

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

October 17, 2018

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTIONS | 1 |
| 2. ANNOUNCEMENTS | 2 |
| A. Acceptance of 2nd Quarter 2018 Noise Report | 2 |
| 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (July 18, 2018) | 3 |
| 4. PUBLIC COMMENT | 3 |
| 5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS | 3 |
| A. Rep. Barbara Lee Thank You Letter | 3 |
| B. Subcommittee Report | 3 |
| C. FAA Noise Forum Meeting | 7 |
| 6. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT | 9 |
| A. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items..... | 9 |
| 7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT | 11 |
| A. Update on Action Items from April 18, 2018 meeting | 11 |
| B. Viewpoint Update | 11 |
| C. FLEET WEEK RECAP | 12 |
| D. CAL STATE VISUAL APPROACH TO RUNWAY 30 | 12 |
| 8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATES | 16 |
| 9. FORUM 20TH ANNIVERSARY..... | 18 |
| 10. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (January 16, 2019) | 18 |
| 11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT..... | 18 |

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The October 17, 2018 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:35 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
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
Gary Singh, Councilmember, City of Union City
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Peter Marcuzzo, Citizen Representative, Oakland
Asres Kaffl, Citizen Representative, Union City

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Jose Hernandez, U.S. Representative Barbara Lee's office
Mallory DeLaura, U.S. Representative Eric Swalwell'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
Kathy Ornelas, City of San Leandro
Emily Oxsen, OAK ATCT
Gene Reindel, HMMH, Acoustical Consultant
Rhea Gundry, HMMH, Acoustical Consultant
Adam Scholten, HMMH, Airspace Consultant
Christian Valdes, Technical Consultant, Landrum & Brown
Kathleen Livermore, City of Alameda
Burt Ganoung, Noise Abatement Office, San Francisco International Airport
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, Court Reporter (CSR 4401)
Michael McClintock, Forum Facilitator

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Acceptance of 2nd Quarter 2018 Noise Report

The facilitator introduced this agenda item and Co-Chair Benny Lee said he had reviewed the report and had some questions. He noted that with re Runway 28R/L there were 200 more flights but the compliance rate improved by 3%. Matt P. Davis replied that there were a couple of reasons for the improved compliance. First of all, he said, he wanted to thank the FAA air traffic controllers who, even in the face of a number of special events and increased operations, did a great job. Secondly, Davis said, airport staff continued their outreach efforts with the carriers and FBOs which also helped the increased rate of compliance. He said it was the collaboration between airport staff, the FAA, and FBOs that made the difference. Lee noted that compliance for the 100-degree radial turbojet landing procedure was 95% in 2Q 2017. For 2Q 2018 it was 99%, but there were 916 fewer landings. He asked what can be done in the future to maintain this high degree of compliance as landing operations increase. Davis responded that staff had worked directly with Northern California TRACON, as well as the air carriers, to make sure pilots are aware of the 3,000-foot requirement. Again, he said, NorCal TRACON helps as part of the continuing outreach between the Port and FAA. Matt added that there would be a presentation later on about a procedure that may help with compliance.

Kurt Peterson said he wanted to go on record one more time about the compliance report being misleading because “it's using different parameters.” In years past, he said, it's always been considered non-compliant if they “broke the turn” prior to reaching 3,000 feet. It is now considered to be compliant if the tower tells someone to turn before 3,000 feet. Peterson said he wanted the record to reflect that it's unfair because “you're not comparing apples with apples.” It might look better on paper, but only because the rules have been changed. There being no further discussion, Co-Chair Lee moved that the 2nd Quarter 2018 noise report be received and filed. Seconded by Tom Wagner. Motion approved with one no vote (DelliGatti).

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (JULY 18, 2018)

The facilitator noted that members of the Forum had received a copy of the draft minutes for the July 18, 2018 Forum meeting with their agenda materials. He noted that the minutes were quite lengthy due to the desire to provide as close to a transcription as possible of the remarks of FAA Regional Administrator Dennis Roberts in order to “give him a fair shake.” Administrator Roberts reviewed the draft of his comments and said that what was reported in the minutes was accurate with regard to his presentation. McClintock said that, if there were no questions or comments, he would request a motion to approve the draft Minutes of the July 18 meeting. Co-Chair Lee moved approval of the draft minutes. Seconded by Tom Wagner. The motion was approved.

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 and air quality at Oakland International Airport. He asked that anyone wishing to speak on this agenda item to please fill out a speaker's card and stated that there would be a two-minute time limit per speaker. He said that he had received a card from Kurt Peterson. Mr. Peterson recognized Burt Ganoung from the San Francisco International Airport Noise Office and thanked him for his attendance, noting that “we” should have similar representation or attendance at their Roundtable meetings because “this whole process involves all three airports intertwined.” So, he said, the more input and understanding that the other airports have only increases our chances to improve the situation with the FAA. Having received no additional speaker's cards, the facilitator closed the public comment period.

5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

A. Rep. Barbara Lee Thank You Letter

Facilitator McClintock noted that the FAA has provided the Forum with an updated response to issues raised by the Forum concerning NextGen implementation. This report has been forwarded to East Bay community organizations for their review and comment. Also, the Forum's NextGen subcommittee has held a meeting on this, which will be reported on by subcommittee chair Leslie Ransbottom. This agenda sub-item is to inform you that the Forum Co-Chairs have sent a letter to Rep. Barbara Lee thanking her on behalf of the Forum for her efforts to broker cooperation between the FAA and the Forum on NextGen implementation issues. The facilitator read the text of the letter for the benefit of the audience.

B. Subcommittee Report on FAA's Updated Response to Forum's Recommendations

The facilitator called upon the NextGen subcommittee chairperson Leslie Ransbottom to review what the subcommittee discussed after reviewing the FAA's most recent report. This report was released by the FAA shortly after the July 18 Forum meeting. The report is an update of the FAA's previous report and is not its final report. Ms. Ransbottom explained that the NextGen subcommittee met on October 10 to address the FAA's report, entitled "Updated Response to Oakland Airport-Community

Noise Management Forum's Recommendations." This report was dated August 2018, but was not released until September. The purposes of the NextGen subcommittee meeting were to review the FAA's report, and to make recommendations and format responses to action items. In a nutshell, she said, the subcommittee was disappointed with the FAA's response and added that the report is available online at the Noise Forum website for those who may not have been able to review it. The message sent by the FAA is they don't support about 99% of the Forum's noise mitigation proposals. This response was very disappointing, but the battle is not over, she said.

