

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

July 18, 2018

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

1. INTRODUCTIONS	1
2. FAA REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR DENNIS ROBERTS	2
3. ANNOUNCEMENTS	14
A. Acceptance of 1st Quarter 2018 Noise Report	14
B. Honoring Vince Mestre’s Service to Forum.....	15
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (April 18, 2018)	16
5. PUBLIC COMMENT	16
6. ELECTION OF OFFICERS	16
7. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS	16
A. Update	16
i. Rep. Barbara Lee Letter to FAA.....	16
8. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT	17
A. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items.....	17
9. NOISE OFFICE REPORT	18
A. Update on Action Items from April 18, 2018 meeting	18
B. Viewpoint/Power BI websites	19
10. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATES	20
11. FORUM 20TH ANNIVERSARY.	22
12. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (October 17, 2018)	22
13. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....	22

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The July 18, 2018 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by the Forum’s Facilitator, Michael McClintock. Mr. McClintock welcomed the Forum members and guests. The facilitator asked the Forum members and advisors to introduce themselves for the benefit of the audience:

Forum Members/Alternates Present:

Bryant Francis, Aviation Director, Port of Oakland
Benny Lee, Co-Chair, Councilmember, San Leandro
Walt Jacobs, Co-Chair, Citizen Representative, City of Alameda
Mayor Trish Herrera-Spencer, City of Alameda
Councilmember Susan Wengraf, City of Berkeley
Cindy Horvath, representing Alameda County Supervisor, District 3
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Peter Marcuzzo, Citizen Representative, Oakland
Kathy Ornelas, Alternate, San Leandro
Asres Kaffl, Citizen Representative, Union City

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Dennis Roberts, Regional Administrator, FAA Western-Pacific Region
Jose Hernandez, Senator Barbara Lee's office
Kristi McKinney, Assistant Director of Aviation
Matt. P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager
Matt Davis, Port Governmental Affairs
Diego Gonzalez, Port Governmental Affairs
Doreen Stockdale, Airport Noise and Environmental Supervisor
Jesse Richardson, Sr. Noise and Environmental Affairs Specialist
Emily Oxsen, OAK ATCT
Kyle Bertsche, OAK ATCT
Ford Frazier, Southwest Airlines Flight Operations
Rhea Gundry, HMMH, consultant
Adam Scholten, HMMH, airspace consultant
Christian Valdes, technical consultant, Landrum & Brown
Vince Mestre, retired technical consultant, Landrum & Brown
Kathleen Livermore, City of Alameda
Burt Ganoung, Noise Abatement Office, San Francisco International Airport
Mike McClintock, Forum Facilitator
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, Court Reporter (CSR 4401)

2. FAA REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR DENNIS ROBERTS

The facilitator introduced Mr. Dennis Roberts, FAA Western-Pacific Regional Administrator. Mr. Roberts thanked the Co-Chairs for their support and commended the Forum members for their dedication and resolve to reconcile the issues at hand. He said he also appreciated the interest of the community in attending the meeting this evening. He told the Forum that he hoped to be able to share some information that would be of value to the group, including the direction and progress of the FAA's review of the Forum's proposals to mitigate the effects of NextGen implementation on Alameda and Contra Costa counties in the NorCal Metroplex. Administrator Roberts said he had been with the FAA for 15 years. As regional administrator for the Western-Pacific Region he is responsible for an area that encompasses the states of California, Hawaii, Nevada and Arizona, and the Pacific Islands of Guam, Saipan, and the Northern Marianas... a very, very large region.

He said this is the third region that he's been the regional administrator in, having previously served in Seattle for the Northwest Mountain Region, and in Atlanta for the Southern Region. He was responsible for Metroplex projects in the Southern Region as well. He also served at FAA Headquarters

in Washington, D.C. He is a civil engineer and began his career as a consultant doing airport planning and engineering. He is also a commercial instrument rated pilot with about 1500 hours of flying time. All in all, he has about 40-years of experience in airport planning and engineering, the last fifteen of which have been with the FAA. Roberts said he really enjoys working in the field and being a part of the things happening in aviation today. He commended the Forum for its work, but wanted to let everyone know that by speaking tonight and addressing the issues set forth in the twelve written questions prepared by the Forum that this does not constitute a re-opening of the environmental determination that was completed in July 2014. The environmental assessment for the Northern California Metroplex Project Airspace Modernization Project was approved with a finding of no significant impact, or FONSI. It followed all of the rules and requirements spelled out in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). So, any actions that the FAA might take on the recommendations of the Forum or on behalf of the national airspace system users would constitute a new action or individual actions subject to their own environmental review and final determination. He said he wanted to be clear that this meeting does not constitute a re-opening of that document, but is just a continuation of new actions that the FAA might undertake.

Administrator Roberts said that the FAA has asked a lot of the Forum and groups such as this to provide public input and feedback. He said there are four current roundtables or noise forums in the San-Francisco-Oakland-San-Jose area, with a fifth one about to start in the South Bay that will address issues affecting communities in Santa Clara County. In addition, he said, he is working with four roundtables in Southern California, not to mention nine separate lawsuits. They have settled five and four remain active. In the Bay Area, he said, they continue to work on the recommendations of the San Francisco Roundtable and the select committee. The SFO Roundtable and select committee submitted close to 245 recommendations to the FAA, as well as the recommendations prepared by the Forum. Roberts said they have a lot of work going in both Northern and Southern California. The Southern California Metroplex project is the largest in the country. He noted also that he had the “dubious honor” of being responsible for carrying out the implementation of the court-ordered decision for the Phoenix Airspace Project, which was remanded back to the FAA by the U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. circuit, to be redone and the procedures modified. He noted also that the FAA has a Metroplex project in Las Vegas. As a result, the people in the Western-Pacific Region, and in Seattle, who are doing all the analysis work on these projects concurrently for the FAA Air traffic Organization are “extremely, extremely busy.”

Roberts expressed his appreciation to the Forum for being asked to attend tonight’s meeting, and for initially providing the FAA with its recommendations. He said he also appreciated the opportunity to meet with Port Aviation Director Francis. During this meeting they discussed the issues confronting the Forum member communities. It was at this meeting that Director Francis invited Administrator Roberts to attend the July Forum meeting. Roberts said he subsequently received a letter from the Co-Chairs also inviting him to attend the meeting. He said he asked for a list of questions, so that he could come prepared to respond to any specific issues raised by the Forum. Prior to the meeting he was provided with a list of questions compiled by the Port, SOSEB, and CLASS with the assistance of members of the Forum’s NextGen subcommittee. Forum members and those in attendance at the meeting received copies of the questions presented to Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Roberts explained his role as regional administrator as being the executive representative for the Administrator of the FAA in the Western-Pacific Region. He said this means that he is the face of the FAA in our area. In this capacity he has no direct line authority over anyone. He has ten staff members, five of whom are responsible for managing their office building. Of the other five, two are administrative, one is his deputy, and one is his senior advisor. He and his senior advisor are responsible for coordinating all the noise projects with the other FAA business lines. He

said he would like to say that he is responsible for everything, but he really has no authority. The only way he gets work done is through collaboration in working with the other business lines and through professional relationships. He said, he is really here to take feedback and input back to the agency and act, on behalf of the Forum communities, as an advocate with the rest of the FAA's business lines to make sure they understand what our concerns and our issues are, what our suggestions and recommendations are, and then follow up with them to try to get them to implement and at least address the Forum's questions and issues.

