

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

April 18, 2018

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

1. INTRODUCTIONS	2
A. Purpose of Forum and Meeting Protocol	2
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS	3
A. Remembering Harold Perez	3
B. Laurel Strand Resignation	3
C. Peter Marcuzzo New Oakland Citizen Representative	3
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (January 17, 2018)	4
4. PUBLIC COMMENT	6
5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS	6
A. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE	6
i. FAA Interim Response to Forum Subcommittee Recommendations	6
ii. HMMH Review of Interim Report	9
iii. Forum Response to FAA Interim Report	10
6. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT	11
A. 4th Qtr. 2017 Noise Report Updates	11
B. Acceptance of 4th Qtr. 2017 Noise Report	12
C. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items.....	12
7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT	13
A. Update on Action Items from January 17, 2018 meeting	13
B. FedEx Fleet Mix Update	14
C. Freshtracks Communications Project Presentation	14
8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATES	16
9. FORUM 20TH ANNIVERSARY.	18
10. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (July 18, 2018)	18
11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....	18

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The April 18, 2018 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:38 p.m. by the Forum's Facilitator, Michael McClintock. Mr. McClintock welcomed the Forum members and guests. He introduced Jose Hernandez from Rep. Barbara Lee's office and Diego Gonzalez from Port of Oakland Governmental Affairs. The facilitator asked the Forum members and advisors to introduce themselves for the benefit of the audience:

Forum Members/Alternates Present:

Benny Lee, Co-Chair, Councilmember, San Leandro
Matt Pourfarzaneh, Citizen Representative, City of Alameda, alternate for Co-Chair Walt Jacobs
Mayor Trish Herrera-Spencer, City of Alameda
Councilmember Susan Wengraf, City of Berkeley
Pat Mossberg, alternate to Council president Larry Reid, City of Oakland
Cindy Horvath, representing Alameda County Supervisor, District 3
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Peter Marcuzzo, Citizen Representative, Oakland
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Councilmember Gary Singh, City of Union City
Asres Kaffl, Citizen Representative, Union City

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Jose Hernandez, Senator Barbara Lee's office
Kristi McKinney, Assistant Director of Aviation
Matt. P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager
Jesse Richardson, Sr. Noise and Environmental Affairs Specialist
Joan Zatopek, aviation planning and development management, Port of Oakland
Diego Gonzalez, Port Governmental Affairs
Emily Oxsen, OAK ATCT
Kyle Bertsche, OAK ATCT
Gene Reindel, HMMH, consultant
Rhia Gundry, HMMH, consultant
Adam Scholten, HMMH, airspace consultant
Christian Valdes, technical consultant, Landrum & Brown
Kathleen Livermore, City of Alameda
Kathy Ornelas, City of San Leandro
Burt Ganoung, Noise Abatement Office, San Francisco International Airport
Mike McClintock, Forum Facilitator
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, Court Reporter (CSR 4401)

A. Purpose of Forum and Meeting Protocol

Facilitator McClintock reviewed the purpose of the Forum and presented the new meeting protocols put in place at the last meeting. He restated the purpose of the Forum; which is to serve as an advisory body to the executive director of the Port of Oakland on issues of noise and air quality related to the Oakland Airport. The Forum itself does not have any specific authority to implement policy or enact legislation. The Forum is here to listen to community concerns and, where we

can, make recommendations to the Port or to investigate and make recommendations for corrective actions. The Forum has been quite successful in this over the almost 20 years of its existence. In addition, the Forum has recently undertaken the role of being a sounding board for the communities affected by the FAA's implementation of the NextGen air traffic control system, which has resulted in a lot of problems for the East Bay. He noted that neither the Forum nor the Port has any authority or jurisdiction in this area other than to express the concerns of our member communities to the FAA and offer potential solutions where feasible.

As for the new meeting protocol, McClintock noted that at the January meeting the use of speaker's cards was reinstated. Now, if anyone desires to address the Forum or ask questions on a topic not on the agenda during the "Public Comment" period, they are asked to fill out a speaker's card and mark the "Public Comment" box, then give the card to the facilitator. If one desires to speak or ask questions on an item that is on the agenda, we are asking that they also fill out a speaker's card with the requested information including the number of the agenda item. They also need to get the card to the facilitator in time for him to organize the cards. Comments/questions will be recognized in the order that the speaker's cards were received. If the facilitator does not have cards from everyone who wants to speak, they will have to wait until everyone who has provided speaker's cards have had their opportunity to speak. Please note that agenda items will first be discussed among the Forum members, then the facilitator will go to the speaker's cards. If anybody else wishes to speak on an agenda item, they will have to wait until the end of the item. At this point the facilitator has the discretion to ask for speaker's cards or not. Individuals will have only one opportunity to speak on any one agenda item, and all speakers will be subject to a 2-minute time limitation.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Remembering Harold Perez

The facilitator announced that Mr. Harold Perez, a member of San Leandro's Davis West community had recently passed. He asked San Leandro Councilmember Benny Lee to say a few words about Harold. Mr. Lee said Harold had been active in his community and worked with many elected officials, including former Mayor Tony Santos, to better his community. He said he and Harold had met through their community activism and that Harold had encouraged him to run for public office. Harold was very passionate over the issue of airport noise and its impact on the Davis West community. He commended Harold for his community activism and his desire to build a better community, noting also that Laurel Strand and Leslie Ransbottom are also activists who are working toward bettering their communities. The facilitator added that Harold was a person who spoke his mind and would be missed. He called for a moment of silence in memory of Harold Perez.

B. Laurel Strand Resignation

The facilitator said that Laurel Strand had resigned from the Forum, and that Forum members had received a copy of her resignation letter. Facilitator McClintock said that a Certificate of Appreciation had been prepared for Laurel for her service to the Forum as Oakland's citizen representative.