It was the opinion of the subcommittee that the FAA was, for the most part, disingenuous and obfuscating in their reasoning for why they could not implement the majority of the recommended changes. In a review by HMMH, Adam Scholten presented a detailed review of each of the mitigation proposals. HMMH concluded that they could not support much of the FAA's reasoning that supposedly proved that the Forum's proposals were not feasible. However, not all of the FAA's reasoning was faulty. In these cases, the subcommittee felt that further discussion would be in order. One of the subcommittee's concerns was the FAA's repeated stance against "noise shifting," without any definition of what they actually meant by this. From the subcommittee's perspective it meant consolidating many different flight paths over an area that had not experienced this before, thereby concentrating them over that area along with an associated increase in noise and annoyance. Ransbottom noted that this was a concern of the subcommittee and had been accounted for in their proposals. She said the subcommittee was very cognizant of not just moving the problem from one area to another, but it is Ms. Ransbottom's opinion that that is just what the FAA did when it consolidated traffic over the Oakland hills. The subcommittee's mitigation proposals took this into account and even provided some estimated noise levels in the proposals themselves. She added that the subcommittee found the FAA's position on noise shifting to be largely hypocritical because they had had no problem shifting and concentrating noise throughout the U.S. with the new NextGen routes; it was only when affected communities called the FAA's attention to the damage that they were causing that the FAA developed a sudden problem with noise shifting associated with any potential modifications to NextGen flight paths.

Another major concern of the subcommittee, she said, was that the FAA professed to be working collaboratively with the Forum, but their response showed differently. There was no discussion or attempts by the FAA to work with the Forum on its proposals to see if any adjustments could be made to make them feasible. The subcommittee had developed detailed proposals backed by good data, and the idea was to form a collaborative team to work on the feasibility of the proposals and to adjust them as necessary to make them work or to develop workable alternatives. This collaboration never came to pass.

Ms. Ransbottom said the subcommittee had several recommendations to the Forum:

1. A technical rebuttal/response to the FAA is warranted. Future meetings of the subcommittee will be required to accomplish this.
2. The FAA needs to be reminded of their commitment to collaborate with the Forum and the Forum needs to urgently request they provide appropriate technical personnel to speak with and discuss their ideas with the subcommittee *[N.B. The subcommittee noted the FAA has sent two technical persons to the San Francisco Roundtable. Subcommittee requests for a similar meeting have been ignored. Additionally, Rep. Barbara Lee's specific request to meet with the FAA has not received a response. The subcommittee also noted that the SFO Roundtable is also having difficulty with the FAA, i.e. the FAA claimed at the last meeting that the Roundtable was not specific enough in one response, and then, when they came back with very specific questions, the FAA proclaimed that the questions and related requests were too specific].*

3. The Forum, as well as the SFO Roundtable and other airport noise groups, need to gain an understanding of the breadth and specificity of what the FAA requires of them when commenting on NextGen implementation issues. No one in the United States has any idea of what the FAA is looking for or what information and data they require from the affected communities. Everyone is going about this differently and not very efficiently judging by the FAA's responses. A guided approach on what to do and how to do it from the FAA would be helpful.
4. The FAA also needs to define what they mean with respect to the term "noise shifting" and how this is taken into account in their aircraft route planning and how it will be used going forward. The Forum needs to know what the FAA's rules are so we can play by these rules.
5. The subcommittee also recommended that the Forum participate in efforts to establish a regional voice politically for the Nor Cal Metroplex. However, care should be taken to not let the FAA use this as a delaying tactic by requiring that the Metroplex issues only be addressed as a whole, but individual NextGen issues that are not connected to other airports should be mitigated as expeditiously as possible.

Ms. Ransbottom noted that at the next subcommittee meeting they would start preparing a technical rebuttal for the FAA. This may take some time, she added. Lastly, she said she was stepping down as subcommittee chairperson because she and her husband are moving to New York to take over the reins of a family business. The subcommittee unanimously elected Peter Marcuzzo as its new chairperson. SOSEB member on the subcommittee, Sol Weingartner, will be stepping in. Facilitator McClintock thanked Leslie for her service to the Forum communities and said that she had done a fantastic job and would be missed very much. Ms. Ransbottom thanked the Forum for giving her the opportunity to be of service.

Facilitator McClintock noted that, because the Forum is an advisory committee to the Executive Director of the Port of Oakland, the subcommittee's recommendations will need to be submitted to the Executive Director in the form of a memorandum. He said he would prepare a memo and submit it through Aviation Director Bryant. As an aside, the facilitator noted that the FAA is a very large organization with many different divisions. For NextGen issues we have been dealing with the Air Traffic Organization (ATO), which is the operational arm of the FAA. The ATO also includes the Northern California TRACON and the Oakland Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT). The Forum has been fortunate to have a good working relationship with the OAK ATCT and NorCal TRACON over the past 20 years, and the issues and concerns raised by the Forum's subcommittee in no way should be considered disparaging of the cooperation and support of the local tower and TRACON in working with the Forum and the airport to resolve airport noise issues. We are looking forward to a long and continued working relationship with them. McClintock also noted that the FAA Regional Administrator, Dennis Roberts, retired shortly after his meeting with the Forum in July. He has been replaced by Ms. Tamara Swann as acting as Regional Administrator until a full-time replacement can be appointed. McClintock asked Matt P. Davis if he could get the contact information for Ms. Swann. The facilitator asked if there were any questions for Ms. Ransbottom.

Ernest DelliGatti thanked Leslie for her work with the subcommittee. Mr. DelliGatti said he had read the FAA report and had dubbed it the "Can't Report," because the FAA stated 22 different times that it "cannot support this [or that] recommendation." He said the FAA asked the Forum for feedback and input, yet it ignored the "hundreds of hours" of work by the Forum and the subcommittee, only to be rejected without fair consideration. He said the FAA report was "an insult to the Forum and...the subcommittee...as well as the residents of the East Bay." He said he was concerned about the FAA's use of the term "noise shifting." Mr. DelliGatti said that noise shifting has been occurring for the past three years, he said, especially over San Lorenzo, Hayward, and even down to Union City. This is especially evident at night, he said, because that's when most of the traffic occurs. So, with respect to the subsequent follow-up, he said, he would like to make sure that the entire package

and the response from the Forum gets forwarded to not only Congresswoman Barbara Lee's office, but also to Rep. Eric Swalwell's office for action. DelliGatti believed that by incorporating Rep. Swalwell in the process it would give this a little more horsepower. He said this was necessary because for the past five years, the FAA has been "stringing us along," and that he agreed with Leslie's premise that the FAA has been disingenuous and has wasted everybody's time. McClintock thanked Mr. DelliGatti for his comments and asked if Forum members had any additional questions or comments. There being none, he turned to the speaker's cards he had received on this agenda item.

Mr. Tomas Colussi from the Oakland Hills interjected with a question to Leslie about contrasting "our situation with the City of Phoenix's situation, which just happened to have a lawsuit?" He said he wanted "to understand the differences between our case and their case." The facilitator admonished, that, if in the future he wished to speak on any matters before the Forum, he needed to fill out a speaker's card. In Phoenix, he noted, the FAA did a different environmental process than here in the Metroplex. Ms. Ransbottom added that when the FAA was announcing NextGen to the Phoenix area, they did it in a slightly different way than for our area, so it opened the door for the lawsuit on the basis of the fact that the FAA's actions were capricious and arbitrary, and the changes were made without appropriate public notice; whereas, with us, the FAA followed the letter of the law, if not the spirit.