He said, he is not the technical expert on these matters, which are very complex and require a lot of review and analysis because the air traffic system is extremely complex and interrelated. No airport or community operates independently. People might think it's a big sky out there, but when you look at the proximity of San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland Airports by themselves, that airspace is highly integrated. You can't push in one spot without having an impact somewhere else in the system. The FAA has to look at the system as a whole because we can't really operate one area independent of another. For example, whenever the weather changes at one location, air traffic control has to turn airport operations and the air traffic system around in unison so that all of the airports operate together. He noted that the Bay Area, particularly San Francisco, is noted for its fog and weather conditions. With the advent of NextGen and the precision that satellite-based navigation brings, it is now possible to better track where aircraft are flying and to know their exact location within the air traffic control system. We still rely on radar, he said, but the satellite navigation and surveillance capabilities of NextGen provides access to more specific data. But, because the weather can and does change very rapidly at San Francisco International, it is necessary to keep the arriving aircraft as close in as possible before the weather closes in and reduces ceiling and visibility to the point that operations have to be cancelled. Such conditions can affect Oakland and San Jose Airports as well. Because of the proximity of the three large Bay Area commercial service airports to one and other and their respective runway geometries, the useable airspace is very tight and there is not a lot of space to move the airplanes around close to the surface. He said these are some of the challenges that the FAA has to deal with in order to ensure that things operate in a very safe way.

Administrator Roberts next addressed the pre-prepared questions provided for him. He noted that the Air Traffic Organization had reviewed and commented on some of the questions. He cautioned that some of the answers will not be the final answers, but at this stage must be considered only interim. He said he was pleased with Congressional Representative Lee's June 12, 2018 letter to Acting FAA Administrator Daniel K. Elwell, because it has "moved some of the responsibility out of the area we're responsible for here in the region up to the headquarters level." He said Rep. Lee's support and involvement is much appreciated and that the Forum's requests are of very high priority within the Western-Pacific Region. Roberts noted that he is putting as much pressure as he can on the Air Traffic Organization to be as timely, concise, and thorough as possible in its responses. The ATO advised him that they have prepared an interim response to the Forum's report and recommendations and that within the next 45 days ATO anticipates being able to provide the Forum with an updated response containing more details and specifics.

The administrator addressed the question of how the Oakland Noise Forum recommendations stack up, or where are they in line or in order of priority with respect to everything else that is going on. He said the FAA initially received the recommendations of the SFO Roundtable and the select committee, which were followed by the Forum subcommittee recommendations and San Jose's recommendations afterwards. These recommendations were taken in the order that they were received, but, in the end, they all have to be looked at together because they can't do things at one airport independently or in a vacuum without considering the potential impact it would have on the other airports. The FAA has to make sure the system operates in unison and without creating conflicts

between the other airports. To the question of would it help to prioritize the Forum's recommendations, he replied that they have a process that they must go through that is spelled out in their orders as to how they process airspace cases. He said they don't cherry-pick projects, but if in their initial review they find some "low-hanging fruit," they can do something if it results in only minimal impact. If this generates a positive response, they will work on it while continuing to work on the other projects in unison to ensure consistency. He said the FAA creates new or revised air traffic procedures every 56 days and will put out about 300 new procedures or amendments to existing procedures during each of these 56-day periods. However, he noted, there is a full environmental process they have to go through before they can implement any changes. He said they have to do noise modeling and analyses, air quality analyses, and air traffic simulation. Considerable staff training is also required to ensure that air traffic controllers are familiar with the new procedures.

Roberts offered that because lay people are not experts in the field, they often ask if the recommendations they have made are turned down as being not feasible technically, can they not be tweaked to make them feasible? People say, "Why can't you just push them here or push them there? We don't ever see an airplane there." He answered that there's very little of the airspace that isn't already spoken for or occupied sometime, some way, and in some manner or another, either with arrivals or departures, or transient traffic that's flying through the area. He said, they evaluate these as part of a system, and they try not to cherry-pick. If there are minor tweaks that can be made, then they would take a second look at those. They're hopeful they'll be able to provide that assistance. Congress recently added eight additional positions to do noise work in the FAA. This means that the Western-Pacific Region will get one additional position, and the technical staff in Seattle will get two. He said they are hoping that this will give them some relief and enable them to provide services to the affected communities as expeditiously as possible.

With respect to NextGen issues, he said, people ask "Are you the only person we can talk to? If we can't get an answer here, is there anyone else we can talk to in order to expedite this?" Congresswoman Lee has addressed this issue with the acting FAA Administrator. She has elevated the questions up to Acting Administrator Elwell, and they come back down to us. We provide technical assistance, and our air traffic organization, our safety organization, and our environmental group evaluate all the recommendations and then submit our response back up to him for his signature. The FAA is a huge organization, with about 47,000 people. Thirty-thousand of whom are in the Air Traffic Organization. Many of these people are air traffic controllers, but there is a lot of staff that work these issues too. he said, his job is to serve as the horizontal integrator across all the various lines of businesses and organizations to make sure they're all talking to one another. He said he attends a lot of meetings and teleconferences; he pulls a lot of groups together and tries to advocate on behalf of the affected communities and noise forums to make sure that his organization understands the concerns and the urgency of the communities as a result of the FAA's air traffic procedures. He said this is but one of his "really big jobs."

Mr. Roberts reiterated that the FAA has to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), which sets forth the requirements for the conduct of environmental analyses by federal agencies, and what the environmental review criteria for federal projects are. Because these are federal projects or actions, the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) does not apply. He said, people ask "If we had more noise complaints, would that raise or elevate the urgency of all of this?" His response was that "It's really not the number that's important; it's the quality of the information [provided]," as well as the level of detail. He added that, "If someone comes to us with specific issues, with specific information, it really helps us understand what the problems are or what the issues are all about." Two thousand noise complaint "robo" calls saying that someone just heard an airplane with no specifics does not give them a lot

to work with. It is the quality of the information that they receive that counts, not the number of calls.

He said when the FAA went to satellite-based navigation, they moved from where aircraft were dispersed over a wide area to one in which the planes follow precise tracks. With NextGen, the flight procedure is programmed into an airplane's automated flight management system. These arrival and departure procedures have specific names, and the pilot just types in that name, and the aircraft will follow that track very precisely. Previously, air traffic controllers would do vectors. They would give an aircraft a heading, saying "Fly this particular direction, and this altitude, at this speed." The new NextGen procedures have all that preprogrammed in. What this has done is to reduce the overall number of people under the flight tracks, but, unfortunately, for those who are under the tracks, the activity is now more concentrated. He said, people ask, "Is there a way that you can identify multiple tracks where you can still use NextGen capabilities..., but rather than a single track, have multiple tracks?" His answer was that the FAA is "constantly looking at ways to improve the system, to improve the efficiency of the system, to maintain at least the same or a higher level of safety but also being very, very cognizant of the environmental effects it's having on the individuals below those tracks." He noted, there is a lot of work going on right now on this, but they don't have the capability of dispersing aircraft onto tracks A, B, C and D. The system doesn't have the capability to do that, nor do the avionics or the electronics onboard the aircraft have the capability to have alternative procedures in there at this time. However, he said, they're constantly working on this type of technology, and at the speed technology is moving, they're hopeful they will have some ability to do this in the future.

The administrator commented that, everyone seems to think that if they don't get an answer from the FAA, they need to go to their Congressional Representatives. He noted that there are 56 Congressional Representatives in California, and that "at least half of them have [him] on speed dial." He said they are working with them all the time. His goal is to work at the district level as much as possible, so he's working with the local district staffs, because that's really where they are most closely in touch with their constituents to get the true answers. If they can avoid things going to Washington, it helps them because they can solve the problems a lot quicker than if they go to Washington first. But if they do, then they work through them on high priority. However, it is important to know that it was Congress that directed the FAA to modernize the air traffic control system and move away from the 1940s and 1950s technology that we've been using for so many years now. But, he added, Congress is responsible to the people, as their constituents, and they do recognize that that directive did create some unintended consequences. The FAA continues to work with Congress, and they provide the laws that give the FAA the latitude and freedom to improve the system.

Administrator Roberts addressed the fact that the FAA works very closely with the individual airports, and that Aviation Director Francis and his team at OAK have a very active noise office that does a good job keeping track of noise data and complaints. He said, this is the best source of information for the FAA, and that they rely on the airports to keep track of this information. He noted that they recently held a summit in Seattle for what they call their "Core 30" airports, which are the 30 busiest airports in the United States. The Western-Pacific Region has eight of the busiest airports in the U.S. The directors of these airports attended the meeting, and another one is scheduled for San Diego in the immediate future. The purpose of these meetings is to bring together these airports to learn their common problems, discuss best practices, and determine what the FAA can do to enhance and improve community engagement so that they can all work together in a more collaborative fashion. He said that this pretty much concluded the questions received from the Forum, and he thanked the Forum for providing them. He said he was here tonight to listen, and to hear any

comments and questions that are presented. He is looking forward to getting the questions and to forwarding them to the appropriate subject matter experts for answers. He thanked the Forum for the opportunity to come to tonight's meeting.