C. Peter Marcuzzo, New Oakland Citizen Representative

The facilitator announced that Mr. Peter Marcuzzo is the Forum's new citizen representative from the City of Oakland. McClintock said that Peter is very well qualified for the position, he has also served on the Forum's subcommittee on NextGen implementation.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (JANUARY 17, 2018)

The facilitator noted that members of the Forum had received a copy of the draft minutes for the January 17, 2018 Forum meeting with their agenda materials. He asked if there were any questions or comments. If there are no comments, questions, additions or changes, the facilitator said he would entertain a motion for approval. Councilmember Wengraf said that Lori McWhorter was her legislative assistant and is listed as being a Forum member or alternate. Lori was not formally appointed to this position but was asked to come in her place. McClintock said that this was adequate authorization for Lori to serve as Ms. Wengraf's alternate. The facilitator asked for a motion to receive and file the minutes. Mayor Spencer moved to receive and file the draft minutes. Motion was seconded by Co-Chair Lee. Ms. Horvath, Ms. Mossberg, and Mr. Wagner abstained.

Ernest DelliGatti said that he was waiting for an update on the total number of noise complaints. He said this issue was raised at the last meeting and was supposed to be dealt with at this meeting. His concern was that because the noise complaint totals do not track the increases in jet operations over the past couple of years many noise complaints may not have been tallied. Matt P. Davis said that Doreen Stockdale has done some work to confirm the numbers. He said he believed the issue was that the total number of complaints had declined over a two-quarter period, and that that was what was being questioned because an increase would be the normal expectation. Doreen responded that they had worked with the noise software vendor to verify that there were no outstanding noise complaints still in the system or that hadn't been accounted for. DelliGatti said his concern was based on the fact that in 2016 49,544 noise complaints were registered, and in 2017 37,472 complaints were recorded, but over this same period jet traffic increased. He said he did not understand the rationale for this and asked how it is that with the increase in jet traffic at Oakland the noise complaints have gone down. Ernie said his concern was that all of the noise complaints were not being captured by the airport noise complaint system.

Kristi McKinney replied that there is not necessarily a one-to-one relationship between air traffic and noise complaints. She said there may be a general correlation and that HMMH could speak to this in more detail and could undertake an analysis of this. However, she said, we need to understand that there have been some unique events going on during the years cited by Mr. DelliGatti. NextGen is the elephant in the room. When we had the impacts of NextGen being felt by certain communities, we saw massive increases in noise complaints for 2016. By working with the communities and the FAA to develop a dialogue and exchange information the noise complaints decreased because the community understood that we were trying to resolve the issues. There are also other factors that play into whether noise complaints go up or down that may or may not have anything to do with the actual number of aircraft operations or air traffic levels. DelliGatti replied that he was still not satisfied because, again, air traffic has increased and this is not the first time he has questioned these numbers. This has been going on for the past couple of years, he said, and air traffic has increased at Oakland Airport, as well as the other airports in the Bay Area. He repeated that he still did not understand how there can be a decrease of over 12,072 noise complaints over the previous year when air traffic has actually increased. In fact, he said, if anything Oakland is touting itself as the "new airport." Every time you turn on the TV it's, "Fly Oakland."

Ms. McKinney said she understood the point he was trying to make. DelliGatti answered that he wanted to see the justification for the noise complaint numbers for the last two years. Kristi replied that her staff has done an extensive amount of work and looked into all the facts of the

matter, and that they are confident in the data and that there is no direct correlation that says if traffic goes up passenger volume goes up proportionately. There is also nothing that says, therefore, complaints must also go up. She added that there have been several very unique events over the past two years that could very easily explain the ups and downs. However, if the Forum would like the Port to look at any additional data, or to have other people come in -- experts -- and explain this, that would be fine. We have confidence in the data and we have not heard the same concern from other Forum members. Mr. DelliGatti said he would like to see the Port's methodology with respect to how the noise complaints are accounted for because, he said, "they are lying."

Facilitator McClintock said that there was a motion and a second on the floor to receive and file the minutes of the January 18, 2018 Forum meeting. He asked Mr. DelliGatti if there was anything in the draft minutes that did not accurately reflect his concerns as expressed at that meeting. The facilitator said he was given the opportunity to reiterate his concerns tonight and that these concerns will be reflected in the Minutes of this meeting. He asked if Ernie wished to make a motion. He said he would. McClintock said it would be first necessary to deal with the current motion as seconded.

Matt Pourfarzaneh said he was speaking for Ernie. He said four meetings ago this was discussed but did not recall if it was actually at the North Field/South Field Group. At this meeting it was stated that NextGen implementation has created problems for our communities and that there were a number of things that were proposed to be done in response to this; but more complaining is not going to be any more helpful than it already is. So, he said, we asked our communities to hold off and the noise complaints went down from 3-4 thousand a month to about 1 thousand per month. Making more work for the noise office did not make any sense. McClintock called for the question. The motion carried with abstentions by Wagner, Horvath and Mossberg.

The facilitator called upon Mr. DelliGatti to make his Motion. DelliGatti moved that the Port provide the Forum with the methodology they have been using to develop the noise complaint numbers over the past two years so that the actual numbers of complaints can be verified. Seconded by Mayor Spencer. Co-Chair Lee requested that the motion be amended to have the report include a breakout by the different channels for complaints; whether it's the web site or by telephone by months and quarters in order to gain a better understanding of the types of noise complaints and where they are coming from. Mr. DelliGatti said he would accept the addition to his motion. Gary Singh said he believed it would be good to have the information on a monthly basis. Ms. McKinney said this could be done and that her staff would continue to produce all of the data requested by the Forum. However, she noted, if someone is convinced that if air traffic increases there will be a corresponding increase in noise complaints, that person may never be satisfied.

