

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

July 17, 2019

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

1. INTRODUCTIONS	1
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS	2
A. Doreen Stockdale Retires	2
B. Acceptance of 1st Quarter 2019 Noise Abatement Report	2
C. Updated 2019 Forum Work Plan	3
D. Annual Membership Dues	3
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	3
A. April 17, 2019	3
4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS	3
5. PUBLIC COMMENT	4
6. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS	5
A. Subcommittee Report	5
B. FAA Noise Forum Meetings Update	5
C. FAA Deputy Regional Administrator’s Update	5
D. WNSDR Procedure Report	7
E. Santa Clara/Santa Cruz Roundtable Request	9
7. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT	10
A. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items.....	10
8. NOISE OFFICE REPORT	11
A. Update on Action Items from April 17, 2019 Meeting	11
B. Viewpoint Update	11
C. Cal State Visual Approach to Runway 30 Update	11
9. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATES	12
10. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (October 16, 2019)	14
11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....	14

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The July 17, 2019 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, advisors, and guests. He announced that Alameda citizen representative and Forum Co-Chair Walt Jacobs was ill and would not be present tonight. Howard Hintermeister from

CLASS would serve as Walt's alternate for tonight's meeting. The facilitator asked the Forum members and advisors to introduce themselves for the benefit of the audience:

Forum Members/Alternates Present:

Kristi McKenney, Assistant Director of Aviation, Port of Oakland
Benny Lee, Co-Chair/Councilmember, City of San Leandro
Howard Hintermeister, Alternate for Walt Jacobs, Co-Chair/Citizen Representative, Alameda
Tony Daysog, Councilmember, City of Alameda
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
Cheryl Davila, Councilmember, City of Berkeley
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Peter Marcuzzo, Citizen Representative, Oakland
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Jaime Patiño, Councilmember, City of Union City

Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:

Martin Velez, U.S. Representative Barbara Lee's office
Tamara A. Swann, Deputy Regional Administrator, FAA Western-Pacific Region
Adam Vetter, Community Engagement Lead, FAA Western Service Area Operations Support Group
William E. Freeman, FAA, Community Engagement Officer
Brian Marshall, FAA, Air Traffic Manager, Oakland Air Traffic Control Tower
Diego Gonzalez, Port Governmental Affairs
Matt. P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager, Port of Oakland
Jesse Richardson, Sr. Noise and Environmental Affairs Specialist
Alice Kim, City of San Leandro
Kathleen Livermore, City of Alameda
Rhea Gundry, HMMH, Acoustical Consultant
Adam Scholten, HMMH, Airspace Consultant
Christian Valdes, Technical Consultant, Landrum & Brown
Ford Frazier, Oakland Flight Operations, Southwest Airlines
Bert Ganoung, SFO Noise Abatement Manager
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, Court Reporter (CSR 4401)
Michael McClintock, Forum Facilitator

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Doreen Stockdale Retires

The facilitator informed the Forum that Doreen Stockdale retired on June 28, 2019 and has relocated to Montana with her husband.

B. Acceptance of 1st Quarter 2019 Noise Report

The facilitator noted that this item is to receive and file the 1st quarter noise abatement report for 2019. The facilitator noted that there were two parts to the quarterly noise report this time around. The first component is the Noise Forum summary itself, and the second component is a comparison of the first quarter 2019 with the fourth quarter of 2018; which is a one-page table. This was at the request of Co-Chair Benny Lee at the April Forum meeting. This, he said, will give you an opportunity to see what's happened since the previous quarter, and should help us to better see any trends that are developing one way or the other. Co-Chair Lee commented that this is exactly what he

requested, and that it gives us a better understanding of compliance and non-compliance trends. Lee said that, in the past we had annual and quarterly comparisons to work with, and that we still have these. But now, we have the ability to compare each successive quarter, so that we can see if we are still trending in the right direction. Having this information allows us to make more informed decisions and to provide better direction to staff. Co-Chair Lee moved to receive and file the 1st quarter 2019 noise report. Seconded by Tom Wagner. The motion carried.