Facilitator McClintock thanked Mr. Roberts and requested that he provide the Forum with a written response to the Forum's prepared questions. Roberts responded that he would do so. The facilitator polled the members of the Forum for their questions or comments:

- Co-Chair Jacobs (Alameda) said he appreciated what Mr. Roberts had to say, but there are two issues in Alameda/BFI that were previously discussed with the FAA that are of great importance to the community, and which can be dealt with outside NextGen. One is the HUSSH procedure. He asked why this cannot be resolved locally (i.e. by Sacramento [Northern California TRACON]) since it has no effects on other communities. The HUSSH was developed as part of NextGen to replace the SILENT procedure that was in effect prior to Nextgen. We request that the FAA adjust the HUSSH departure procedure to restore the ground track of the prior SILENT SID. This can be done by simply moving the HUSSH way-point slightly further south.

The second is regarding OAK9 and CANDEL departures, along with the recent designation of this runway from 29 to 30, is bringing departing aircraft closer to the BFI/Alameda shoreline. The proposed adjustment would move aircraft ground tracks and noise contours away from the BFI/Alameda shoreline. It doesn't appear that this change would create a conflict with SFO departures. He asked why an RNAV procedure cannot be developed locally, since it does not have any effects on the neighboring communities, and establishing an RNAV procedure for these would be highly beneficial to the neighborhood around the airport in general.

- Alameda Mayor Trish Herrera Spencer thanked Administrator Roberts. She asked for a show of hands by the people in the audience from CLASS [Citizens League for Airport Safety and Serenity].
- Edward Bogue (Hayward) said when the Metroplex was first presented to us by the FAA, we told them that the consolidation of air traffic into discrete paths would have a greater impact than was the case with the ground-based system with more dispersed tracks. The impact was even greater than we anticipated. It would be better if the new tracks could be dispersed or spread out over a larger area.
- Cindy Horvath (representing Alameda County Board of Supervisors) thanked Mr. Roberts and said she appreciated hearing his tone of collaboration because we haven't always felt it in this process.
- Ernest DelliGatti (Alameda County) said Mr. Roberts stated that he was not here to reopen the FAA's 2014 environmental plan because it's a done deal. DelliGatti said he thought the FAA should use it as a marker, because the data that were used "was flawed from the get-go." He said that if you look at when NextGen began, the number of noise complaints that were being tracked by the Oakland Airport from 2015 increased from 5,252 to a total of 49,544 in 2016. These are the latest numbers. We don't have any from 2017 or 2018. But, he said, he can almost guarantee that the numbers have significantly increased by a factor of over a thousand percent because in those two data points, 2015 to 2016, the percentage of noise complaints increased 843 percent. He said the problem has gotten worse and the citizens can't wait for it to be resolved. He said anything Mr. Roberts could do to give the residents of Alameda County any relief would be greatly appreciated.

- Peter Marcuzzo (Oakland) thanked Mr. Roberts for his presentation, and said he did not want to expand on what Mr. DelliGatti had stated so well. He added that everyone was anxiously awaiting the FAA's release of its report in 45 days.
- Asres Kaffl (Union City) said the last time he saw the information from the FAA it could take two years to get some things done. So, when he heard 45 days, he was much more optimistic. He added that, as a group, the Forum seemed to concentrate of departures. In Union City, he said, the issue is arrivals. He asked if the FAA was only interested in departures, because arrivals are of concern to Union City, Fremont and Hayward. He asked that the FAA consider both arrivals and departures.
- Co-Chair Benny Lee (San Leandro City Council) thanked Administrator Roberts for his presentation and said that he was looking forward to continuing the working relationships and collaboration that have been established. He wants to make sure that these channels of communication remain open. Mr. Lee said he had the opportunity to talk with Administrator Roberts for some time before the meeting. He said they discussed the procedures and practices of the air traffic controllers and pilots, and their training as well. He said it was important that pilots and controllers adhere to procedures, unless in emergencies. When the air traffic controllers or the pilots do not adhere to the procedures, that's when we have noise issues that result in greater impacts to the public. Benny commented on studies of the impacts of noise on people's health. He agreed with Mr. Kaffl about arrivals being part of the problem because San Leandro is also under the approach path to the airport. The health of the people living under the approach path was of concern to him. He asked Mr. Roberts to try to accelerate the process of moving forward with more Part 36 Stage 4 aircraft. He said was looking forward to working with Mr. Roberts.
- Aviation Director Bryant Francis expressed his appreciation on behalf of the Port of Oakland, the airport, and the Forum to Mr. Roberts for agreeing to meet with him recently, and for being here tonight to address the Forum and the community. He noted it was good that Mr. Roberts was here to listen to the concerns of the community, and to take what he has learned back to the FAA and its various offices for consideration and follow-up. He thanked Mr. Roberts again for coming here tonight.

The facilitator said it was now time to hear from the public on this agenda item. He asked that anyone who wished to speak to please fill out a speaker's card and hand it in to him. He called the first public speaker:

- Ty Allison (Lafayette) said that his area has become an "air traffic intersection" that is experiencing the highest volume of eastbound departures from San Francisco and Oakland along with a sharp increase in lower elevation jets. He said, unlike other areas which may have a couple of flight paths, we experience multiple paths coming from different directions, all from San Francisco and Oakland. This leads to overhead flights coming back to back from different directions and creating a non-stop rumble throughout our homes. He said he had printed out some diagrams showing the problem. One track in particular runs approximately 45 degrees from San Francisco through Moraga and Lafayette right behind his home. It's being used with increasing frequency and an increase in lower elevations. Quite often these jets fly over one after the other only a couple of minutes apart, again creating a non-stop rumble in the air. As an example, he noted, this past Sunday we had 93 jets that

flew this path and many at significant lower altitudes than normal. He said, what is additionally troubling is that one of the goals of NextGen is, purportedly, to save fuel, yet a great number of the flights on this northeast path are southeast or southern destinations, which defeats fuel efficiency by flying in the wrong direction. Our area gets the bulk of the 7 a.m. flights when most flights from San Francisco and Oakland are in our direction, including a steady flow of UPS and FedEx flights.

- Linda D. Hoffman (Oakland/Piedmont Pines) said she wished to speak in support of continuing to address the airplane noise impact on our lives. She said, she and her husband moved into their home in Piedmont Pines off Ascot in 1992. They are exactly 1,200 feet in elevation and directly in the crosshairs of the San Francisco and Oakland airplanes. A major quantity of the planes are only at 3,700 feet over her home. Direct impacts include the time-consuming process of virtually non-stop tracking by phone app regarding 40 to 60 planes a day. She said she recorded the highest of 120 per day on one occasion. Tracking is irritating and time consuming and eventually caused her an injury called "trigger finger" from holding her phone in a fixed position so much. A painful shot was the result and ear infections and then ear plugs. She said they hear planes around the clock. The FedEx jets come into Oakland around midnight, and 7:00 a.m. is typically a full onslaught. So, they bought a white noise machine for relief. It didn't really help. Noise canceling headphones don't help much either. They've completely lost the use of their gardens, decks and patios. She said, their home was built by the founders of the Hillside Gardeners Club, and their beautiful gardens are of little use to anyone because you can't actually relax and converse outside anymore with the jets overhead. She concluded that they have completely lost their natural air conditioning as they can no longer open any of the windows, especially at night. So, they had to purchase an air conditioner, the "racket" of which is a counterpoint to the loss of the bird songs they used to enjoy every morning.
- Michael Bostick (Oakland/Montclair) commented that he was pleased that Administrator Roberts could be here tonight and that it's been a long time since Glen Martin was here. A little too long, he said, adding that we need to have an open channel, as was suggested, in which we can directly complain to the FAA so there is a system in which a qualitative complaint can be made directly. He said he lives in the Oakland Hills in Montclair, and the thing about this is that there is an interesting dynamic between the quiet and the noise. When WNDSR came over Montclair, it was such a shock. And, of course, the San Francisco departures are unbelievable. It has basically ruined our lives. He said, he knows he speaks for a lot of people who can't and don't complain, and don't understand the opportunity to complain, and are not represented here but nonetheless exist in vast numbers. He said, he appreciated the fact that Mr. Roberts understood their pain and suffering and could advocate for them in Washington, D.C. He hoped that Mr. Roberts had the capability to make an impact on the people in Washington and is able to direct resources properly to forward this program.
- Reva Fabrikant (Oakland) said she is with Save Our Skies East Bay (SOSEB) and wished to thank Mr. Roberts for coming to the meeting, the Forum for holding the meeting, and for the community's response. It was a wonderful turnout. She also thanked Rep. Barbara Lee for representing the community and sending letters on our behalf, and thanked Jose Hernandez for his efforts also. She said she hoped that in the future she could thank Administrator Roberts for advocating on behalf of the community. She asked about notification for the Metroplex environmental review, saying that she has lived in the area for the past 10 years and did not remember ever seeing an advertisement about a meeting. She wanted to know