So, McClintock offered, would it not be beneficial for the Forum, as a result of this meeting to go to the FAA and say, "Can we facilitate a conversation between the subcommittee and the FAA so we can move forward, instead of having to wait three or four months until a response can be drafted?" Ms. Ransbottom concurred, saying if we can, I think we should get a letter to them very quickly. Ed Downing asked if the Forum would agree tonight to send a letter to the FAA requesting their immediate cooperation in helping to resolve the subcommittee's concerns. McClintock said he had no problem with this approach, but we still needed to advise the Executive Director of what we propose to do. Also, he said, we need to remind the FAA that they promised us a collegial approach to this, but so far, they've not been forthcoming, not to mention that Barbara Lee's last letter in June asked to get "everybody together here and deal with the issue." McClintock added that the Forum has waited patiently for the FAA's report and now that it's out and been reviewed by the subcommittee, it has been found to be lacking. So, we now need to move forward with the subcommittee's recommendations.

The facilitator called upon Ms. Reva Fabrikant, who said she was speaking on behalf of Save Our Skies East Bay. She thanked the Forum and members of the subcommittee for being so supportive of all the problems that the community has been experiencing. She said she wanted to make sure that everyone was aware of SOSEB's position, i.e. "Our community needs a more equitable distribution of NextGen flight paths and noise." Based on the past 18 months of challenging interactions with the FAA, she said, SOSEB is far from convinced that the FAA is working collaboratively or in good faith with the East Bay. After two interventions by Congresswoman Lee, three written Noise Forum proposals and two FAA responses, and the updated FAA response, as was just reviewed today, the FAA refused to support our recommendations. This is not collaboration. Furthermore, she was at the October SFO Roundtable meeting where the FAA sent two technical representatives. These representatives only covered four or five of SFO's initiatives and then they left. The upshot of the FAA's presence at the Roundtable was increased frustration by its members. The FAA basically stood their ground, negating all suggested flight path changes and responding to questions with such a narrow focus that it was clear they were not open to truly working collaboratively with the Roundtable either. She added that, it seems like they're not working collaboratively with anyone in the United States. The only thing they seem to be responding to, because they have to, are the lawsuits that they have lost to the communities. This process of dealing with the FAA has been frustrating, but it's important to continue trying to negotiate with the FAA since that's what they asked us to do. However, we also

need to expand our strategies. We're not the only ones in the NorCal Metroplex who are suffering from NextGen. It's time to work together as a Metroplex and plan joint strategies. And, as Leslie said, it's also important to keep the technical aspects of each airport separate. We need more joint political pressure on the FAA to get them to work collaboratively with communities and sit down at the table to develop flight paths that truly minimize and disperse the airplane noise. She said "SOSEB welcomes the support we've had from Congresswoman Barbara Lee, the Noise Forum member communities and the Port of Oakland. In conclusion, Ms. Fabrikant asked the Forum to "step up [its] efforts and move forward with the strategies, including encouraging airlines to fly quietly and presenting a local and national united front, because the current strategy is taking too long..."

The facilitator called upon Mr. Fred Verner, a resident of Panoramic Hill and a member of the Panoramic Hill Association. Panoramic Hill spans the border between Oakland and Berkeley. He thanked everyone present for their efforts to resolve the issues created by NextGen implementation in the East Bay. He said he knows that what he is going to say echoes that said by many other people before him, but the number of low-flying planes over his home at night and in the morning have increased. This severely impacts his family's sleep, their emotional well-being and physical and mental health, and even the possible uses for our house. They are affected in so many ways by this. He encouraged the Forum to keep following through with this, and continue with all that it is doing. He asked what the average citizen is supposed to do when being harmfully impacted by the noise created by low-flying aircraft at all hours of the day and night.

Mr. Fred Shurkus said he has lived in Montclair since 1972. He suggested the Forum change its tactics because "the FAA has shown they don't give a damn about us or our Congressperson," and is implementing NextGen nationwide. He suggested that Congresswoman Lee's office could "identify every district under the TRUKN and WINDSR [flight paths] and that the affected citizenry "contact our friends and families in those districts, too." He guessed that this would "identify hundreds of districts and probably millions of constituents, and a new Congressional caucus could emerge." He proposed that this caucus be called the "Victims of the FAA" caucus. He offered that this could lead to "useful hearings, and that perhaps threats of budget cuts to the FAA might hit them where they live." He said "Since the FAA and their lawyers have basically contrived to make their so-called 'EIR' unchallengeable, we need to find new grounds to sue them." There may be some lawyers who might be able to come up with some different grounds to do this, he said, and "maybe having the FAA to spend more time in court, while we're sitting out here suffering with outrage, would change their perspective on how to deal with their customers."

West Alameda resident Kurt Peterson said he agreed with Ernie DelliGatti that the FAA was not taking the NextGen situation seriously. He felt offended by the fact that FAA Regional Administrator Roberts appeared before the Forum, but failed to disclose that he was about to retire when he knew he wouldn't be here to be involved with this much longer. He added that he "could not believe" that our two U.S. Senators and Bay Area Congressional representatives could not get together on this issue and present a united front to the FAA to resolve the NextGen issues confronting the Bay Area. He also felt that it was important for the Forum to work with the SFO Roundtable and the Santa Clara County Cities Association to put the pressure on the FAA to work with us.

The facilitator asked Adam Scholten about his presentation. He said Ms. Ransbottom had pretty much covered it already, and that he would have an updated presentation at the January 2019 meeting.

C. FAA Noise Forum Meetings

Assistant Director of Aviation Kristi McKinney said she had just come from a meeting with the FAA in Los Angeles. She said she wanted to share what has been going on with the FAA and some of the

Western Service Area airports because, while we have yet to see where things will go, they are positive steps. FAA Western Service Area Director, Clark Denning, has established a forum with the airports in the region, which consists of ten western states, including Alaska and Hawaii. Denning has reached out to the airports in the region to talk with them about the challenges they are facing with the implementation of NextGen and, frankly, she said, the failure of the FAA to successfully engage and work with affected communities. Kristi said this was the second meeting of the group since the Forum's October meeting. The topic of the current meeting was about how to enter procedures into the system for the FAA to even be able to consider them. She commended the hard work, dedication and perseverance of the East Bay communities in working with the Forum, because she is hearing that the FAA is starting to comprehend where they went wrong in responding to some of the NextGen implementation issues.