C. Updated 2019 Forum Work Plan

Facilitator McClintock noted that the Forum had adopted its 2019 work plan at the April meeting. In the adopted document references were made to several pieces of noise legislation that were pending in committees of the U.S. house of representatives. However, with the end of 115th Congress, these bills also died. For this reason, he said, he has made a minor correction to the work program to eliminate any references to the bills that failed to make it out of committee, but kept in wording that provides a sense of what those bills were about. He said he would continue to monitor this in the hopes that additional noise legislation will be introduced in the 116th Congress. Tony Daysog moved approval for the updating of the Forum's work plan. Seconded by Co-Chair Lee. Co-Chair Lee added that the bills that did not make it out of committee likely failed because of lack of support. He said that, these bills had from 25 to 40 co-sponsors, but in order to move them out of committee you need at least 220 co-sponsors/supporters. So, he said, we need to reach out to not only our local Congressional reps, but to others as well. With the motion having been made and seconded, the facilitator called the question. Motion carried.

D. Annual Membership Dues

The facilitator said the Forum's annual membership dues are payable in August. The Port has sent out invoices, but so far only Berkeley and San Leandro have paid. He asked that the other Forum members give this matter their highest priority.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. April 17, 2019

The facilitator said that Forum members had received copies of the draft meeting minutes of the April 17, 2019 Forum meeting. He asked if anyone had any questions, comments, or suggestions? Co-Chair Lee thanked Valerie Jensen Harris, the Forum's court reporter, for her good work, especially in capturing the sense of what Forum members and friends of Tony Santos had to say about him during the April 17 Forum meeting. Benny said he shared these sentiments with Tony's wife and family and that they were well received. He moved approval of the draft meeting minutes. Seconded by Tom Wagner. There being no further discussion the facilitator called the question. The motion carried.

4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The facilitator introduced this item by noting that the Forum has only two officers-- the Co-Chairs. One is an elected official and the other a Citizen representative. San Leandro Councilmember Benny Lee is the current elected Co-Chair and Alameda's Walt Jacobs is the current citizen Co-Chair. Both have indicated their desire to stand for re-election. The facilitator placed the names of Benny Lee and Walt Jacobs in nomination for their respective positions as co-chairs. Seconds received from Councilmember Daysog and Peter Marcuzzo. The facilitator asked if there were any additional nominations. There were no additional nominations, so the facilitator closed the nomination procedure. Benny Lee and Walt Jacobs were re-elected to their respective Co-Chair positions by acclamation.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

The facilitator announced that this is an opportunity for people to speak on issues not on the agenda, but relevant to airport noise and air quality at the Oakland International Airport. He said if anyone wished to speak under this item, should fill out a speaker's card. Speakers will be called in the order their cards are received, and there will be a two-minute time limit per speaker. He called upon Mr. Ty Allison, a resident of the east side of Lafayette. Mr. Allison said that the area in which he lives is traversed by any number of different flight paths coming from all directions. He said, where his home is located is probably the busiest intersection of any for east-bound departures. He said he lived under the TRUKN departure route. Mr. Allison presented a diagram showing all the different flight paths that intersect over his location. So, he said, "We live in a very busy area for jet noise." He said he had a couple of issues he wished to address. First of all, "The FAA, or whoever established it, has a nighttime flight noise abatement path. They're supposed to fly up to Richmond and then turn east. What we have seen over the past year is a marked increase in jets ignoring that. Last night we had a jet come right over [our] house at 1:47 a.m., absolutely no other jets anywhere that would be conflicting with that." Mr. Allison continued, saying, that there has been an increase in jet traffic after 10 p.m. and before 7:00 a.m., which is very disturbing, and every month we've seen a sharp increase in these flights. He said he thought this was a trend that should be followed to find out what is going on. Since Mr. Allison's speaking time had expired, the facilitator offered that if he could scan the information and send it to him, he would send it out to the members of the Forum.

Mr. Kurt Peterson of Alameda said he wanted to say that "...every time we get one of the compliance reports about how well we're doing, [we need] to take into consideration that approximately... a year and a half ago they changed...the requirements for compliance and non-compliance, meaning that if the controllers...said there was a conflict of a pattern, that it didn't count as non-compliance even though it might fly right over my neighborhood." So, he said, in comparing the noise abatement compliance reports it is easy to say "Gosh, man, [these figures are] maybe a few points less than in prior years." They should be way less if you're going to use this new way of counting, and, he noted, they are less than 3,000 feet over his house. If the controllers are doing their job properly, they have to look at the patterns, he said, and they have to look and see whether they are going to have a conflict from San Francisco to Oakland. Peterson stressed the issue that he has emphasized for five years, "Why isn't the middle of the bay used for departures and arrivals into our airport and San Francisco?" He said he'd like to see this happen because there's never been any reasoning that anyone has presented for not using the bay for this.