what public meetings were held for the Metroplex project, when and where they were held, and how they were advertised. She also wished to know how high a priority the East Bay is if it has taken over a year to get a response from the FAA. She suggested that any future meetings include community members. She said, don't just come to our meetings, but invite us to come to yours so we can speak on our own behalf. We have technical experts who would be happy to attend. Her last point was to ask "how can you expect your average citizen to give a qualitative comment when we hear planes and don't know where they're coming from and don't have the time to check?" People are burned out complaining. A better procedure is needed.

- Teri Chalmers (N. San Leandro) said she wants to thank Jose Hernandez for the work he's done through Barbara Lee's office. She thanked Mr. Roberts for his presentation, and said that after hearing him speak, she thought that one of the things that would be very encouraging for herself and other people in the audience would be to see some sort of incremental movement. Something where you can say, "Okay. Yes, we do have these concentrated flight paths, but we're really going to pursue alternatives to those flight paths and at least broaden things out so it's not so completely dispersed over our homes." If you can make some incremental changes like that, she thought it would be very meaningful to the people here. She is looking forward to seeing the FAA report in 45 days and hopes that it will have some good news.
- Leslie Ransbottom (Oakland/SOSEB/Chair of Forum NextGen subcommittee) thanked the administrator. Based on Rep. Lee's letter, she asked when the FAA planned to meet with Lee's staff, and with the Noise Forum and the community to develop an action plan. She said the residents of the East bay were starting to "feel like the ugly stepchild" of this whole Metroplex issue. The Roundtable and select committee received concrete information within 14 months of submitting their report(s). After 13 months, the East Bay got an interim report that had nothing of significance. She noted that the SFO report had 250 recommendations, while the Forum's report had only 35. She said it was our understanding that the two reports were being reviewed concurrently. So, again, she said she was looking forward to the FAA report in 45 days to see if there will be any additional information. She was also looking forward to the meeting with the FAA to get some solid information and to move things forward.
- Kurt Peterson (W. Alameda) thanked Mr. Roberts for coming. He said he knows the administrator is going through a lot on this, but if the FAA had implemented NextGen correctly by telling people what was going on, instead of presenting it as being completed, it would have saved everyone a lot of stress. About four years ago, a young lady came down from Seattle and told us, "This is, basically, what you'll get." There was no input from us. Maybe in the future you can do it a little better, and we won't have to go through this again. In addition, Co-Chair Jacobs brought a key point concerning the HUSSH procedure. He said he did not know why it can't be implemented right away, and on a constant basis. It doesn't seem to significantly interfere at all with San Francisco departures. He would like to see some quick action on this because it affects all of Alameda. He said, he was aware of where "moving one flight pattern to another can create a problem because whoever you move it over is not going to be happy, but we have a bay that's not being utilized properly."
- Michael Langan (Oakland) thanked the administrator and said he was pleased that he's here to listen to the community's complaints. He said that, he and many of the people here tonight are long-time residents and homeowners in the Oakland hills, i.e. pre-dating the NextGen flight paths. Of particular concern is the WNDSR procedure. It has gotten worse. Not

only are the flights coming in more frequently, they're coming in lower, they're bigger, they're louder, they're dirtier, and they wake us up. On behalf of everybody who lives on his street, a good 60 homes, many with small children living directly under these low-flying planes, they see it every day. What's happened this year is that they are not just arrivals, but departures as well. He said, they have departures from Oakland that fly over their homes within a minute of the flights that are arriving from the northwest. They also have departures coming out of San Francisco. It's like a three-layer cake. On any given day, we can look straight up and see not one, not two, but three planes; large aircraft, crisscrossing directly over our homes. This happens to everybody on our street, and to everybody in the Oakland hills. We are at an elevation where these low flights are just too low for the people living at 1,000 feet above sea level.

- Trey Lindseth (Oakland) thanked Administrator Roberts for coming to the meeting, saying that his coming and spending time with us was appreciated. He said he lives in the Oakland hills on a small street about four blocks long with a lot of small children. As Mr. Langan noted, the elevation of their homes is at one thousand feet above sea level. When you have planes going overhead at 3,000 feet or 3,500 feet, he really wonders to what extent the environmental impact assessment for the NextGen implementation took this difference into account. Their homes are 2,000 feet away from these planes. As he said, they have many children, young children, on their street. What is the impact to them? So, he really would like to get more information on this and to make sure that whatever is implemented in the future takes the effects of this on peoples' health into account.
- Barton Lounsbury (North Oakland) resides at an elevation of 1,200 feet in the Oakland hills. He said, he commiserates with his neighbors with respect to the impact of aircraft noise in the hills. He said he was senior counsel for environmental law at the University of California, and served as counsel to a federal agency “that acts on compliance with NEPA.” He emphasized that he understands the NEPA process and environmental impact analysis quite well. He said if he were representing a client who has been sued in virtually every jurisdiction where this [Metropolitan] program has been deployed, and if he was Mr. Roberts, and half the California representatives had him on speed dial, he would be concerned that he'd done something wrong. There may be Congressional mandates to modernize airspace, or modernize the FAA system of directing flights, but these are not reasons to postpone remedies for the East Bay. They are also not reasons to defer responsibility to someone else or to legal compliance. These are real issues that affect thousands of us. And, he said, he really hopes you'll be able to accelerate what has been a painfully slow process for many of us in addressing this concern.
- Solomon Weingarten (Oakland) asked if the FAA realizes how much they have upset people? He said, there does not seem to be any urgency on the part of the FAA to respond, as indicated by the length of time they took to respond to the Forum's recommendations. When the FAA finally responded, there was very little substantive information. He said, the people come to the Forum to speak, but this does not seem to get back to Washington, D.C. You [Administrator Roberts] say that the EIS is a done deal; that you followed all the criteria for this environmental action. According to your finding, if I reached into my pocket and took out an air horn and set it off in this room, which would hurt ears, that would be okay because it would be averaged over the length of time of this meeting; therefore, it would average out to nothing. Do you understand how ludicrous your position is and how ludicrous you appear to the people you are trying to deal with? He said, my question is “do we have to go to D.C. to be heard or are you going to take our word back to them? Do we have to show up in D.C. with air horns

or with lawsuits that will cost everyone a lot more time?" We need to see some action on the part of the FAA in getting back to us and showing us what progress is being made.