The conversations with the FAA have been illuminating in terms of their openness and willingness to say they need help in engaging with the communities, and that they are not well set-up or structured to deal with these kinds of issues because it's never been part of their mandate or policy in managing air traffic issues. And, she said, this is coming from the director of air traffic for the western service region. This doesn't in any way solve our problems, but it's a step forward and it would not have happened without the work and the serious commitment of the folks in this room and the many community members that have become engaged in the issue. The Port is engaged in this process and is committing as many staff as may be needed. The meetings are held at the FAA's Western-Pacific headquarters in Los Angeles and, she said, she was attending every meeting. Kristi said she had secured commitments from Clark Denning, who has organized these meetings, as well as current acting regional administrator, Tamara Swan, to attend the next Forum meeting to make a long-term commitment that the regional administrator's office will be represented at Forum meetings and engage with the community. Ms. McKinney added that the opportunity for a meeting, under the sponsorship of Rep. Barbara Lee's office, is proposed to be held with the FAA's senior regional leadership including Ms. Swan and Mr. Denning. She said the Port will do everything in its power to make sure this happens and will support Rep. Lee in organizing the meeting. McKinney also urged that another subcommittee meeting be held to work on very detailed and specific responses, and how we can engage with the FAA between these meetings. Lastly, she said, she did not want to present this as a cure-all for all our problems, but it is the first sign that the FAA may be more open to hearing our concerns and to make commitments to work with us in a different way than they have in the past.

Co-Chair Jacobs asked Ms. McKinney who she spoke with. She said she spoke with Mr. Denning about meeting with the Forum, and that the Forum needed to have this meeting so that it can demonstrate progress and determine what it is that we can work with the FAA on. The Forum needs to know what things are on or off the table, and how we can work together. Denning has committed to the January 2019 Forum meeting. Jacobs asked, "How are you going to communicate and set this up?" Ms. McKinney said she would work through Rep. Lee's office because the Congresswoman has taken a leadership role in this and has been out in front on this matter. The FAA supports this approach. Kristi added that one of the benefits of going to these meetings is that she has now established relationships with the top air traffic people in Seattle, and Matt has as well. So, she said, we are now in a better position to begin to see some progress, but don't expect things to happen too quickly. The FAA has told everyone that they currently have 40 thousand procedure requests in the system. This is a massive workload and we've got to work with them on how we can prioritize what really matters to the Forum member communities.

Ernest DelliGatti asked if the FAA would take another look at their report and move forward from there, because he'd hate to see them have to "reinvent the wheel." Co-Chair Jacobs said, that at the last subcommittee meeting it was decided that we had probably submitted too many items, and a couple were redundant. The subcommittee wants to trim the list down to maybe five very specific

items rather than the 33 items initially identified. Ms. McKinney said this is exactly what will be needed to help the FAA to better focus on the Forum's issues. Reva Fabricant interjected to thank Kristi for her presentation, and added that this does sound encouraging to a certain extent, but why has it taken the FAA so long to realize there's a problem? She said we can't wait another 5-years for them to respond. Leslie Ransbottom also thanked Kristi for the encouraging news and offered that she believed that at least two meetings would be necessary. The first meeting should be to inform the general public of what is expected to happen moving forward. The second meeting should be with the subcommittee to establish a collaborative approach with the FAA on technical matters. Ms. McKinney said that staff had been emphasizing the need for collaboration, but that she didn't think that they were ready for a "full roll-up-your-sleeves workshop meeting." She said she thought the next step should be to keep having the subcommittee meetings to narrow things down to the top five issues and then take them to the FAA. This would be more manageable for both the Forum and the FAA. We need a couple of wins, she said, then we can go from there on the bigger package that we have to discuss with them. Kristi said she wanted to work with the subcommittee and dive deeper into the issues with a smaller group from the subcommittee. Leslie added that the subcommittee has learned by experience how the FAA reads and interprets things submitted to them. It would be a good thing if they could just tell us how they want our information presented to them, we could work with them in a much better way.

Kurt Peterson offered that one of the problems in working with the FAA is that the people in charge keep changing. He said, the key thing is if you're working with the same people, you kind of have an idea of what's going on. It helps a lot as far as moving forward. Ms. McKinney responded that we can't control how the FAA assigns or reassigns its people. Right now, we are dealing with an acting regional administrator. The good thing is that this person was Dennis Roberts' assistant, so even though she is acting, she represents some degree of continuity and should remain in the regional office for some time. As for herself, Kristi said, the most important folks that we're meeting with are the people doing the actual work. These are career people in Seattle who are not at the top of the pyramid, but who do the technical work and analyses.

Sandra Green said she has spoken with many of the people in the room, and wanted to "put a face to the airplane noise that is in the Hayward hills; specifically, Fairview. She said she purchased her home one year ago and, in this time, there have been countless airplanes at all times of the day and night over her home. She recently took this problem to the Fairview community and they wish to join with the Forum. She said she would also like to take this matter to KSFO radio host, Michael Savage, to help make more people aware of the problem.

The facilitator said that we have to deal with the subcommittee report. He said he has asked that a copy of the report be provided to him for use as the basis for the recommendations to the executive director. In addition, Kristi McKinney has offered ideas on how to approach things going forward. He asked for a motion to direct the facilitator to prepare an informational memorandum for the executive director, and to have staff come up with some recommendations for how the Forum can move forward with the FAA per the meetings that Kristi and Matt P. Davis are attending. Mayor Spencer made the motion. Co-Chair Benny Lee seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

6. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

A. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items

Airport Operations Manager, Matt P. Davis, recapped the NextGen items from the September 19, 2018 North Field and South Field research group meeting. One of the action items they've been working on is continued monitoring and the SALAD nighttime departure procedure that encourages propeller aircraft departing from North Field to make a right turn to avoid Bay Farm Island. The noise
October 17, 2018

Office used to have a “good effort” zone around Bay Farm Island where, if the pilots made their turn within that area, the flight was not considered non-compliant. We've changed that, he said. You'll notice that the compliance percentage has dropped for this procedure. The reason that the compliance rate dropped for this procedure is because we changed the way we're measuring it. Davis said they've also made other changes in terms of having aircraft depart from Runway 28R as opposed to 28L (Runway 28R is the northern most of the two runways) for the SALAD departure. It's expected those aircraft will then have an easier time clearing the houses on Bay Farm Island. We've seen that non-compliance for this procedure is not a matter of a pilot flying straight and not performing noise abatement; it is that they are not making the turn tightly enough. It's not a compliance issue. Davis said, one issue we'll track related to the SALAD departure is any negative impact on San Leandro from moving that turn. We have not seen any such impacts, and we will continue to watch this. In addition, we will study any changes at noise monitors 9 and 10 to see if there's an increase in the noise related to the shift. We'll have a formal report on the next NF/SF group meeting at the January 2019 Forum meeting.