Ms. Patel of Oakland said she wanted to "reiterate the frustration that the residents have been negatively impacted." She said she has "been watching the conversation unfold over the past few years of community meetings, and we've given incredibly good suggestions that have just been summarily dismissed without really clear explanations." She asked, "Why don't you want to improve our quality of life?" For us, she said, it's not just in our homes. "You cannot visit the East Bay Regional Parks anymore without feeling you've been being strafed by low-flying jets, whether Redwood Regional Park or Strawberry Canyon or Grizzly Peak." Even in San Francisco, she said, you can see the impact of the low-flying jets, where you can count ten jets in the sky all around you. This is completely unnecessary, she said, and it wasn't the case just three years ago. We know this is not necessary because, for decades, we were operating flights at different altitudes, and we were not negatively impacting anyone. She added that "There's obvious clinical damage to peoples' health based on noise pollution, and you guys are aggravating that, and you are impacting public health. And it needs to be taken more seriously." She questioned how much "autonomy" local government has over the issue of noise, or do we just wait for Congress to take action? She concluded that "It's not fair to all of us whose lives are being deteriorated on a daily level." Having received no more speaker's cards, the facilitator closed the public comment period.

6. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

A. Subcommittee Report

The Chairman of the Forum's NextGen subcommittee, Peter Marcuzzo, said that there is no report. He said the subcommittee is waiting to get together with the FAA to start discussing things that can be done to alleviate NextGen noise concerns. The subcommittee knows that the FAA has been busy and has been told to expect to hear from them in mid- to late-August. He said he hoped that FAA Deputy Regional Administrator Tamara Swann would have an update for the Forum. The facilitator noted that in addition to Deputy Regional Administrator Swann, some of the FAA technical experts are also present tonight.

B. FAA Noise Forum Meetings Update

Assistant Director of Aviation, Kristi McKenney, began by providing some background on the FAA's initiative to work with airports in its Western Service region through the conduct of regular meetings. The FAA's air traffic office has been a bit remote and removed from the individual airports in the Western Service Region, she said, and it's been challenging to create dialogue in areas where, as several people have mentioned, we're all seeking increased dialogue and engagement. This initiative was started by the FAA over a year ago because air traffic is primarily focused on safety and efficiency, and has not historically focused on the level of engagement that other FAA groups are typically engaged in. She said she has been impressed with the level of the FAA's commitment and expertise, and the time that's being given to this effort to meet with the directors and senior staff of the airports in the Western Service Region to talk through how we can collaborate as communities and work with the FAA more directly and more collaboratively on solving issues and concerns and developing mutual understanding. In some circumstances it will not be possible to make changes, she said, but by gaining an understanding of the technical issues and understanding why certain things are the way they are, and where there may or may not be options for change is invaluable. The groups next meeting will be in San Francisco in August and Oakland will be represented there. She said she was very pleased to see the FAA technical representatives here tonight, and that this represents a radical change from the past several years. She commended the FAA for listening to us, as it is a large national organization, and it takes a long time to move a big ship. She said she understands peoples' frustration with the time this is taking, but invited everyone to "embrace the participation we have tonight as a sign of the times, a sign of change and a sign of the future." So, she said, moving forward we'll have more conversations about some of the specific activities, and, as Peter said, "We hope to work together, through our technical subcommittee, with the FAA experts, and others to come up with some ideas and solutions the Forum can consider."

C. FAA Deputy Regional Administrator Update

Deputy FAA Regional Administrator Tamara Swann acknowledged what Kristi McKenney said about the FAA meetings, which were started in March 2018. So far, she said, there have been six such meetings, with the seventh scheduled for August. Ms. Swann said they started with twelve people and now have more than seventy attendees. She said it was very exciting to see airport directors from all the major airports in the Western Service Center attending, as well as their FAA counterparts. The reason that the FAA is back at the noise forums is because she made the commitment that they would be here at the December meeting in Las Vegas, and, she added, we have been to every roundtable/forum in the Western Pacific Region since that time, and we will continue to do so. Ms. Swann introduced Will Freeman. Will is the FAA's new Community Engagement Officer. This is a new position that was mandated by Congress, and the Western-Pacific Region recognizes the need for this position. Going forward, she said, Mr. Freeman will be at these meetings as a representative of the regional administrator's office.