- Juliet Eichberg (Broadmoor district, North San Leandro) thanked administrator Roberts for attending and listening to our concerns. She presented data from April 28, 2018, from the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. She said she sat with her phone listening to the planes coming out of SFO over her house. They came at 8:02, 8:03, 8:09, 9:00, 9:11, and 9:13. The average altitude was 5,779 feet and the average decibel level was 59. This averages one flight every four minutes over her house. She said she can't sleep. She gets migraines and is stressed. She can't go outside and she can't study. She said, she is studying for her Master's Degree and can't even do that because of the planes. She said she would like to see the planes dispersed more, so that no one corridor is subject to continual overflight.
- Virginia Vogel (Oakland) said she would e-mail her questions to the facilitator.
- Ahna Dominski (Pacifica) said, you may wonder why someone from Pacifica is here tonight. She is here, she said, because jets from the Oakland Airport fly over her home located in the coastal town of Pacifica, south of San Francisco, adding jet noise and jet pollution to her once peaceful and quiet neighborhood. One would never imagine that a small coastal town would experience jet noise from the Oakland Airport, but with NextGen implementation from the FAA, jets from SFO and Oakland fly over her neighborhood every two to three minutes from 5:30 in the morning till late evening, seven days a week. Departing southbound Oakland jets fly over San Francisco near Potrero Hill, disturbing all towns south of San Francisco and all homes, schools and parks, etc. in their flight path before arriving at LAX, Las Vegas, Burbank, Long Beach, Orange County, etc.

The Oakland Airport needs to stop bombarding their jet noise and jet pollution over other counties. Those counties aren't getting any of the profit from the airport; only abuse. Jets need to fly over water, not homes, whenever possible, and fly higher and faster. She said she works in Hayward, and at work she gets to hear jets on their arrival path to the Oakland Airport. Every few minutes jets that never used to fly overhead now fly low and loud. The implementation of NextGen has destroyed the quality of life in the San Francisco Bay Area for everyone. The FAA needs to listen to the public and remedy the situation before a public nuisance class action lawsuit forces them to do so. We are tired of the empty promises of the FAA to remedy the problem they started in the first place.

- Tony Dominski (Pacifica) said he and his wife use stopjetnoise.net. It's an application web site that files noise complaints and, through GPS, you can track where the jets have come from, and what the altitude is. We have over 220 jets flying every day from SFO and Oakland. And the problem is that there is a solution for this which they've heard talked about at the SFO Roundtable—but nothing is getting done. He commented that one way to get the qualitative flight information that Mr. Roberts said he needed in order to evaluate noise complaints, is to use apps like stopjetnoise.net. He said he can't stay home all day and do this he is burned out. What he wants the FAA to do is buy superhigh tech NextGen ready monitors and put them in the areas where people are complaining, and then you can find out yourselves with qualitative information. Why should we have to call up and complain, he asked? The problem has to be fixed, and the solution is to go higher, raise the deck, not 7,000, 6,000, or 5,000 feet. It used to be 20,000 feet.
- Michael Sagehorn (Oakland/Montclair) said he is a teacher, and prior to that a Marine officer for 22 years. He knows a lot about jet noise, having served at MCAS Cherry Point, and feels

like his house is under Cherry point 4X. He said, he feels that types and the frequencies of the aircraft coming in are as low 3,000 feet and that's really, really close. He said, he echoed the issues and concerns of his neighbors, and that there needs to be a sense of urgency in the FAA to fix this. It's also not safe. You should fly over the bay or over the Pacific Ocean because fish don't complain.

- Kathryn Muir (Oakland) thanked Mr. Roberts for coming. Now, she said, if the FAA would just do something, this would be really, really helpful. She said she is very tired from lack of sleep. She said they cannot sleep at night because of the noise, and has dangerously high blood pressure as a result. She believes this to be killing her. In addition to re-arranging all the paintings and artwork in her house, every week she has to go around and correct them again from the rumbling and the vibrations of the jets. This has really screwed up peoples' lives in a really big way. She can't understand, with all the technology, that the computer design for NextGen can only handle so many flight paths, when, in the past, they were so dispersed and not as much of a problem. She proposed moving the WNDSR approach to the east as it seems to be low-hanging fruit. This has gone on for three years and people are being heavily impacted.

The facilitator said that was the last of the public speakers, but he did want to make sure that Jose Hernandez was given the opportunity to speak. He said that he wanted Jose to know that the Forum and everyone in the audience appreciates his efforts, along with those of Rep. Lee, in helping us to move this issue forward.

Mr. Hernandez said he did not have a lot to say other than what was already said in the letter that was sent to the FAA administrator in D.C. by the Congresswoman. He did want to take the time to thank the regional administrator, Mr. Roberts, for coming, and noted that we are looking forward to working with him and with his staff. We're hoping we get more concrete answers in the next report that, as was stated, we'll be getting in the next 45 days. We're also hoping he said that the report will set forth concrete timelines and milestone dates, that we can accomplish together. Andres Kaffl offered that the Forum should send an appreciation letter to Ms. Lee if we haven't already done so. The facilitator said this would be done through the Co-Chairs.

Alameda Mayor Spencer said normally the mayor would not attend these meetings, but that she started coming because this is such a big issue. Earlier, she said, she asked people from her community to raise their hands, but this is what this meeting looks like all the time. She said she was very grateful that Mr. Roberts was here, but as the people have said, "this cannot continue because they are giving up the quality of their lives." You should not have to move. You should, in fact, be able to be in a home you've always lived in without having the federal government decide they're going to fly these jets over your home so that it actually becomes an unsafe situation. She said she hears complaints like these regularly, which is why she is here. It is the FAA's job to not ignore these complaints, but deal with them. It is completely inappropriate for people to feel that they and their children are being harmed by something that our federal government has done. They did not move into homes that had these planes flying like this; that is a new condition. We do not have to assume, when we purchase a home, that planes will be all of a sudden over our homes like this. So, it is a critical situation. In fact, when she went to Washington, D.C. — as has Co-Chair Lee—she has had meetings with the FAA, where her delegation was graciously received, but nothing has been resolved, and this has to be addressed.

Co-Chair Benny Lee said he is a technologist and that technology is not a panacea. It may give you a lot of information and a lot of data., but someone needs to leverage that data. What he heard tonight was that many people are collecting flight information and reporting this in the form of

noise complaints, but it seems to go nowhere. He said, what we need are solutions, e.g. we need to raise the altitudes, if possible. We need to find solutions. We need to leverage technology to help us to find a way to solve these problems. The information that we are compiling is available to the FAA because we're measuring it on a regular basis. They can analyze that information and see what the impact is. What you need to understand is what the data represents. That data has to change so it has less impact. So, let's work together and try to find smart solutions to solve these problems.

James Nelson offered that one of the themes that he's hearing, and has also experienced in Berkeley, is that it's not just the sound level, but the frequency of the flyovers. If flight paths are concentrated over one area, as in Montclair with the WNSDR approach, the flights are frequent enough that they interrupt conversations in and outside of homes. So, he said, the big problem is the concentration of flight paths due to NextGen.

Walt Jacobs said that this was the worst crisis condition that he has seen since the Forum was created in 1998. When you're in a crisis condition, he said, people get angry -- although tonight he thought that everyone handled themselves really well. The problem is that we have no solution. The FAA needs to give us some solutions to show that they are an action-oriented organization, not just people who write long letters. He said, he has served on the Forum's NextGen subcommittee and has gone to meeting after meeting after meeting where we have studied things and analyzed things and done it right with lots of good information and advice from the community. These are not a bunch of screaming neighbors, but are people who really care and who have come up with some great questions that were incorporated into the Forum's initial report to the FAA. He said, he suggested at the beginning of the evening that could have been dealt with six months ago, but, instead, the FAA has danced around the issue and done nothing. They need to show us some solutions. That's how you show you actually care.

But, Jacobs said, I understand the complexity of the situation when we hear that it's going to take six months for this and two years for that, and that they [the FAA] have to think of all the other airports and things like that, it is still very frustrating. He said he also understands what happened when they did the environmental analyses. Even though the process was in accordance with federal law, it was still rammed through with the minimum required effort to comply with NEPA. When you start doing things that can affect the population, it seems to him, that you might want to run some tests before you implement things. But it never happened that way; it was just adopted and implemented. Had the procedures been tested, they might have learned that there were going to be problems. So as a local citizen who has been personally involved with the Forum for too many years to count, he takes pride in the Forum's cooperative relationship with the airport and the many accomplishments stemming from this relationship over the years. He would like to have a similar relationship with the FAA, where they do everything within their power to come to fair and equitable solutions.