James Nelson asked how the traffic is measured? Is it the number of flights or by passengers? Ms. McKinney replied that flights do not always correlate directly with passengers. For the same volume of passengers in smaller aircraft, she explained, the number of flights would have to go up; with larger capacity aircraft the number of passengers can go up significantly without requiring any additional flights. He replied that, "the Port should scale according to the number of flights rather than passengers." Kristi said that the Port can provide all the data requested, but in this case aircraft operations are the more important variable. Leslie Ransbottom offered that both Kristi and Ernie are correct, but that the problem may be that the numbers do not reflect all complaints because many complaints are filed via the "Stop Jet Noise Complaint app," and those complaints are not accounted for in the Port's noise complaint methodology. Reba Fabrikant attributed the decline in noise complaints, in part, to community fatigue. The issues with NextGen

have gone on so long that a lot of people just don't want to complain anymore because it takes too much time, she said. Ms. McKinney concurred with Ms. Fabrikant's observation and added that the Port would like to hear from anyone who has concerns. Ms. Fabrikant added that she hoped the FAA was listening because she did not want to hear them say next year that "nobody is complaining anymore, so there is no issue." After restating the motion as amended the facilitator called for the question. The motion passed with one no vote.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

The facilitator announced that this agenda item is an opportunity for members of the public to speak on issues not on the agenda, but relevant to airport noise, air quality at Oakland International Airport. There is a two-minute time limit per speaker and speakers are requested to fill out a speaker's card. The facilitator called upon the speakers in the order in which their cards were received. The facilitator opened the public comment period by asking Jim Hager to come to the podium. Mr. Hager said he's been a tenant at the airport since 1991 and is the owner of four t-hangars. His issue was that there is no water source at the t-hangar area except for the restrooms. He said this can get quite messy when trying to fill a bucket in the sink. He would appreciate it if water could be made available at the t-hangar area. He also noted that at one of the rest rooms the "occupied" sign is always on whether or not the restroom is actually occupied. This has led to some embarrassing moments. Lastly, he said one of the paper towel dispensers is not operating properly. The facilitator next called upon Ms. Terri Fonseca a 20-year resident of North San Leandro who wished to complain about jet noise. She said that she has definitely noticed a change since the implementation of NextGen. It used to be that she would hear commercial aircraft occasionally, but now has a steady stream of planes flying over her home. She said she represents a lot of people in her neighborhood who have been feeling the effects, and they don't quite know what to do. So, she said, I speak for a lot of people that live in North San Leandro that I know. She expressed confusion with the workings of the "Stop Jet Noise" website. She said more people would probably complain if the instructions were made more understandable.

Kurt Peterson expressed his concern for safety in light of the recent engine failure on a Southwest flight. He said he wanted the FAA to realize that there's safety involved with flying over anyone's area. He didn't understand why, with NextGen technology, that the bay couldn't be used more often. He said he has never gotten an answer to this simple question, especially since the bay is a natural safety barrier and would eliminate the need to fly over people's homes. In response to Ernie Delli-Gatti's concerns, he said that he, along with many of his neighbors, has given up on making noise complaints. There being no more speaker's cards, the facilitator closed the public comment period.

5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

The facilitator opened this topic with an update on what has happened since the last Forum meeting in January. He said the FAA had issued its interim report on the Forum's recommendations. HMMH has reviewed the FAA's report and will be discussing it tonight, and Leslie Ransbottom will be reporting on subcommittee activities. On tonight's agenda is a draft response to the FAA from the Forum on its interim report. This will require Forum action.

A. Subcommittee Update

i. FAA Interim Response to Forum Subcommittee Recommendations

Leslie Ransbottom gave a short PowerPoint presentation of the chronology of the key events leading up to the FAA's interim report:

- In 2016, at the request of the former FAA Regional Administrator Glen Martin, the Forum accepted the role of liaison between the FAA and the East Bay communities affected by NextGen implementation.
- In June 2016 informal noise mitigation proposals were submitted to the FAA by the Port of Oakland.
- The Forum submitted its noise mitigation recommendations to the FAA on March 27, 2017.
- After eight months with no response from the FAA, Representative Barbara Lee was able to get them to commit to providing a report to the Forum in January 2018.
- The FAA's "Interim Response to Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum's Recommendation" was received in February 2018.

Ms. Ransbottom noted that the Forum's submittal identified six major procedures that were NextGen related:

- HUSSH TWO—The nighttime noise abatement procedure for Oakland departures.
- WINDSR TWO—A new 24-hour RNAV concentrated arrival route down the Berkeley-Oakland hills into Oakland.
- OAKLAND NINE—A standard instrument departure (SID) for aircraft departing on Runways 28L/R and 30.
- CNDEL THREE—A RNAV departure procedure for aircraft departing to the west on Runways 28L/R and 30.
- NIITE THREE—A SFO nighttime departure procedure.
- TRUKN TWO—A new NextGen RNAV departure procedure for easterly departures from SFO.

Both NIITE THREE and TRUKN TWO concentrate SFO Departures over the East Bay, which bears the burden of about 60 percent of SFO departures. Leslie noted also that each one of these six procedures had multiple recommendations and alternatives in the Forum's report. In its interim response, the FAA separated the six different procedures into 33 individual recommendations and also responded to three procedural questions included in the Forum report, for a total of 36 responses, which were presented in tabular form, as follow [note that the FAA response are categorized as (1) Under Evaluation; (2) Feasible and Could Be Undertaken in the Short Term--Less than 2 years; and (3) Not Endorsed by the FAA]:

- HUSSH--Eight recommendations are still considered to be under evaluation, and one deemed to be not endorsable by the FAA.
- OAKLAND NINE—All are still undergoing evaluation.
- WINDSR-- All recommendations are still undergoing evaluation.
- CNDEL—All recommendation are still undergoing evaluation.
- NIITE—All recommendations still undergoing evaluation.
- TRUKN—Four recommendations still undergoing evaluation, and three deemed feasible and could be undertaken in the short term--less than 2 years.

Ms. Ransbottom stated her concern that the FAA's responses were vague and unsatisfactory and seem only to infer that studies could be initiated within two years. Also, there is no information where, in the two-year feasibility timeline, the proposals are. She asked, "Are we at the beginning or the middle?" Does this mean that we have to wait another year before the FAA starts its two-

year implementation process? As to the Forum's process questions about how things will go forward, what we can anticipate, and the timelines. The FAA responded with a generalized guideline of what the standard operating procedure is on looking into these issues:

- Finalize the preliminary feasibility study;
- Conduct formal environmental and safety reviews; and
- Coordinate and seek feedback from communities and stakeholders.