Other items of interest included Runway 33, where there've been a number of discussions regarding the length of the runway for takeoffs by jet aircraft and whether or not the jets using the runway should be counted as compliant or non-compliant. Runway 33 is the North Field's shortest runway, and there are concerns from the community that jets using this runway should be using the longer ones. This was discussed with the NFG/SFG group where it was noted that aircraft taking off are using information prepared by the FAA. Before a pilot takes off, they must be aware of the available runway length. There are tables published for every aircraft about how much runway length is required for takeoff. So, Matt said, every pilot has to make sure they have sufficient runway length to depart safely. They rely on FAA and manufacturers data to do that, and all of the planes using Runway 33 currently comply with FAA runway length requirements. As for the noise issue, he said, use of Runway 33 by jets was never specifically mentioned, nor was the term "North Field," used in the context of “no jet departures off the North Field.” The agreement refers to Runways 27L and 27R (which are now 28L and 28R). Whether or not these operations are compliant is the subject of discussions with Alameda. The airport considers such takeoffs to be compliant because these operations are not called out in the settlement agreement. The City of Alameda believes otherwise.

Other action items coming before the group were to:

- Look at noise monitors 9 and 10 for any changes based on the SALAD departure;
- Look at low altitude turns over Bay Farm Island from Runway 30 (which is a different issue than the early procedural turns); and
- Why 80 dB was selected as the threshold for reporting SELs (Single Event Levels) in the quarterly reports.

Some minor items were also discussed, including operations by very large aircraft. An Antonov 225 was at the airport recently. The An 225 is the largest strategic airlift cargo aircraft operating today. There's only one--the wing spans the size of a football field and it is loud. It was at OAK to pick up hurricane relief supplies for Guam. It is not anticipated to be a regular visitor to Oakland.

Ed Downing introduced himself and reviewed his aviation experience:

- 23 years as a Navy fighter pilot;
- 25 years as a Southwest Airlines captain; and
- 20 thousand flight hours.

He said he wanted to go on record as a concerned citizen of Alameda. He said he was concerned about the safety of jet aircraft using Runway 33. He referenced "balanced field length limit," noting that every aircraft manufacturer puts out information on this. He said, the balanced field length limit is the minimum amount of runway an aircraft needs to take off, or reject the takeoff, if it has to, at

rotation speed, or to continue takeoff and clear a 50-foot obstacle at the end of the runway with an engine failure. Runway 33 at the Oakland Airport is 3,376 feet long and 75 feet wide, he said. The aircraft using that runway require a balanced field takeoff run of from 3,100 feet to 3,300 feet. What this tells him, he said, is that on a standard day with zero wind and 61 degrees F., the airplanes that are using that runway have a safety margin of 200 to 300 feet. If the runway was 200 or 300 feet shorter, they wouldn't be able to take off under those conditions. There are three other runways at the airport where the safety margin for those aircraft would be measured in thousands of feet. So, he said, what we have done at the airport is create a situation where pilots are encouraged to use a shorter runway to keep from getting a letter that they're non-compliant with airport noise abatement procedures, which makes no sense to him, he added. He encouraged the Port to take another look at what their lawyers are telling them and classify Runway 33 jet takeoffs as non-compliant. In other words, he explained, if pilots are going to take that kind of risk and minimize their safety margin, they should at least be getting a noncompliance letter. He said he is going on record to present this as a safety issue and is asking the Port to take a serious look at how we can do something different to minimize the risk that the people who live off the end of the runway are experiencing with jet aircraft using that runway.

Ernie DelliGatti agreed with Mr. Davis that the pilots that are using that runway are meeting the minimum requirements for a "safe takeoff" on that runway. However, he noted, his point was that there are much better options for those pilots, and we need to do everything we can to encourage them to pick a different option. Matt Pourfarzaneh, CLASS president, said that since the subject of the settlement agreement was brought up, he wanted to give the Forum some relevant facts. He said he reviewed flight data for Runway 33 from 2002-2015—over 700,000 flights at OAK, and that there were only about 50 flights per year on that runway. Suddenly, he said, in 2015 and 2016 usage increased to about 250 flights per year. What changed, he asked. As Ed noted, Matt said, the pilots probably did not want to get a noncompliance letter. Howard Hintermeister said he had reviewed the notes on the airport's web site having to do with pilot instructions for Runway 33. He noted that "Runway 15/33" is closed to commercial aircraft, i.e. any aircraft that is either operating carrying passengers or freight for money. He said he could not believe the jets taking off on Runway 33 were not doing this for a profit. His question was, "are these jets commercial operators?" Matt P. Davis responded that, unfortunately, the term "commercial aircraft" is used in various contexts by the FAA. In this case it depends on what Part of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) they are operating under. Private aircraft/corporate jets operate under Part 91 (General Operating and Flight Rules). Commercial operators, like Southwest and United Airlines, sell tickets to passengers. They operate under CFR Part 121. Part 121 operators are prohibited from using Runway 33.

7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

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

Doreen Stockdale noted that at the July meeting there was an action item where the facilitator asked Mr. Roberts to provide the Forum with written answers to questions prepared for the July meeting. Mr. Roberts responded with answers on July 28. The facilitator distributed Robert's responses shortly thereafter. A second action item was the Forum's directive to the facilitator to send a thank you letter to Representative Lee. This was completed as well, along with the distribution of the questions and comments received after the July meeting with Mr. Roberts. In addition, all the supplemental questions submitted via e-mail to Mr. McClintock from July 11 through the 27th were forwarded to Mr. Roberts and entered into the record. Co-Chair Lee had said that the tables in the reports had the totals but the graphs did not. Now both the graphs and the report have the same totals listed. Co-Chair Lee also asked for a copy of the HMMH presentation from the July meeting. A copy was forwarded to him.

B. Viewpoint Update

Doreen said that “Viewpoint” is software prepared by Bruel & Kjaer, which is the vendor for the Port’s noise monitoring system. This software will help Jesse and she process noise complaints more efficiently, as well as to publish web sites for operations and complaints so the public will be able to do its own analyses and reporting. She said, the Port is still in the procurement stage for purchasing Viewpoint. At the last meeting a subcommittee was set up to help Doreen and her staff review web sites to refine what they would like to see on the Port’s web site. A meeting has been scheduled to get the process started.

C. Fleet Week Recap

For Fleet Week 2018, Ms. Stockdale said, there were 49 complaints from 23 complainants. This is down from 57 complaints and 30 complainants in 2017. She noted that 15 of the 2018 complaints were from one person on Bay Farm Island. So, 35% of the 2018 complaints came from one individual.

D. Cal State Visual Approach to Runway 30

Matt P. Davis said that Adam Scholten would do a presentation on this proposed procedure, and that this may address some of Benny Lee’s questions regarding possible increased traffic on the downwind leg for Runway 30. Matt noted that a visual approach is an approach which authorizes the pilot to proceed visually and clear of clouds to the airport; and is executed with visual reference to specific visual indicators on the ground. Cal State Hayward is a pretty easy thing to see from the air, he said. The primary purpose of the approach is to alleviate controller workload by providing a procedural turn. The current procedure has aircraft coming from the northwest to fly down the Oakland hills and to turn towards the runway by air traffic control. Where these aircraft turn can be a wide swath with aircraft being told to turn here or sometimes there. The proposed Cal State visual approach is intended to proceduralize this turn to make it more consistent. One potential positive of this change would be to lead aircraft to the 100-degree radial. Potential negatives include the possible concentration of traffic over a narrower area. Matt said staff was keeping an eye on this.