Facilitator McClintock again thanked Administrator Roberts for meeting with the Forum and members of the community. McClintock said all of the questions and comments received tonight will be entered into the minutes of the meeting and serve as a permanent record of the proceedings. For those who wish to submit written questions or comments, his contact information and e-mail address are on the agenda. Before closing this agenda item, he asked everyone in attendance to give themselves a big round of applause because they have been really, really great. He said he appreciated the community members coming out tonight and expressing their issues and concerns.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Acceptance of 1st Quarter 2018 Noise Report

The facilitator introduced this agenda item and said that he understood that Co-Chair Lee had some questions. Lee said that the tables in the report do not have totals; whereas, the graphs have totals. He said, this was confusing and it would be better if both the charts and graphs had totals. Co-Chair Lee also asked why the Runway 10R/L compliance number had decreased—going down from 76% to 68%. He said, “We are going in the wrong direction,” and asked what could be done to correct this situation. Matt P. Davis replied that, this was a challenging question because air traffic control cannot discuss noise abatement procedures when aircraft are on a short final approach. This, he said, is really an outreach issue that needs to be looked into. The Port has hired a consultant to help them with such outreach, and to find ways to get the word out to the FBOs and pilots to help ensure they're aware of the appropriate procedures. He said, they will be working on it this winter, because they don't see the problem too often in the summer. They are looking at instant messaging and improved outreach to the FBOs and, by extension, the flight crews that operate on the North Field. Co-Chair Lee asked if these were recurring flights by the same pilots or many different flights. Davis replied, that he would have to look into this, but believed that it is primarily transient aircraft that fly in only once or twice, and that it is easy to miss the noise abatement procedures. Lee thanked Matt and moved to receive and file the noise report. Seconded by Walt Jacobs.

Kurt Peterson asked a question about what constituted compliance or non-compliance. He said, he gets letters in response to his complaints saying that the flights were compliant, were not compliant, or were not compliant because of SFO traffic. Davis replied that the issue here is whether the departing OAK flights are making right turns below 3,000 feet over Alameda. Mr. Davis stated that if there is an air traffic conflict that creates the early right turn, that is considered to be a compliant flight. Air traffic control had to turn that aircraft for specific reasons, so, that's considered to be compliant. If it's not, that flight is considered to be non-compliant. Staff researches each complaint and make the determination if a flight is an air traffic generated turn or whether or not the turn is necessary to avoid other air traffic. Jesse Richardson added that, the summary report for 1st Quarter 2018, indicates three non-compliant departures. There were 59 departures that were excused because there were air traffic conflicts with SFO departures. In answer to Mr. Peterson's question, he said, “Those air traffic conflict flights were executed in compliance with the noise abatement program.” Mr. Peterson replied that the numbers cited “were for a different period of time than what [he] saw before,” but that it showed 6% non-compliant. This was based on what was in the noise report for the last meeting. Ms. Stockdale asked if Mr. Peterson was referring to the Runway 30 east departure. Peterson replied, that was correct, and that he had been looking at the “wrong thing.”

There being no further discussion, the facilitator called the question. Motion was approved, with Mr. DelliGatti abstaining. The facilitator noted that there is one announcement that did not make it onto the agenda. It is the annual dues notice, and Forum member organizations should have received their copies in the mail.

B. Honoring Vince Mestre's Service to Forum

Facilitator McClintock announced that this agenda item was to honor Vince Mestre, the Forum's noise consultant for his almost 20-years of service to the Forum. McClintock read from the Certificate of Appreciation being presented to Mr. Mestre for his technical expertise and lasting contributions to the Forum. Mestre was also presented with an engraved brass ship's bell for his boat as a token of the Forum's appreciation. Assistant Director of Aviation, Kristi McKenney, expressed her gratitude and thanks on behalf of the Port of Oakland, the Airport, and herself to Vince for his service to the Forum. Co-Chair Jacobs said that he, along with former San Leandro Mayor, Tony Santos, was instrumental in hiring Vince out of several candidates. He said, that the Port told them, “Hire who you want.” So, Jacobs said, Vince has been a representative of the members of the Forum

exclusively ever since its beginning. He said, he appreciates everything that he has done over the years for us.

Co-Chair Lee said, that while the Forum is a place where the community can come to express its concerns and ask questions about problems, almost everyone looks forward to Vince's presentations because they are very educational, engaging and fun. Director Francis said that his professional relationship predates his time at OAK, and thanked Vince for his great work at the Long Beach Airport. He said, when he came to Oakland, he was pleased to find that Vince had a long-standing relationship with the Noise Forum. He said, over the years Vince has brought us great information and he thanked him for all of his great work. He congratulated Vince on his retirement. Mr. Mestre thanked all for their sentiments and said, "The Forum, by far, has been the most rewarding work he's done because of the closeness with the community, the airport, the airlines and the FAA." This is a very, very unique relationship, and he has worked at airports all over the world. The Forum, he said, "...is by far, the most functional community airport working group he's ever seen, anywhere."

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (APRIL 18, 2018)

The facilitator noted that members of the Forum had received a copy of the draft minutes for the April 18, 2018 Forum meeting with their agenda materials. He asked if there were any questions or comments. Ernest DelliGatti asked about certain action items from the last meeting. The facilitator said these would be covered under agenda item 9A. Mayor Spencer moved approval of the draft minutes. Seconded by Co-Chair Lee. Motion passed with one no vote (DelliGatti) and one abstention (Bogue).

5. 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 and air quality at Oakland International Airport. He said he had not received any speaker's cards on this agenda item, and asked if anyone wished to comment. There being no one who wished to comment, the speaker closed the public comment period.

6. ELECTON OF OFFICERS

The facilitator announced that the Forum has but two officers—its Co-Chairs. There is an elected official co-chair and a citizen representative co-chair. Both Benny Lee, the current elected Co-Chair and Walt Jacobs, the current citizen Co-Chair, indicated they wished to stand for reelection. The facilitator placed their names in nomination and asked for a second. Councilmember Susan Wengraf seconded. The facilitator asked if there were any additional nominations. There being no additional nominations, the two Co-Chairs were reelected by acclamation.

7. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

A. Update

i. Rep Barbara Lee Letter to FAA

The facilitator noted that this item was kept on the agenda in order to discuss Congresswoman Barbara Lee's letter to the FAA. He thanked Jose Hernandez of Rep. Lee's staff for getting this taken care of in a timely manner. The letter opens the door to having a face-to-face meeting with the FAA, along with Port staff and members of the Forum's NextGen subcommittee, so we can begin to get direct answers to some of our questions. As for an action item, the facilitator asked for a consensus on writing a letter to Ms. Lee thanking her for her help and continuing support of the Forum. The Forum members concurred, and the facilitator said he would work with the Co-Chairs to draft the letter. Matt

Pourfarzaneh offered that both CLASS and SOSEB have written thank you letters to Rep. Lee and said that such a letter from the Forum would be appreciated. Susan Wengraf said the Berkeley City Council has done the same.

8. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

A. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items

Matt P. Davis said they talked about enhanced web interface for the public and Port staff. The program is called Viewpoint and is provided by the Port's noise equipment contractor—Briel & Kjaer. The new program provides Forum members and members of the community additional insight into the data used by the Port to perform noise analyses. He said they were currently in the process of purchasing the system. The Viewpoint system provides a lot of data for its users. He said they can prepare their own noise reports, look at specific data, and poll the system by zip code, airline, flights, and time of day. He said they'll still be able to prepare reports, but the idea is to allow individuals access to the same data the Port uses. Again, Davis said, we have reached out to a number of people regarding the interface. We want to make sure it's user friendly for the community, but at the same time, provide the ability to dig into information to get what they need. Some people want to know only minimal information, and some people want a lot of detail. We're excited about this. He said that he would go into additional detail at the October Forum meeting.