Hopefully, they keep their word and undertake additional negotiated actions as needed and implement new procedures as required. We want them to implement new procedures that fix noise issues. So far, they have not committed to any specific timelines for any of the Forum's recommendations. We appreciate that some of them are bigger fixes than others, but nothing specific was provided, just a generalized list of procedures with the average estimate timelines for any of these standard operating procedures.

The NextGen subcommittee has met and went over the report with the assistance of HMMH. The consensus was that the term "under evaluation" is vague. The subcommittee wanted to know where in the evaluation process each of the six submitted issues for consideration are. Also, what is the FAA's thought process? Are they for or against the recommendations? The Forum also needs to be a part of the dialogue. The Forum's initial request was that. And to move forward, we do need to be part of the back-and-forth with the FAA. We are going into our third year on this issue, she said, and we are seeking expeditious timelines for each of the six submitted issues. Moreover, she added, the NextGen subcommittee is not convinced that the recommendation to use the HUSSH 24 hours a day for certain OAK departures is a safety issue that prevents it being endorsed by the FAA. The subcommittee also wants to clarify that initiating studies for three of the TRUKN recommendations that were deemed feasible within two years is a vague and unsatisfactory response. We want to strongly urge the FAA to more closely and collaboratively include the Forum in the procedural design process going forward, and we need to request that the FAA commit necessary resources to actively move forward with the Forum's recommendations. To this end, the subcommittee has prepared a formal response to the FAA's interim report which covers all the issues and concerns discussed tonight. Facilitator McClintock thanked Ms. Ransbottom for an excellent presentation and suggested that it would be good to have this information posted to the Port's website.

Co-Chair Lee thanked Ms. Ransbottom for her report. He added that he had recently attended the National League of Cities Conference in Washington, DC and, while there, went to Capitol Hill to meet with Congresswoman Barbara Lee. He said he briefed her on the Forum's activities and thanked her for support and efforts in assisting the Forum and its constituent communities in dealing with the FAA. He said he also looked into the possibility of securing funding for more noise monitors and noise insulation for residences. Howard Hintermeister from CLASS said he believed that the FAA was making changes to procedures they were not telling the community about. He cited the TRUKN procedure as an example where in the past SFO departures were vectored directly over OAK. Now they seem to be more dispersed and are flying directly over Alameda. James Nelson asked if the SFO departures were now making their turn earlier, and because of that, they're passing over Bay Farm Island; whereas, before they passed over the Oakland Airport and would do a later turn passing over Montclair? Hintermeister concurred. Matt P. Davis said this topic has been discussed at the North Field/South Field Group meetings with respect to both pre- and post-Metroplex implementation. Davis said he would be happy to share this information with the Forum. Ed Downing said he was frustrated by all the speculation as to what the FAA may or may not be doing without the presence of an FAA TRACON representative present who could answer

many of these questions. Ms. Ransbottom concurred that the FAA needed to send a representative to the Forum meetings who could answer its questions.

ii. HMMH Review of FAA Interim Report

Adam Scholten from HMMH, the Port's noise and airspace consultant, said he had a PowerPoint presentation that included many of the issues raised by Leslie in her presentation, so he would focus on some of the more technical aspects of the FAA's response. Adam said the first recommendation is the one which the FAA deemed to be not feasible. This was the recommendation to use a modified HUSSH departure 24 hours a day. To refresh everyone on what the HUSSH departure is and what it looks like, he described the track a departing aircraft would use under this procedure based on the published FAA information. The Forum's recommendation to modify the HUSSH procedure is based on the fact that OAK departures over Berkeley and Oakland are lower in altitude and markedly louder than SFO departures. The Forum's short-term recommendation would be for air traffic control to assign headings to aircraft departing Runway 30 that would restore the initial SILENT ground track. Additionally, the FAA should ensure aircraft remain on their filed route and not turn prior to the REBAS intersection and to keep aircraft on the route as published unless safety dictates otherwise. The FAA said they could not endorse this recommendation "Due to safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System."

HMMH's review of the FAA's response indicates "that safety could, in effect, be maintained with other procedures through using appropriate sequencing." HUSSH is procedurally separated from other departure procedures out of SFO. There is one procedure where there is a sequencing issue, but it isn't as heavily used as a San Francisco departure. Safety could be maintained by flying the appropriate spacing between aircraft, so they would be deconflicted from the other procedure and be separated. However, Adam noted, to maintain the appropriate separation between aircraft for safety purposes the degree of separation would have to be increased significantly. This could result in capacity constraints for both OAK and SFO, and potential increased workload for SFO air traffic controllers. The proposed modified procedure could also result in added flying time, which translates into additional fuel burn and cost.

Adam next addressed the FAA's response to the TRUKN departure procedure from SFO. He gave an overview of the procedure and showed a graphical exhibit of the published procedure. He noted, however, that just because the procedure is published, it does not mean that aircraft will fly the route precisely because there is some variability in where an aircraft makes turns and also some vectoring that goes on from air traffic control. The Forum recommendation was that the FAA investigate both TRUKN North and East and that airspace and noise analyses be performed to identify appropriate adjustments to restore historical traffic patterns and conditions. The FAA responded that this was feasible and could be undertaken in the short term, meaning, they said, less than two years. However, he noted, this doesn't necessarily constitute a commitment to modify the TRUKN procedure. All this really is, is a commitment from the FAA to conduct analyses to determine if modifications to the TRUKN departure is possible. This does not mean that the FAA is going to change TRUKN; it simply means the FAA will look to see if there are any modifications that could be made and what those modifications are, if possible. HMMH's recommendation is that the Forum needs to be able to review any redesign of TRUKN prior to implementation.

The Forum also recommended that the FAA investigate and analyze to determine if a procedural decrease in altitude over TRUKN exists and whether higher altitudes can be restored for both TRUKN North and TRUKN East departures. Again, the FAA said this was feasible and could be

undertaken in the short term, in less than two years. Adam noted that as before, this is not an FAA commitment to modify the TRUKN procedure, but simply a FAA commitment to conduct analyses of the TRUKN procedure to see if there are any altitude modifications that could be made that would allow for altitudes to be increased. HMMH's initial analyses on the procedure did not indicate any reduction in altitudes on TRUKN subsequent to the implementation of the Metroplex. In other words, there is no indication that these departures are being held down arbitrarily or for another traffic flow above.