Adam Scholten of HMMH, the Port’s airspace consultant, said his firm performed an analysis of the proposed approach to see what it might look like once implemented. He emphasized the fact that the proposed procedure is still draft form and has not been published by the FAA. He reiterated that the purpose of the proposed approach was to improve controller workload, but also to help address community concerns regarding compliance with the 100-degree radial noise abatement procedure where aircraft are supposed to cross that radial above 3,000 feet. It will be a charted visual flight procedure, which means pilots navigate on this procedure with reference to visual landmarks. It can also be entered into an aircraft’s flight computer, so they can call it up and fly the approach that way, if they don’t want be looking only at visual landmarks. To maintain compliance with the 100-degree radial noise abatement procedure, aircraft will be instructed to cross the Cal State East Bay at or above 3,000 feet. This procedure is designed to be used when the ceiling (the height of the constant cloud layer above the ground), is at least 3,000 feet and visibility is at least three miles as reported at the Oakland Airport. In bad weather, they can’t use this approach, and a controller has to vector aircraft on some kind of instrument procedure, he said. Adam showed graphical illustrations of the proposed procedure. It is anticipated that the FAA will publish this procedure on, or about, April 29, 2019.

Adam summarized HMMH’s conclusions:

- The proposed Cal State visual approach has the potential to concentrate the flight tracks coming from the northwest for Runway 30 downwind.

- There is a potential to shift the flight tracks slightly to the northwest, but this is based on an overall average of where aircraft are turning over that location.
- The overall average approach altitude has the potential to lower by approximately 130 feet (none of the aircraft flying this procedure would be below 3,000 feet over the campus or the 100-degree radial).
- The aircraft will likely fly a more optimized profile descent because of the guidance available through the aircraft flight computer.
- The results of HMMH's analyses were consistent with what HMMH has seen with other aircraft navigating on a similar procedure at other airports.

HMMH recommended that the Forum provide comments to the FAA if the design of this proposed procedure has raised any concerns from the communities being overflown. The facilitator thanked Mr. Scholten for his presentation and asked if there were any questions or comments. Asres Kaffl asked how this procedure might mitigate the noise from aircraft approaching from the east and south that affect Union City. Adam replied that the proposed procedure is only for aircraft arriving from the northwest and is not designed to serve other arriving aircraft. Mr. Kaffl pointed out that there are more flights coming from the south and east. Mr. Scholten acknowledged this and added that this procedure was mainly designed for flights coming from the northwest on the downwind leg to Runway 30. This does not mean that air traffic control isn't going to instruct aircraft coming from other directions to be compliant with the 100-degree radial noise abatement procedure. Asres asked if Adam could provide a breakdown on the ratio of aircraft coming from the northwest, south and east. Matt P. Davis replied that 17% of the aircraft are coming from the north or northwest on the WNSDR arrival track. The remainder (83%) come in from the south and east. Kristi McKinney said that this procedure is not meant to address anything else other than flights coming from the north, so, it couldn't be used by an aircraft coming from the south. The proposed procedure was not meant to mitigate anything. It was meant to serve the purposes that were mentioned at the beginning of this topic primarily for aircraft coming from the Portland and Seattle area.

Ernie DelliGatti asked at what altitude were the current flights turning over Cal State Hayward. Adam replied that the average altitude was 3,200 feet [above mean sea level (MSL)]. Mr. DelliGatti offered that it could be worthwhile to look at the minimum altitudes being entered into the flight computer so that the procedural turn over the university could be made at a higher altitude, thereby lessening the noise impacts for residents of Montclair and other residents of the Oakland hills. Also, he said, the FAA should consider making the turn to final approach over the industrial area along the Bay. This should help to alleviate a lot of the noise complaints from the Hayward, San Leandro and San Lorenzo communities. Co-Chair Benny Lee asked what is the elevation of Cal State East Bay. Matt P. Davis replied that the elevation was 600 feet MSL. Co-Chair Lee said he sees more problems with this procedure because it would intensify the flight tracks over more homes that may be close to 1,000 feet in elevation. Edward Bogue said he agreed with Benny. This would not be good and there is no way that things will be better than they are now, he said. Under this procedure the arriving aircraft will be turning between Hayward and Fairview where it is about as high as one can reside in the hills. So, he said, under this proposed procedure, residents will be that much closer and subject to higher density traffic. From his perspective in Hayward, the desire is to keep the planes as high as possible over the hills and to only bring them down over the industrial area.

Peter Marcuzzo asked if the FAA had officially presented this to the community? Matt P. Davis said they had not. Kristi McKinney said this was work in progress, so that is why it is being presented for the Forum's interest. This came about, she said, because the Forum requested staff to meet with Ernie DelliGatti to review his concerns about aircraft turning prior to Hayward Airport and the 100-degree

radial. The compliance rate for the 100-degree radial turn is very high, but not 100%, and staff continues to work on it. Peter Marcuzzo said he had issues with the proposed procedure, e.g. “Any charted visual approach will take the aircraft out of the south turn and more over the bay, than line up on the three-mile final.” He asked if that made any sense? Adam asked if Peter was saying that aircraft turning to go over Cal State East Bay would continue to the west and get over the Bay. Marcuzzo said, yes, that was what he was saying. Secondly, Peter said, this all starts at the last waypoint before the WNDSR arrival. He said the proposed procedure would reinforce WNDSR, which the community does not want; it wants the WNDSR track moved two miles to the northeast. Adam said that they were just working with what the FAA gave them, and as yet, is only in draft form. The facilitator asked if the FAA was accepting public comments at this time. Scholten replied that, to the best of his knowledge, the FAA is not yet requesting public input at this time. He repeated that it's in the FAA's queue for being published in April of 2019, that's why staff wanted to get it before the Forum for discussion. The facilitator asked Adam for a copy of the presentation so he could send it out to the Forum. In addition, he asked that Adam monitor the FAA's actions on this and, at the appropriate point in time, let him know who to contact in the FAA with the community's concerns. Reva Fabrikant said she did not understand the “technical stuff,” but saw this as “just another example of the FAA not understanding what the problems are--concentrating the flight paths is not a good thing.”