Two other action items were discussed. One was a change to the SALAD departure that was worked out with air traffic control. SALAD is the nighttime departure off the North Field that requires an immediate right turn to avoid Bay Farm Island. Davis said, they made a slight adjustment. Previously, Runway 28L was used, which made it difficult to avoid the noise sensitive areas. Runway 28R has a little more space between the runway and houses. So, they've made the change with air traffic, and will be monitoring compliance rates. Davis said, they have had some successes, e.g. during the NBA finals, game two, there were no departures off the North Field—ATC worked hard to get them to takeoff from South Field. This involved a significant number of airplanes departing over a very short period of time. When the game was over, there were some 50 jets wanting to depart. It took considerable effort to get those planes to the South Field for takeoff. Matt thanked the FAA air traffic control personnel for their good work in handling the situation.

Matt continued, noting that they are still working on early morning flights from Southwest Airlines and others, and attempting to open the runway early after the regular Monday morning maintenance—the runway is closed from 12:30 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. for this work. If an aircraft wishes to depart South Field before 6:00 a.m. on a Monday, there is no runway available to them. As a result, he said, there are some North Field departures between 5:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. As a rule, however, airport staff is working hard to reopen the runway by 5:30 a.m., and even by 5:00 a.m. to prevent the flights from occurring off North Field. He said, they have been successful in achieving these many times, but now that the runway rehabilitation work has been completed they are back to the routine maintenance schedule. He said it is their hope that the 5:00 a.m. to 6:00 North Field departures will be the exception, rather than the rule. As for FedEx, he said, they continue to talk with FedEx on its fleet mix plans, and are monitoring what they are using, especially since the carrier is taking delivery of many aircraft.

Matt Pourfarzaneh commended Davis and the noise office staff for continuing to work on these issues. Howard Hintermeister said he's recently noticed a couple of weekend closures of taxiways, which have led to a lot of jet traffic off the North Field during the day for extended hours. He said, this appears to be new thing, and he does not recall this happening in recent years. Matt explained that this has been an exception. Because of the layout of the airport, he said, they have one taxiway that

can exit North Field to the South Field. Unfortunately, when they have to perform maintenance on the taxiway, they are required to close it so aircraft aren't able to make it to the South Field to depart. These operations are compliant with the noise abatement procedures, because there is no way for them to get to the South Field. These closures are not project related, but are due to maintenance needs at the time. He noted that, there will likely be a project in the fall that will require a couple closures. He said they will notify the community, and reach out to the various interest groups. Howard Hintermeister said, he did not recall this happening in the past, and, as a consequence, those aircraft having to depart from North Field should be counted as noncompliant. Davis replied that, typically, they don't have to close the taxiway that often and even though it has happened in the past, it is rare. Normally, he said, taxiways don't require a maintenance schedule like a runway does, so you shouldn't see these closures happening on a regular basis. He said they will monitor the situation, and keep everyone informed.

9. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

A. Update on Action Items from April 18, 2018 Forum Meeting

Doreen Stockdale started the update of the action items from the April 18 Forum meeting by noting that at this meeting there was a request to show how the complaints received by the Noise Office were obtained. She said, complaints can be reported in three different ways: by calling the noise hotline [(510) 563-6463]; via e-mail to oaknoiseprogram@portoakland.com; or via WebTrak. She compared the data from 2016 and 2017, broken down by the manner in which they were received. In 2016, she said, the majority of complaints were received via WebTrak, but in 2017 it became 50/50 between WebTrak and e-mail. She attributed the change to Montclair residents using the "stop.jetnoise.net" app to report their noise complaints. Montclair has a daily report on complaints received, which is forwarded to the airport noise office to be input into its noise complaint data base.

The Forum also wanted to know if there is a correlation between complaint numbers and operations and passenger volume. Rhea Gundry, from HMMH, said that the Forum's request was to analyze complaints and compare them to operations data at other large U.S. airports to see if there was any correlation, or if Oakland was unique in this respect. She said HMMH collected data from six large airports over the last 10 years--from 2008 to 2017. The complaint data came from the Baltimore-Washington International Airport, Chicago's O'Hare International and Midway Airports, San Diego International Airport, Seattle-Tacoma International Airport and San Francisco International Airport.

Ms. Gundry explained the information on the graphs she was presenting and the sources of the data presented for each airport. She clarified the reasons for the differences in flight operations numbers for the various airports, which included such things as a new runway at Chicago O'Hare. As for noise complaints, she noted that in 2014 complaints started to climb as a result of the introduction of software that allowed people to file noise complaints on-line, which made it easier for them to reach out to the airports and tell them what was going on.

All in all, she concluded, there does not appear to be a direct correlation between increased noise complaints and airline or passenger growth. Issues of major community interest, such as Metroplex flight path changes and large airport construction projects, e.g. the new Chicago runway, coupled with the availability of on-line noise reporting software, probably have more influence on increased noise complaints than does increased aircraft operations or passenger growth. In conversations with the SFO noise office, it was pointed out that there are many nuances in their noise complaint data. They believe that noise complaints have dropped over the past year because of the work of the SFO Roundtable and the hope that the FAA will continue to engage the community to seek solutions to Metroplex issues. Co-Chair Lee asked for a copy of the slide presentation. Ernie DelliGatti said, the data for the various airports was well and good, "but where is Oakland in all of this?" Ms. Gundry

replied that, as was stated previously, Oakland “does not have a direct correlation of the number of complaints to the [number of] operations.” Mr. DelliGatti replied that he had “some real concerns about the methodology.” He said, staff stated that, “in 2017 there was a total of 905 complaints.” Ms. Stockdale corrected him, saying there were “905 complainants, not complaints.” Mr. DelliGatti continued with his analysis of the Port’s reporting and analyses of the noise complaint data. He said, “the methodology does not make any sense...and keeps changing.” He said there needs to be another meeting with staff to reconcile the data inconsistencies he has pointed out. “the noise complaints are going up,” he said, “and people are angry.”

DelliGatti said he would like to make a motion to “follow this up and everything, because these numbers do not accurately reflect the number of noise complaints that people are calling in and the FAA is motivated by the number of noise complaints.” The motion was seconded by Co-Chair Jacobs. James Nelson said it was not clear how big a follow-up meeting would be.” The facilitator said he believed this should be worked out with Ernie and staff. Matt P. Davis said, if the Forum would like clarification on these issues, staff would arrange a meeting with Ernie and Walt. He said he needs to gain an understanding of what the Forum wants, and would work with Walt and Ernie to figure out exactly what would be discussed and what the meeting format would be. He said the Port has been accused of providing false data to the Forum, so, he needs to have an understanding from the Forum about what that is. It would help him because he’s not clear what the accusations are. DelliGatti replied, that, for the record, Matt and Doreen were not at the March meeting, where his issues were discussed and there was to be follow-up. Co-Chair Lee offered that some perspective was needed, and that the system for accounting for the noise complaint data needs to be enhanced through technology.

Doreen Stockdale offered that the action item for the 24-hour HUUSH procedure would have to be carried over to the October meeting. Kurt Peterson suggested that by assigning a number to everyone who calls in a noise complaint, it would be easier to keep track of their calls over a period of time. The facilitator called for the question on Mr. DelliGatti’s motion. Motion passed.

B. Viewpoint/Power BI websites.

Doreen Stockdale continued with an update on the status of the “Viewpoint” software currently in use at Reagan National Airport (DCA) in Washington, D.C. She said she had forwarded a link to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority complaints dashboard, noting that this is what is being proposed for implementation at Oakland. She said she was looking for volunteers from the Forum to work with airport staff to look at the DCA dashboard to determine if it fits the community’s needs, and, if not, recommend appropriate modifications. She said, the various components of the system can be moved around, added to, or deleted from the system. She said she was not looking for volunteers with technical expertise, just people who may be interested in helping fine tune the system. Doreen said they already have one volunteer from San Leandro. She said the Viewpoint system will allow individual members of the community to access and research the airport’s noise information and data.

