role. On the other hand, for non-NextGen issues the North Field/South Field Groups may be better suited to dealing with these issues.

Facilitator McClintock thanked all those who came to tonight's meeting. There being no additional new business the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.