Kristi McKinney explained that the proposed procedure will have positive affects for certain members of the community, but there is no perfect solution for everyone. She said this procedure can actually solve some problems for some of the Forum member communities, but she wanted to be very clear that some solutions may not necessarily benefit everyone, as has been explained in other meetings. This is one of the tough decisions the Forum has to weigh in on. If the FAA moves the bulk of the turns to the south, they're going to be more concentrated than if they were to be spread out farther to the north and farther to the south. She said the Forum will have decide if they wish to weigh in on this. This is why HMMH was tasked with reviewing the FAA's draft proposal, and present its findings to the Forum, so that the Forum can decide the issue for itself. This is one of the kinds of challenging decisions that the Forum needs to balance between various community interests that will ultimately benefit or negatively impact them. She said, she thought that this was an issue that the FAA is still open on and interested in, and wants to engage on. She said she thought the Forum should engage now. For the record, said Ernie DelliGatti, he is a Forum member who has advocated for this approach over the past five years. He said it looks good, but there is room for improvement. He agreed with Peter Marcuzzo that raising the approach altitudes significantly would help to resolve both the Montclair/WNDSR issue and the turn to final over the industrial bay lands.

Benny Lee said he appreciated the flight track maps and graphics prepared for Adam's report, but what is missing are heat map overlays showing population densities in the affected areas. What is the population density in the affected areas, he asked? Without such information it is almost impossible to accurately assess the human impacts. Benny contemplated the effects of hills and valleys on the distribution of noise created by aircraft overflights, saying that they will reflect or deflect the sound. He said what was needed in addition to the flight track maps were topographical maps and population maps where the effects of terrain and population densities can be factored into the assessment of impacts. Peter Marcuzzo said he wanted to correct his earlier statement to acknowledge that there was more industrial land use to the south and west than he had imagined. Edward Bogue said, one of the big problems they had in Hayward, where aircraft were allowed to turn farther to the north and cut the 100-degree radial was that they had to be at a lower altitude when lining up for final approach. With a higher approach altitude, they are not going to be able to quickly drop a thousand feet to align with the final approach unless they have traveled farther to the south. Even then, he added, the elevations of the houses around Cal State would make the FAA's proposal even more of a problem. We are trying to alleviate problems, not cause more, he said. Matt P. Davis said it is a tough issue, but it
October 17, 2018

can be taken back to the FAA or further consideration. Peter Marcuzzo said, everyone needs to know that there are altitude requirements for other aircraft traversing the area that may result in conflicts, e.g. when you say there's an easy answer by increasing the altitude on the WNDSR arrival, that's minimizing the issue. If you go back to the FAA and say you didn't create an optimal profile descent because you didn't want to, this will get kicked back as unreasonable. He said if the Forum wishes to tackle this issue independently, changing altitudes will not be the way to go because that will spur other issues with the FAA. Benny Lee said he talked about GIS and residential heat maps, but he also felt that the locations of schools should be plotted as well, because noise on schools can have severe impacts on kids' ability to succeed. He recommended that heat maps be prepared for this proposed procedure showing topography, residential land use, and schools. Industrial areas should also be shown because they are considered compatible with airport noise. Ernie DelliGatti added that within San Lorenzo alone there are six schools, which he identified by name.

The facilitator said he wanted to recap the discussion so far. He said he asked Adam Scholten to provide him with a copy of the HMMH presentation, so he can get it out to all interested parties on his e-mail distribution list. The second thing was he needs to be kept abreast of where the FAA is in this process, so everyone will be able to respond as they see fit. The third thing is the proposed use of population heat maps, topographic information, and land use data, including schools. He asked, who should be doing this? Matt P. Davis said his staff could manage this, and added that, to Benny's point, HMMH can provide additional detail on these maps. He said they would be happy to produce the updated information and make it available to the Forum as soon as they can compile it. Facilitator McClintock noted that the next Forum meeting was scheduled for January and the FAA proposes to publish the new procedure in April. He asked when the public comment period would begin. Davis said he did not know, but the proposal had to go to public comment before it could be published. Kristi McKinney added that the FAA is inviting us to engage at the earliest stage possible. This is the new approach they're working with us on. It's very much in the formative stages, and they're trying to influence and change some of their institutional culture. She commended them for this and thought it to be an excellent example of exactly what they're talking about with regard to community engagement and input. Kristi said the airport is happy to engage the FAA on these kinds of issues, but reminded the Forum that it has to dig into this and make decisions about which community members will have their problems resolved, including future problems that have yet to materialize. The facilitator said that this was all the more reason to get our information before the FAA as soon as possible. This means individual members of the Forum and Forum communities need to weigh in on this as quickly as they can.

Ernie DelliGatti said he would prepare a Google overlay of all the schools within San Lorenzo, as well as Hayward, that are impacted. He said he would send it to the Co-Chairs. Benny Lee thanked the staff for the work they have done and, also, to Ernie sharing his information. Co-Chair Jacobs said he would like Ernie to provide his information to the facilitator, as well, so he could forward it to the communities. Jacobs added that for some this may only be an interesting item, but for others it could be very important. So, he said, what we have to do is to come to a decision base and figure out what it is that we want to present to the FAA, as opposed to just throwing it on the table. Ed Downing said he agreed with Kristi. He said this is the unintended consequence of trying to solve a problem that was a very minor problem to start with. He commented on one of HMMH's slides that showed the differences between the proposed pattern and the current pattern, asking questions and noting that as a pilot he wanted to say that he has flown the old visual approach many, many times, and that the arrival into Oakland presents difficulties in getting down to the runway. As a pilot and as a passenger, he said, you want to be flying what's called a "stabilized approach." That means, at a thousand feet, you want to be on glide slope with the engine "spooled" in order to make a safe landing. Even on the straight-in approaches to OAK, he said, pilots are held at 2,000 feet until clear of Hayward

Airport. So, he said, due to altitude restrictions, noise abatement procedures, and Hayward's traffic pattern, it causes pilots to have to make a steeper-than-normal descent. It's anything but what pilots would call a profile descent. The point he wanted to make, he said was that you can only keep airplanes up high only so long, and that there comes a point where you want to get down to be able to apply a stabilized approach into the airport. He suggested the Forum should keep this in mind going forward. The facilitator thanked Mr. Downing for his insight as a commercial airline pilot, and, moving along, said that he had already recapped the things that needed to be done. He said, under these circumstances, a vote was not required.