Facilitator McClintock asked if this system would be capable of resolving the apparent discrepancies between the numbers of complaints that have been an ongoing issue for several meetings. Stockdale said, the program would show all of the data in the Port’s ANOMS system. Matt Pourfarzaneh volunteered, as did Teri Chalmers and Benny Lee. McClintock said that there will be an update on the progress of this project at the Forum’s October meeting. Doreen encouraged those who were sent the link to the MWAA website to try it out for themselves, and it represents an open data platform as has been requested by Co-Chair Lee. Lee asked if the Viewpoint system would help to address some of the issues that came up at tonight’s meeting, and whether it would automatically count all complaint calls. Stockdale said the system will have “voice detection” capabilities that will count all complaint

calls, even repetitive ones. Lee asked if complaints received by e-mail are “triaged.” Doreen said they were.

10. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

Christian Valdes of Landrum & Brown began with an update of the FAA reauthorization bill. He said the bill had passed the House earlier and was now in the Senate. He highlighted some of the likely provisions if, or when, the bill is approved:

- A study of the effect of noise on communities;
- A study to cover the relationship between aircraft speed, noise, safety and airport capacity, travel time and fuel burn. The impetus for this amendment was a finding by an MIT aeronautics professor that slowing aircraft departures by about 35 miles per hour could significantly reduce noise on the ground.
- The CLEEN program will continue. The Continuous Lower Energy, Emissions and Noise (CLEEN) Program is the FAA's principal environmental effort to accelerate the development of new aircraft and engine technologies and advance sustainable alternative jet fuels.
- The Government Accountability Office will do a study on whether air traffic controllers are trained on noise and health impact mitigation in addition to safety and efficiency, they will also study the prevalence of vectoring flights due to overcrowded departure and arrival paths, along with alternatives to this practice.
- The FAA will undertake a pilot study on the use of Stage 2 aircraft under certain conditions
- The FAA will evaluate alternative metrics to DNL 65 and the use of actual noise measurements during environmental assessments.
- The FAA will do a cost-benefit analysis of Stage 3 aircraft phaseouts.
- The FAA administrator is to determine appropriate revisions to land use compatibility guidelines as set forth in 14 CFR Part 150.
- The FAA is to exercise leadership in the creation of federal and international policies, regulations and standards relating to civil supersonic aircraft operations.

Christian advised that the FAA’s annoyance survey has been delayed again, and there is no assurance as to when it may become available. The results of this survey could revise the 40-year noise policy used by the FAA to estimate community annoyance. The FAA has requested more time to gather additional data, and to contact the public to clarify responses. The FAA has also requested public comment on its intention to establish a noise complaint portal for receiving complaints from the public. This is the second time they have made this request. The prior request for comments received only 21 comments. Some of the commenters were concerned the FAA would be duplicating efforts by airports that already have noise complaint systems.

On the Phoenix decision, Valdes said, a petition seeking a re-hearing was filed by Georgetown and Georgetown University because they think the three-judge panel misread the facts and should not have allowed the lawsuit to be filed after the 60-day window for appeal had closed. Georgetown also claims the FAA placed two illegal notices in local newspapers and excluded the mayor and D.C. city council from its mailing list. The U.S. Department of Justice told the U.S. Court of Appeals that no grounds exist for a re-hearing because the petitioners did not identify any genuine conflict in law or error of fact. The court has yet to rule. In Phoenix itself, the first of two required steps have been completed. The FAA implemented nine replacement RNAV departures which are intended to be similar to those routes flown prior to September 2014. The next step requires the FAA to consider feedback from the airspace procedures throughout the Phoenix area.

For Cleveland and Detroit, the FAA filed an EA for implementation of the Detroit Metroplex and concluded it will have no significant impact. The FAA stated that, when new procedures are implemented, some people might see aircraft where they did not previously fly. In Maryland, the State has filed a petition seeking review of the FAA changes to an approach path at Reagan National Airport, asserting the environmental review of the procedure was not appropriate. A second petition was also filed requesting the FAA to provide a supplemental environmental assessment for an RNAV procedure at Baltimore-Washington International Airport. However, Christian noted, these lawsuits were filed beyond the 60-day window allowed under federal law. The flight path changes and questions were implemented in 2014. The State of Maryland is also requesting that the FAA prepare a supplemental study to the Metroplex EA, which did not show the actual proposed routes with sufficient detail to allow residents to determine exactly what changes were proposed and how they would affect particular homes, schools, churches, parks, etc.

Christian said, the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), is considering a major update of the rules implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 (NEPA). The CEQ seeks public comment on potential revisions to the regulations to ensure a more efficient, timely and effective NEPA process. The CEQ wants to know if the terms "cumulative impact" and "significant impact" should be revised. Additionally, the CEQ wants to know if provisions in its regulations relating to categorical exclusions and environmental impact statement records of decisions and findings of no significant impact need to be revised. However, some environmental groups fear the current administration will use an update of the NEPA regulations to gut environmental laws which must be followed in implementing NextGen procedures. On the subject of NASA, he said, they have tested new technology that reduces airframe noise on landing by seven percent. They did this by adding chevrons to the leading edge in the landing gear and put a net stretched across the opening to alter air flow. Additionally, to reduce wing flap noise, NASA used an experimental flexible flap that would be seamless as opposed to the conventional flaps. In related news, NASA will fly an F-18 fighter jet over Galveston, Texas in November to produce loud sonic booms and quieter booms, all part of NASA's Supersonic Transport Program. These flights will take place to determine the public's reaction to quieter booms, also referred to as "low booms." Additional test flights are planned in 2023 when NASA will fly its X-59 Quest aircraft currently being built by Lockheed Martin.

In Heathrow news, Christian said, they have a "fly quiet and green program," which uses seven metrics to assess airline performance. LOT Polish Airlines moved from last place in the rankings in 2013 to second place in the latest results because they are now flying Boeing B-737 MAX aircraft. Heathrow is currently developing its five-year noise action plan and held a series of public consultation events, giving the public a chance to chime in on how the airport will handle noise in the future.

In the Southern California Metroplex the U.S. Department of Justice submitted a brief to the U.S. Court of Appeals stating the FAA used the correct noise metric (DNL) for assessing potential noise impacts from NextGen implementation. Furthermore, the DOJ opined, the FAA did not violate NEPA or the Clean Air Act. It was claimed that the FAA has an ongoing obligation to establish air traffic procedures that reduce aircraft noise and emissions. The DOJ declared that no such obligation exists. To the contrary, numerous statutory provisions delegating authority to the FAA made clear the agency's primary concerns must be safety and efficiency. Neither Congress nor the court ever imposed noise and emission reduction requirements on the FAA's design of new air traffic control procedures, the DOJ wrote. The DOJ noted that the FAA Authorization Bill of 2003, also called "Vision 100," provides a list of goals for implementing NextGen. The last goal makes it clear that noise and emissions should influence the design of NextGen procedures only when it's practicable to do so while achieving mandatory NextGen goals to improve safety, efficiency, and affordability.

Adams County is suing the City and County of Denver because they think that Denver International Airport is not measuring noise violations correctly; they're underestimating them. The airport says it is using established technology and diligent monitoring of noise. Adams County accepted more than 40 million dollars in noise violation payments. The airport says that advances in aircraft engines and fewer planes overhead, better flight technology, have drastically reduced noise violations, so Adams County gets less money now. Going back to the FAA Reauthorization bill, Valdes added, the bill retains a provision for a zero-emission vehicle pilot program where airports may use Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant money for activities associated with zero emission that transports people or cargo.

Electric aircraft are on their way. The "Sun Flyer 2" recently made its first test flight at Centennial (CO) Airport. Its \$3.00 hourly operating cost is 10 times lower, with no carbon emissions and significantly reduced noise. The Sunflower family will be the first FAA-certified, all-electric aircraft to serve in-flight training and the GA market. As for drones, he said, NASA has a new term for drones: "urban air mobility," and has agreed to further ensure flights are safe, efficient and reasonably quiet. NASA is working with Uber Technologies on its proposed UberAir electric air taxi at NASA's DFW facility, where they will provide simulation modeling. Over the next two and a half years, data will be collected in a set of cities, the closest being Reno and San Diego, where all these data will be given to the Department of Transportation and the FAA to create goals for drone operations. The facilitator thanked Mr. Valdes for his presentation.

11. 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 fall time frame for this. He said to stay tuned for more information.

12. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING – October 17, 2018

The next Forum meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 17, 2018.

13. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

END