The Forum report also recommended that the FAA investigate both TRUKN North and TRUKN East to model how proposed changes will result in noise reduction. The FAA's response was that this was feasible and could be undertaken in the short term. Again, he noted, this is not an FAA commitment to conduct noise modeling for the proposed procedure changes; it's more a commitment that the FAA will satisfy the analysis requirement to meet the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) standard. It should also be noted, he said, that the FAA is not likely to perform noise modeling for every single possible design change. Adam said his recent experience is that the FAA will review a number of design changes with the community, but only carry out noise analyses that seem to have community acceptance or buy in.

Mr. Scholten concluded his presentation and asked for questions from the Forum. James Nelson asked what the potential cost to the airlines might be for the additional 10 mile they might have to travel under the modified HUSSH departure. Adam said he did not know the exact amount, but it would involve determining the amount of fuel burn for each type of aircraft, flying miles, altitude and airspeed. Nelson replied that most of the cost would be incurred during climb-out and any additional miles in cruise configuration would be minimal. James also asked what the altitude for the REBAS intersection was. Adam replied that it would be about 8,000 to 9,000 feet. Peter Marcuzzo offered that the minimum crossing altitude is 8,000 feet.

Facilitator McClintock thanked Adam for a great report and asked that the HMMH presentation be posted to the Port's website. He asked for comments from the audience. Kurt Peterson offered that as far as airspace conflicts with SFO go on the proposed modified HUSSH procedure, it would be interesting to know the exact number of potentially conflicting operations and the nature of any potential conflicts. Kurt added that with re the modified HUSSH departure, the real issue was the additional time that might be required by the airlines to fly the procedure. Jim Nelson asked how much capacity there is with the current sequencing of aircraft departures, and whether or not OAK and/or SFO are at or approaching capacity. Adam said he would have to research this issue and get back to the Forum. He explained the variables that can affect an airport's runway capacity at any given moment. James asked if it would be practical to implement HUSSH departures during the day during off-peak periods. Leslie Ransbottom asked about the FAA policy to not conduct noise modeling on all potential scenarios, and how that determination can be made without actual modeling to begin with. Adam replied that the FAA does this in order to winnow out any procedures that the community might outright reject. Reba Fabrikant asked why efficiency mattered to the airlines, when so much of what they do seems to be inefficient. The answer was that time is money. Judy Estemel (sp?) said that she is a 50-year resident of Montclair, and that aircraft noise in her area has increased significantly over the last 2-3 years, and that there is considerable activity directly over her house. Matt P. Davis spoke to the Forum about making sure he had the necessary information to respond to Mr. Nelson's questions. He said he will have a report for the July meeting.

iii. Forum Response to FAA Interim Report

The facilitator said it was now time to cut to the chase. The Forum has been on this issue for almost 3 years now and we still have not come to a resolution for the problem. The most response from the FAA is more of a non-response and the only positive traction we have received from the FAA is as a result of the efforts of Barbara Lee's office. Be that as it may, tonight, primarily, as a result of the work of the subcommittee, and particularly Leslie, the Forum has been provided with a draft letter to Dennis Roberts, FAA regional administrator, transmitting to him the Forum's response to the FAA's interim report. He said he was asking three things of the Forum in the form of a motion: (1) To approve the letter to be sent to Mr. Roberts; (2) To approve the revised report of the subcommittee; and (3) To have a meeting between the FAA, the Port, and the Forum to get answers to these specific questions:

- Where are you in the process of reviewing the Forum's recommendations?
- What time frame for a final response are we looking at?
- When can we expect to have a meaningful mutual dialogue?

James Nelson said he had heard that the FAA may be short of travel funds. McClintock replied that if Rep. Lee wants the FAA to meet with us, they will find a way. Benny Lee asked if this was to be a single motion. The facilitator replied in the affirmative. Co-Chair Lee moved approval of the proposed motion. Seconded by Tom Wagner. Ernie DelliGatti offered that if we were going to include Barbara Lee, we should also involve the other East Congressional reps. McClintock replied that this was a good idea but believed that for the initial meeting with the FAA we should limit it to the key players. There would be plenty of time later to broaden the participation. Co-Chair Lee concurred, saying that it was his experience that it would be very difficult to get all the representatives in the same room at a given time. Matt Pourfarzaneh added that it would be good if we could speed up the FAA's process, but cautioned that we should not be speculating about what the FAA is or is not doing. Mayor Spencer commented that although Barbara Lee is doing a great job, it is just a matter of courtesy to let the other representatives know what we are doing so that they are not offended by being left out. McClintock said he understood her concern and had no objections to notifying them of any potential meetings with the FAA, although he believed this was a matter better handled through Barbara Lee's office and Port Governmental Affairs. Benny Lee said when he last met with Rep. Lee he advised her that the Forum was working on a response to the FAA's interim report, so she is aware of what we are doing. Mayor Spencer concurred with Co-Chair Lee's assessment of Rep. Lee's interest in this matter because she also had the opportunity to meet with Ms. Lee while in Washington, DC.

There being no more discussion, the facilitator called for the question. The motion was approved. McClintock asked staff to post the letter and the Forum's response on the Port's website.

6. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

A. 4th Qtr. 2017 Noise Report Updates

Matt P. Davis discussed the changes made to the content and format of the 4th Quarter noise report as requested at the January Forum meeting. He said four changes were made. One of the most significant was something the Port and CLASS have been working on in terms of the non-compliance numbers and what the Port considered to be noncompliant. Previously, he said, we showed some operations to be compliant that by definition should not have been. To determine this, we had to go back to the language of the settlement agreement that showed that the only time a non-compliant flight could be categorized as compliant was if it was due to an emergency

or runway repair or maintenance work. This was particularly so for the North Field departures. Special events are no longer deemed compliant. He said they went back to 2011 and revised all the reports to reflect these changes. Moving forward, he said, we will list all the non-compliant flights, or flights that look to be non-compliant, and the reason for the non-compliance. He thought it was important to explain the reason for any non-compliant flights, whether due to a special event, e.g. the NBA finals, or by pilot request. He said some of the appendices and summaries have been modified to make the reports more readable, and some graphs have been added.