8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

Christian Valdes of Landrum & Brown said he would first cover the provisions in the FAA re-authorization bill, then move on to an update on the SoCal Metroplex litigation and then conclude with a few newsworthy items. Christian said that the president had signed the FAA Reauthorization Act, which funds the FAA for the next five years and kicked off some new noise initiatives:

- Section 172 creates a 10-year pilot program that will allow stage two aircraft used for cargo operations in the Caribbean to fly into small airports in Louisiana for maintenance.
- Section 173 sets a 1-year deadline for the FAA to complete an evaluation of alternative noise metrics to supplant DNL.
- Section 174 provides instructions to airports on when to update their noise exposure maps (NEM) under two scenarios: (1) if increased operations result in a larger area of noncompatible land use; or (2) a change in operations has reduced the area of noncompatible land use.
- Section 175 addresses community noise concerns when the FAA proposes new RNAV procedures, including the dispersion of flight tracks when creating a new procedure or changing current procedures.
- Section 176 requires the FAA to take six months to review how it's been doing with its community involvement practices, and two months after that Congress would like a report on how the administration will improve community involvement, and will engage communities in implementing precision-based navigation and, also, to inform Congress of any lessons learned.
- Section 178 report to Congress on terminal sequencing and spacing (TSAS) and whether this will result in more community noise impacts.
- Section 179 report to Congress whether or not reducing the speed of aircraft would also reduce noise.
- Section 180 requires the FAA to designate regional ombudsmen for community liaison within one year.
- Section 181 requires the FAA to lead policies, regulations and standards for civil supersonic aircraft.
- Section 186 authorizes the comptroller general to perform a cost-benefit analysis on phasing out stage three aircraft.
- Section 187 places a deadline of less than two years for the FAA's annoyance survey, DNL review, and Part 150 land use compatibility revisions.
- Section 189 requires the FAA to partner with an institution of higher learning to conduct a study of health effects, such as sleep disturbance and elevated blood pressure, from aircraft noise.
- Section 190 requires the FAA to develop projects that will measurably reduce aviation environmental impacts within five miles of an airport.

In another section, Congress wants the FAA to explain how they will integrate unmanned aircraft

Systems (drones) into the national airspace. And, lastly, Congress wants a study that will evaluate impacts on air traffic control and the national airspace system, noise and flight paths, if NextGen is delayed, diminished or fails.

Christian next provided some background for the SoCal Metroplex. He said, the FAA had made 179 route changes at 21 large and small airports in Southern California. There is currently a total of eight plaintiffs in lawsuits against the FAA. He said he would provide updates on the outcomes of these cases as they are settled. Four cases have already been settled--the City of Newport Beach, Laguna Beach, Benedict Hills Estates and Association of Homeowners. The City of Newport Beach said to the FAA that they did not want any changes to the John Wayne Airport departure tracks because they were already dispersed over a wide area, and to keep the tracks between the microphones that are already in place. The FAA agreed to this. Laguna Beach didn't want aircraft from John Wayne to go over the ocean, but as some are headed east, they depart west towards the ocean then turn back over Laguna Beach. The City wanted the planes to head south toward Dana Point and then turn. The procedure now concentrates the easterly departures south of Laguna Beach. The Benedict Hills Estates Association was concerned about departures from Burbank, and as a result of the settlement, the FAA will implement a new open SID procedure in the coming months. This, in turn, has raised a big outcry the Sherman Oaks and Studio City communities. Christian showed graphical exhibits illustrating the issues involved in these cases. In two weeks, the FAA is having workshops in the Burbank area where they'll take public comments. The cities of Sherman Oaks and Studio City have been active on social media and they'll be there.

Christian noted that the Huntington Beach City Council will be starting a new "Jet Commission." He said he brought this up in case the City contacted the Forum to get advice on how to proceed with forming the group. They're impacted by Long Beach Airport, LAX, and John Wayne operations. In other Metroplex news, he added, one new Metroplex is getting started and another one is not having a good time. The Cleveland Metroplex was started last month, with 60 days for public comment. In the Washington D.C. area there is a movement to stop Baltimore-Washington International expansion, because, they say, until the FAA can provide more information about the harmful effects of NextGen. The World Health Organization (WHO) concluded that people highly annoyed by noise in the 65 LDEN, similar to the CNEL, is about four times greater than what the FAA assumes. These results will likely be used to pressure the FAA to update its 40-year-old aircraft noise policy and force the agency to release the findings of its long-overdue annoyance survey. WHO gave three major recommendations to (1) reduce the daily average noise exposure to 45 LDEN, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse health effects; (2) reduce nighttime noise to 40 LDEN, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse effects on sleep; and (3) reduce the population exposed to noise exposure above the aforementioned noise levels. Christian asked what this means realistically? These are good guidelines, but Sanford Fidell, PhD., a recognized expert on noise and annoyance says "that an ideal world is one in which no person's health or quality of life would ever be infringed for any reason, nor purchased at the cost of enormous public economic benefits." The World Health Organization's perspective is unattainable. If the WHO governed the world, noise would not annoy anyone. The real work of noise regulatory agencies is not to achieve a perfect world but to identify politically and economically acceptable tradeoffs between ideal and realistic circumstances of noise exposure. Valdes said, it will be very interesting to see how the FAA uses this information in its review of their DNL policy.

A Columbia University study has linked aircraft noise to premature death, which sounds pretty alarming. But community members and elected officials want to investigate this a bit more, Christian said. Doctor Peter Muennig, a professor at Columbia University, published a study covering the impacts of concentrated flight paths. The costs associated with the year-around use of single departure procedure out of La Guardia International Airport would far outweigh air transportation benefits. The

study relied on previous studies that found there is an increased health risk, including cardiovascular disease, that can lead to hospitalization and death. The study then used an analytical model created by the author that calculated changes in life expectancy and cost when people are exposed to noise. So now, community groups have embraced the study findings and want their elected officials to take a closer look. Congress has taken action and has committed to expand funding for further research on health effects in the form of a proposed "Airplane Noise Research and Mitigation Act of 2018." Stansted Airport in London launched a noise action plan for public comment. This is the third such action plan since 2011 and will build on previous success on managing the effects of aircraft noise. Some proposed measures include restricting the use of the noisiest types of aircraft that operate at night, stricter penalties on noisier aircraft, improvement of the "nighttime" accuracy of departure routes and the evaluation of steeper approaches. The plan will be finalized sometime in 2019. The Greater Toronto Airport Authority and NAV Canada released a report with six ideas for reducing the noise impact of Toronto International Airport flights. Nearly 1500 residents helped develop the six ideas, which include new nighttime flight paths, increased use of continuous descent, changes to preferential runway systems and a summer weekend alternate runway use program. The program began in February 2018, with outreach to more than 2.9 million people around the Toronto area. Christian concluded that he had no new drone news, except to say that NASA is looking into what they are calling "the new noise." This includes drone noise and the "soft" boom created by supersonic flight. The facilitator thanked Mr. Valdes for his presentation.

Benny Lee asked what the FAA Reauthorization Act meant by the term "human factors?" Christian responded that it was basically in reference to human health and the effects of noise on human health. James Nelson questioned whether or not the World Health Organization was regulatory agency. Valdes replied, it is not. Nelson added that 45 dB CNEL would be nice, but as a practical matter, he said, 45 dB is probably the background noise level in most populated areas.

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 for it. November 9, 2018 was set as a potential date for the observance. The Forum discussed the matter and recommended an alternative date. Davis said an announcement would be forthcoming.

10. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING – January 16, 2019

The next Forum meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 16, 2019.

11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

END