Ms. Swann introduced Adam Vetter. Adam is a technical expert, and he's prepared a brief on a few of the items that have been important to the Forum. Mr. Vetter said they "are in the middle of a rather robust analysis over the middle of the bay and the turns over "Richmond" and the REBAS waypoint, as well as the TRUKN procedure. He said they are listening and doing these analyses even without the request of the Forum, and that this is something we are aware of, and they are working hard to develop this information. As for today's update, there were two requests received from the Forum and one from the airport. Regarding the HUSSH SID, HUSSH and night interaction between San Francisco and the East Bay, they are working to get a technical group together. It will involve interaction with San Francisco because of the dynamic between Oakland and San Francisco over the bay, right in the middle of the bay. The center line is equidistant from both shores, and it looks like it might make the airspace work. Our focus is on safety, Vetter said, but they are now also pushing community engagement. It's right next to safety, in terms of what they can do. He said, "We don't want to make a knee jerk reaction to improve something; we want to make sure it works for all the communities involved." He said the FAA's work group is planning to meet on this.

For the WNDSR STAR [Standard Terminal Arrival] procedure, he said, they provided an update in their recent phase two report. He said they are also working towards a collaborative approach for this procedure, and they are aware of all the communities affected. As for the proposal to move the entire STAR 70 miles to the east "that affected a number of parks and historical lands on an initial look, and communities as well. He said they wanted to make sure they looked at these in depth before they made a decision. The Forum's current proposal does move it slightly over other communities; and as we acknowledged, "We want to make sure that we're doing the process correctly and making sure we're outreaching to these communities and not just moving a procedure to move a procedure. So, he said, that is part of our commitment to working with the airport, with the roundtables, and the subcommittees. He especially thanked the Forum's subcommittee for its diligence.

As for the Cal State visual approach, Vetter said, there has been some concern that the approach paths may be less dispersed with the implementation of an RNAV-charted visual approach procedure. He said he did not want to analyze what might happen if it is a charted visual approach procedure. Having said that, he said that "there has been no request to make it an actual RNAV procedure, period." He said it's a satellite-based navigation, and that by itself would concentrate flight tracks. There is no way around that." As a charted visual approach procedure, he noted, the key word is "visual." In which case, the pilots still have to look out the windscreen to look for landmarks. The published altitudes are recommended. Publication is not a restriction, but a recommendation. With that, he said, "I don't want to speak out of turn with any upcoming work groups or technical groups." We are here to answer your questions as best we can, and we want to remain committed to working with the roundtables and the airports. The facilitator thanked Mr. Vetter for his presentation, but noted that one of the issues that has been raised before the Forum at the last couple of meetings is the way the approach was laid out. It seems to incorporate a large area of residential land uses, when, in fact, there may industrial land uses in close proximity to the residential uses that might better serve as a location to place the tracks.

The facilitator said he would entertain a motion that, with respect to the Cal State visual approach, that we refer it to either the NextGen subcommittee or the North Field/South Field group for further review. For the record, the big issue, from the perspective of the Forum, is that it's the underlying land uses or the land uses being overflown and whether or not it's feasible and, perhaps, preferable to re-route the aircraft over the industrial areas as much as possible. Kristi McKenney said what we are seeing is the "sea change" she has been talking about. She said, if you went back four or five-years we wouldn't have had visibility into such a procedure change. The FAA would have looked at it as an internal decision that helps their efficiency, and the decision would have been made, and it would have been published. Most of us probably wouldn't even have seen it, even if it had gone to the

Federal Register. So, she said, what the FAA has realized is, even if public comment were to be allowed in that framework, it would not be enough; they need to really engage directly with us. So, what you heard Adam just say is they're not publishing anything until they work with us and understand what the concerns are and they come up with what makes the most sense looking at that -- all of those issues again, with safety being paramount, but with looking and hearing from all the folks. This is exactly what we've asked for, and this procedure will be the first one where we're really walking through it together hand in hand. We'll have opportunities to provide input -- and we already have -- long before it's ever gone through the formal process and published. Facilitator McClintock thanked Ms. McKenney for her insight and suggested tabling any motion until we get the Cal State visual approach presentation by HMMH. Then, after the presentation, we can have more discussion on that and see where it goes from there.