He discussed changes to the methodology for analyzing the nighttime waypoint compliance, which included changes to the nighttime HUSSH procedure. A compliant departure under this procedure is one that makes the left turn avoiding Bay Farm Island and the Alameda area (HUSSH waypoint), hits the center of the bay (NIITE waypoint), and proceeds up to REBAS waypoint. It, therefore, has three distinct waypoints enroute. The report now includes information detailing any missed waypoints. Co-Chair Lee complimented staff on the changes to the quarterly report including the addition of graphical information. He said we now have the ability to really see where the issues are. Kurt Peterson said he has not seen the revised report, but in the past non-compliant flights were listed as compliant because of potential conflicts with SFO traffic. Davis responded that there are certain items called out in the settlement agreement, but the right turn over Alameda was a later procedure. This is something that is continued to be shown as compliant because it is due to an air traffic conflict issue that requires an early turn over Alameda. However, he noted, air traffic conflict is justification for the Alameda right turns, but not for the jet departures off the North Field. Departure time and air traffic is not considered to be an excused departure at this time. Mr. Peterson requested more information from Mr. Davis on the subject that the facilitator deemed to be better suited to further discussion outside the meeting. He asked Mr. Davis to report back to the Forum on Mr. Peterson's issue.

Asres Kaffl raised the issue of landings from the south affecting Fremont and Union City all the way up to and including San Leandro. He asked why not use San Francisco Bay for this approach instead of flying over the East Bay hills. Matt replied that most of the noise abatement procedures, in general, do affect more departures at night than arrivals. In terms of getting a procedure by which aircraft would proceed over the bay and use that, that is not something the subcommittee recommended or looked at specifically, and the FAA has not been approached about a visual approach over the bay. Such an approach would be misaligned with the runway and require a close-in correction of some kind. It would be a more difficult approach. However, he added, there has been some discussion of the potential for a charted visual approach into the airport, but the details of this have not been worked out. Getting back to Mr. Kaffl's point, Matt said, there are not many procedures specific to arrivals, and most aircraft try to align with the runway farther out. It is something we can look into.

B. Acceptance of 4th Qtr. Noise Report

The facilitator asked for a motion to receive and file the fourth quarter 2017 noise report. Co-Chair Lee made the motion to receive and file. Mayor Spencer seconded. The question was called and the motion approved with Ernie DelliGatti abstaining.

C. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items

Mr. Davis began by noting that the North Field/ South Field Group meets quarterly between the Forum meetings. The group addresses airport technical issues. For example, an issue of concern to

Alameda was the use of Runway 33 by jets. Runway 33 is the shortest of three runways at the North Field and is used primarily by propeller planes and smaller aircraft. However, because of their small size, very-light jets or micro-jets are starting to use the runway more often. These small jets weigh less than 12,000 pounds. Because of their size and performance capability, they can operate off of a shorter runway like 33, which is about 3,376 feet long as opposed to the other two North Field runways which are 6,213 feet and 5,458 feet long. The group has been engaged in discussions about the Port's role in terms of limiting jet departures. This is not spelled out in the settlement agreement. There is no prohibition on jet use of Runway 33. Another issue being worked on is the ATIS (Automated Terminal Information System). ATIS is a continuous broadcast of recorded aeronautical information in busier terminal areas, i.e. airports and their immediate surroundings. ATIS broadcasts contain essential information, such as current weather information, active runways, available approaches, and any other information required by pilots, such as important NOTAMs (Notices to Airmen).

There was a request by CLASS and members of the NextGen subcommittee to see if the FAA could add information about noise abatement to the ATIS. The FAA's regional air traffic office or the Seattle service center which runs air traffic for us, replied that this is not permissible; that the ATIS should not be used for noise abatement procedures. The group requested that follow-up questions be asked of the FAA, which will be done before the next meeting. He said the group has also been discussing the issues of arrivals during southeast (reverse) flow conditions, aircraft landing over Alameda, early departure turns over Alameda, vectoring off the TRUKN departure resulting in turns over Berkeley, and concentrating traffic in certain areas. Other issues being considered include the update of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), the Metroplex, and North Field quiet departure procedure compliance.

Matt Pourfarzaneh commented that the settlement agreement is very specific in stating that no jet departures are allowed on the North Field runways. He said he believes that the FAA thinks that the airport wants all noise abatement information to be placed on ATIS, when in fact the only thing being requested was just one small sentence to say that this is a noise sensitive area. Mr. Pourfarzaneh also asked about ATC vectoring on the HUSSH departure. Mr. Davis replied that the TRACON says that after an aircraft reaches the minimum vectoring altitude it can be directed to turn. He offered to get back to Mr. Pourfarzaneh on this issue.

7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

A. Update on Action Items from January 17, 2018 Forum Meeting

Doreen Stockdale started the update on the action items from the January Forum meeting by calling on Gene Reindel to respond to Peter Marcuzzo's inquiry concerning membership on the SFO Community Roundtable. Gene said that the Roundtable has been considering applications from other jurisdictions within the area to become members of the Roundtable. There have been a lot of discussions on this, but nothing has been resolved. One issue under consideration is to have non-Roundtable representatives added to the Roundtable's working groups. With respect to having a representative from the NorCal TRACON (NCT) attend Forum and NFG/SFG meetings, Ms. Stockdale said she had e-mailed the NCT manager, as well as the procedures manager who had attended meetings in the past and had copied the district manager and the assistant manager. So far, she has received no response.

Another action item was the 100-degree radial. The Forum requested that staff meet with Ernie DelliGatti to discuss this issue as it related to San Lorenzo. The meeting took place on March 2. There were three particular outcomes from the meeting:

- Adjusting the 100-degree radial to keep aircraft higher before turning inbound into the Oakland Airport;
- Change the heading from 100 degrees to 105 or 110 degrees to accommodate changes in magnetic declination over the years; and
- Creation of a charted visual approach that would avoid San Lorenzo.