D. WNDSR Procedure Report

Adam Scholten from HMMH, the Port's noise and airspace consultant, said he was going to talk about the FAA's proposed change to the WNDSR arrival procedure. He said this proposed change was outside the work that the Forum's NextGen subcommittee was doing. The FAA has proposed this change to address conflicts between arrivals at Oakland and, also, air traffic arriving and departing the Napa County Airport. The FAA has notified the Port of this and is has requested it be presented to the Forum for outreach, and to obtain feedback. The FAA's proposal is to shift the BOYS and WEBER waypoints slightly to the southwest. Adam provided graphic illustrations of the current WNDSR arrival procedure corridor, and the changes proposed by the FAA. There are no proposed changes to aircraft altitudes. Arriving aircraft will still cross BOYS at seven thousand feet and drop down to five thousand feet. He described HMMH's analysis of the proposed procedure in terms of both flight tracks, and land use, and noise. He said the first thing they did was to review calendar year 2018 flight track data for Oakland and identified which operations were using the published WNDSR arrival procedure. Next, they simulated how they anticipated aircraft would fly the procedure with the FAA's proposed changes. The simulations were performed using the FAA's [AEDT], which is the model used for aircraft noise analysis and mandated by the FAA for environmental projects and land use analyses. They also conducted a population analysis under the two flight corridors. Adam compared the two scenarios using graphical illustrations to show the density or concentration of flight tracks under the affected areas.

The difference, he noted, was that the flight tracks shift farther to the west and southwest; specifically, around the area of Berkeley and El Cerrito. He also cautioned, that the simulated flight tracks appear a little more concentrated than they may actually be. Part of the reason for this is that there will always be some aircraft vectored off the procedure at times by controllers due to specific air traffic situations. So, he said, these paths (the FAA proposed WINDSR and the flight tracks densities and concentrations he illustrated) maybe a little more dispersed than what has been depicted. In addition to looking at the flight tracks, he said, they looked at how noise levels might change with the FAA's proposed procedure. The result was that the proposed FAA changes could result in up to and 11 dB CNEL change under the revised flight corridor. The thing to note, he said, is that the increase would probably not meet the FAA criteria for impact reporting, because most of the noise increases happen farther up the bay over water.

Adam recapped the land use analyses performed by HMMH, saying that they looked at the existing land uses under the current WNDSR procedure and also under the path of the simulated WNDSR arrival changes. He showed graphical illustrations of land uses underneath the flight corridors for both the existing and proposed procedures, which also included such noise sensitive receptors as schools, hospitals, and churches. He said they attempted to get more precise land use data from Contra Costa County that is not usually available to the public, but was unable to do so. He said,

there are some areas of missing data in Contra Costa County. So, Adam concluded, the changes to the WNDSR procedure proposed by the FAA may move aircraft to the southwest over communities including Richmond, El Cerrito and Berkeley. However, he noted, the word “may” is important because this proposed change has not yet been published; but this does not mean that the aircraft flight paths will actually shift over those communities, but nonetheless, if it were to be published as currently proposed, it may actually do so. Based on 2010 U.S. census data, the population under the WNDSR procedure could potentially increase from an estimated 76,385 people to 163,306 people with the changes proposed by the FAA. This would more than double the population under the current WNDSR procedure. The flight paths would be expected to remain concentrated because the WNDSR procedure would remain an area navigation [RNAV] procedure utilizing NextGen satellite technology. He said, even though HMMH’s noise analyses did show there would be some noise level increases in certain areas, there would also be noise level decreases in other areas. But, regardless, he did not think that the noise level increases would meet the FAA’s criteria for reportable increases under FAA Order 1050.1F “Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures.”

Kristi McKenney offered to clarify some things about FAA procedures. She said we talked a couple of meetings ago about FAA procedures, and the variety of sources and ways that these procedures are reviewed. So, she said, this is an example of where very early on the FAA brought the proposed WNDSR changes to our attention, and we began working with them in looking at it. We really appreciate the resources on hand at HMMH to quickly do a very detailed look at this to help us understand what our views or opinions might be about this as we go through the data. What was most important, she thought, was that somebody suggested that we look at WNDSR from an FAA perspective; and this opened the door for discussion with the FAA about potential changes to the procedure that the FAA could work with us on. This is not something that is ready for publication, or even being proposed by the FAA, but, she said, it is definitely the kind of thing the Forum’s NextGen subcommittee should be looking at, along with other tweaks or small changes to the WNDSR procedure that might help underlying land uses.