The FAA is currently looking into the feasibility of such a charted approach. It could have the advantage of avoiding San Lorenzo, which is a positive, but, also, it could impact other areas of Alameda County negatively. Davis said we want to make sure that the Forum has a chance to look at this and comment on it to prevent a transference of noise from one sensitive area to another. These three items represent a good start, but the Port will continue to work with the Forum to reconcile Mr. DelliGatti's issues and to see what additional options we may have to get aircraft farther away.

B. FedEx Fleet Mix Update

Ms. Stockdale noted that at the January meeting a request was made for an update on the phaseout of the MD-10 and MD-11 aircraft from the FedEx Fleet. Facilitator McClintock contacted Jim Baas, the Forum's FedEx representative, who replied as follows:

- *"FedEx continues to purchase new Boeing 767 and 777 aircraft to modernize its fleet, replacing any of FedEx's older aircraft is based on the fluctuating market plan and need for cargo capacity."*

Baas could not provide any specific schedule for these phaseouts, saying only that it depends on how quickly Boeing can build aircraft and how quickly they can get rid of their other aircraft. Doreen added that we continue to see lower MD-10 numbers coming in and out of Oakland, but for the fourth quarter, the MD-11 numbers were up for the holiday season. Co-Chair Lee asked about B&K's "Viewpoint" product, which he understood to represent an open data platform for the community to go onto the web and run its own reports and look at complaints. Ms. Stockdale replied that this product is being introduced at the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, but there have been some delays. This is frustrating, because B&K is also supposed to create a demo site for OAK. She said, once we have that information, we'll be able to get it to people to use and test. The decision to invest in the full-blown system will be made by the Port's executive office. She said she was very excited about the potential for this product and hopes that the Port will be able to move forward with it. At the last meeting Leslie asked if Christian Valdes' presentation could be placed on the web site. She wanted everyone to know that they have added two folders to the Noise Forum dropdown menu for presentations and correspondence, and that all of the presentations tonight will be added to that. Certain correspondence will also be added. This will be done each quarter.

C. Freshtracks Communications Project Presentation

Doreen said she had hoped to have a presentation from Freshtracks Communication, but the representative was unavailable to attend tonight's meeting. Doreen gave an overview of the 20-year-old company which is based in Truckee, CA. The firm has done airport work in the past and specializes in community outreach. They have been retained by the airport to update our pilots and community outreach programs as well as websites, logos, facilitation and communication materials. She said the Port's goals are to increase the based and transient corporate pilots' compliance with

noise abatement procedures and build an understanding of the airport's noise compliance program, including the benefits to the airport and the surrounding communities. She said they are in the first two phases of a multi-phase project—research and stakeholders assessments. They have already been in contact with Forum members and have met with CLASS. Doreen said they are also available to meet with SOSEB. Freshtracks will be meeting with non-compliant operators and creating an online survey for pilots to use to find out how they can get the most current information. Freshtracks has a pilot on its team for when it meets with pilots.

Once Freshtracks completes its research, it will meet back with us to present the best way to reach the airport's varied constituents, specifically:

- For pilots—websites or newsletters;
- For the community— websites or newsletters;
- For FBO's—bill stuffers; and
- For the noise program—an updated web site and logo.

Freshtracks will create a platform for the distribution of information and feedback. It is to provide a friendly and welcoming Port platform for a range of audiences, including noise abatement procedures for pilots to encourage them to fly quiet routes. The new platform will enable tracking of the sites and pages, which is something that doesn't exist currently. We'll be able to see the number of hits we're getting on our web site, which will, she thinks, be of tremendous benefit. In addition, they are looking at producing the following materials:

- A quarterly pilot newsletter;
- A compliance campaign targeting corporate pilots;
- Expanded use of the website; and
- Development of other materials including posters and videos.

Freshtracks has many other potentially great ideas, like water bottles for the back of the plane that have a message about the benefit of flying quietly and using the South Field. The video would incorporate interviews with members from CLASS or Alameda residents on the impacts of aircraft flying over their communities and what it would do for them if they make the effort to use South Field. Doreen concluded her presentation with slides of some of Freshtracks work at the Truckee-Tahoe Airport.

Co-Chair Benny Lee said he was looking forward to seeing this information as it is developed. Matt Pourfarzaneh said he had met with Freshtracks and found them to be very capable. Howard Hintermeister said there was an action item on adjusting the time of the Monday morning runway closures for maintenance. He said possible alternatives and times should be looked at. Matt P. Davis replied that this had been looked into and that this runway closure has been in place for a very long time, between 12:30 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. every Monday morning, to perform runway maintenance. Historically, if there has not been a lot of work to be done they are completed by 4:30 a.m. or 5:00 a.m. Matt said there is still some work needed to complete the runway overlay project, including electrical and pavement grooving. Unfortunately, this is all very labor intensive and requires every single minute of time within the work window, and this creates problems for Alameda. We are trying to complete the project as soon as possible in order to return to the normal maintenance schedule. Hintermeister said that his concern is that Southwest is adding flight this summer that will have to use North Field for takeoffs during the maintenance window. He asked what would happen if another airline wanted to have a 4:00 a.m. departure. Davis said the airport cannot restrict when an airline may fly. But the normal procedure is to work with the carrier to avoid having operations during noise sensitive periods.

8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

Christian Valdes opened his presentation by noting that there has been a lot of good noise news and material in the last few months. He began his PowerPoint presentation [which can be accessed in its entirety on the Airport's website] with an update on the Phoenix court case. As was discussed at the January meeting, the FAA was taken to court by the City of Phoenix. The City won its case and the FAA was required to return Sky Harbor Airport flight tracks back to their original configuration. So far, the FAA has complied with court order—sort of. Not all of the original flight tracks have been restored. In another court case, U.S. Court of Appeals in D.C. ruled that the lawsuit filed by Georgetown University and six neighborhood associations was filed beyond the 60-day window set to challenge federal actions. Plaintiffs complained that the FAA had done a poor job of informing the residents of Georgetown about the project. The court said “the FAA's efforts to inform the residents of Georgetown about the evaluation of the D.C. Metroplex were hardly a model of sound agency practice.” Valdes noted that this ruling was different than in the Phoenix case. In the Phoenix case, where the plaintiff also filed outside the window to appeal, the court found that Phoenix engaged the FAA prior to the end of the 60-day appeal period and should not be punished for treating litigation as a last rather than a first resort. This ruling is a clear message that the 60-day comment window will be enforced in the future. In other news:

- In Northern California, three Congressional representatives asked the FAA for a specific timeline for feasible airspace changes, but they did not respond by the March 15 deadline. As of today, the FAA still has not responded.
- In S. California, a Congressman asked the FAA to look into the increase in noise in communities around Burbank Airport due to Metroplex flight changes. Residents are concerned about increasing noise due to the Metroplex.
- In Laguna Beach, Orange County reached a settlement with the FAA on SoCal Metroplex flight path changes out of John Wayne Airport. Aircraft will generally remain over water longer as a result, climb higher and turn east over areas south of Laguna Beach.
- In the Lake Arrowhead area, the FAA may be able to tweak an arrival path into the Ontario Airport that flies over the Lake Arrowhead area. The tweak would move the route about two miles east of the current location and over unpopulated areas where it was originally located.
- The City of Los Angeles filed a 93-page brief claiming the FAA didn't care about NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, and abused its direction in the environmental assessment for the SoCal Metroplex. The city claims that the Metroplex environmental assessment failed to provide information about the proposed action and its environmental effects and that an ordinarily person could not readily determine what the FAA was proposing, how it differed from what was in place before the action and what it meant for a person's enjoyment of their home, school, etc.
- Heathrow Airport earlier this year started two 10-week consultation periods where the public has a chance to provide input on the likely airspace redesign changes around London.
- The FAA predicts that U.S. airline passengers will increase by more than 400 million in the next 20 years. That's a total of 800 million last year, moving up to 1.28 billion in the year 2038.
- A new FAA bill was introduced last week without air traffic control reform. The bill would reauthorize the FAA for the next five years.
- On the environmental front, the bill seeks for a government accountability office study that will look into the benefit, costs and other impacts of phasing out of stage 3 aircraft in

the general aviation and commercial realms. The bill also includes a call to study the potential health effects of aircraft noise, including sleep disturbance and elevated blood pressure, in high-impact areas like California and New York. The bill also seeks community involvement in FAA NextGen projects and Metroplexes.

Christian's next item may impact noise offices that provide public flight tracking web sites, like WebTrak. The measure seeks to permanently protect the privacy of operators who want to shield their registration numbers from real time public tracking web sites or sources. Other noise news issues include:

- Congress focuses on the growing concerns around cybersecurity with a mandate to review FAA's activities and plans in this area.
- NASA awarded Lockheed 250 million dollars to build an experimental aircraft that will have a cruising altitude almost twice as high as commercial aircraft do now at 55 thousand feet and have a speed of about 940 miles per hour. That's 1.5 times the speed of sound.
- Supersonic flight generates a loud sonic boom and is currently prohibited over land. An experimental plane will generate a soft thump or low boom that will be as loud as a car door closing. Test flights will begin to take place in 2022 and continue over a three-year period.
- Results will be shared with U.S. regulators to see if commercial applications are feasible.
- Avinor, Norway's airport operator said all short haul flights lasting up to 1.5 hours will be electricity powered by the year 2040.
- Members of the House Quiet Skies Caucus that represent the New York City area have directed the FAA to evaluate alternatives to modeling DNL in order to measure and reduce impacts of aircraft noise over their New York City districts. The provision encourages the FAA not rely on noise modeling alone.
- Top scientists around the world will be engaged in a study to update noise guidelines.
- Later this year the European office of the World Health Organization will update its 1999 community noise guidelines. The guidelines take into account the noise impact from aircraft and other sources of noise, sleep, cognitive impairment, hearing loss, etc.
- A recent review of surveys on noise near 15 airports in Europe and Asia reached two major conclusions you would probably not be surprised by. The first is that people are more annoyed by aircraft noise now than in the past, and the increase in annoyance is more pronounced around airports that have gone through noticeable changes like opening new runways, operational changes, flight changes, et cetera.
- In the U.S., the FAA's aircraft and noise survey will be released to the public later this year. The FAA will use the survey results and feedback from stakeholders to make decisions to update existing noise policy. In comparison, at 65 DNL, the current noise curve used by the FAA predicts that 12 percent of people are highly annoyed. In comparison, the World Health Organization curve predicts that, at 65 DNL, 46 percent of people are highly annoyed.
- The Mitre Corporation is assisting the FAA in developing ways to disperse some of the now concentrated departure routes due to NextGen implementation.
- United is the greenest airline in the world, said Newsweek. Their eco-skies program promotes the use of biofuels, fuel burn reduction technologies, and they use vendors that operate in a green fashion.
- The FAA awarded almost a million dollars to flight engineers at Emory University in Florida to remove lead from aviation gas. The change to unleaded fuel would be the most substantial improvement in aviation gas since the 1940s. Their research is

- planned to take place over the next couple years.
- Rolls Royce's advanced low emissions combustion system ran for the first time in February. It improves the pre-mix in fuel and air prior to emission, which burns fuel more effectively and lowers NOx and particulate emissions.
 - On the drones spectrum, the Aerospace Industries Association projects substantial global market growth for large unmanned aerial system drones over the next 20 years.
 - The FAA projects that commercial space launches will increase from 22 last year to over 60 in the next two years.

Lastly, Valdes said, he did not think that he would ever say the words "ice cream" and "aircraft noise" in the same sentence, but today is the day the cofounder of Ben and Jerry's ice cream was arrested for trying to simulate aircraft noise; more specifically, noise produced by the F-35 military jet, which plans to move to Burlington, VT. The facilitator thanked Mr. Valdes for a fine presentation.

9. FORUM 20TH ANNIVERSARY

The next item is the Forum's 20th anniversary. Matt P. Davis said that this is something that the Port definitely wants to recognize. However, he did not think it appropriate to give up a Forum meeting over. He said we are looking at a late summer or fall time frames. He said to stay tuned for more information.

10. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING – July 18, 2018

The next Forum meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 18, 2018.

11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

END