James Nelson said, it's taken him a little bit of time to absorb this, but his reaction was that this proposal is going in the wrong direction. It results in an increase in noise exposure for the cities of Berkeley, Albany and El Cerrito. To date, he said, we've had quite a bit of discussion about moving WNDSR to the east, not to the west; the reason being we're trying to get away from the city and move that noise impact over the San Pablo area or even farther east. He said there was a comment by a speaker about the noise impact on the East Bay regional parks. The current WNDSR procedure passes over Wildcat Canyon, Tilden Park, Redwood Park, Sibley and a few others. This proposed procedure probably does not relieve that problem significantly, but that's another example where it's not going in the right direction. Also, he continued, this WNDSR proposal does not relieve the noise impact that many people are screaming about in the Montclair region. In fact, he thought it would increase the noise impact over Piedmont. He said he thought this would excite some people there.

Ernest DelliGatti asked Adam Scholten what types of aircraft were used in the noise analyses. Adam replied that they took all the OAK flight track data for calendar year 2018 from the Port's noise monitoring system, including both arrivals and departures. The fleet mix composition was the same for both the existing and proposed procedure. So, whatever was in the radar data is what was modeled. DelliGatti asked further if the noise analyses included the number of complaints registered from the study areas? Adam replied, no, as this was only an initial analysis to see where the changes in noise levels would be. However, he noted, this was something that could be done as a follow-on study. James Nelson asked if Adam could explain the rationale or the reason for the proposed westward shift. Scholten replied that he did not know the exact details, but believed it was to deal with an arrival and departure conflict with Napa County Airport. Co-Chair Lee asked about where the Contra Costa County land use data were obtained. Adam replied he believed it was from the county itself.

Lee asked if Contra Costa County had an open data platform. Adam said some of the data came from the county's data platform, but much of the land use data and codes were not publicly available, at least when they contacted them. Benny said he would like to see what can be done continue that effort because having that data would help us to visualize the information more effectively. Diego Gonzalez from Port governmental affairs said, they were working with the Contra Costa assessor's office and Supervisor Joy's office to get the data requested. They've been waiting for a couple of weeks now, and are following up on it.

Peter Marcuzzo thanked Adam for his analyses, and thanked the FAA for bringing this to the Forum's attention so we can take a look at it. Peter said he had a few ideas on this, and was looking forward to discussing it in the subcommittee. Reba Fabrikant, representing Save Our Skies East Bay, welcomed everyone who was present, especially the FAA. She said her heart was shaking from what she had just heard about the WNDSR proposal because it sounded like it would make things worse, not better. One thing that came to her mind when it was brought up is that the FAA's mission is, safety; which it should be. She said she feels that way every time she flies, but they should also consider the safety of those of us under the planes. Our health and safety are also critical, she said. When planes continually fly four thousand feet over our homes, God only knows what we're breathing. Nobody will know because no good analysis has been done. What's happening to our hearing, she asked? Our stress levels are increased. We know that excessive noise damages our cardiovascular systems because studies have been done to show that. Please think of it, she asked. People are suffering. You know that, she said, and that's why you [the FAA] are here. So, it's encouraging to see that you're here. And just, please, continually keep us in mind, she pleaded. Don't increase the noise anywhere. Altitude matters, she said. "If planes fly at 5,000 feet, it's horrible under [sic] our homes on a constant basis." At 15,000 to 20,000 feet when they fly, it's so much easier to tolerate; you can sleep. You can't sleep when they're at 5 thousand feet. Ms. Fabrikant again thanked the FAA for coming, and said, she is looking forward to the Forum's technical team working with them. She asked that it be done soon so the community doesn't have to keep suffering. It's over four years that this has been going on, she said, and we can't use our regional parks. They're no longer our places of refuge. We need some quiet.

Kurt Peterson said we were talking about the FAA and their new community outreach person, but the one thing that failed to be mentioned was efficiency. What efficiency comes down to, he said, is efficiency for the airlines, not for us. So, he said, I want everybody to hear that someone with a lot of money has a lot to do with where these planes fly. He said also, that he agreed with James Nelson that shifting WNDSR to the west would make matters worse. He said he knew that there were a lot of people from SOSEB present who are concerned with WNDSR being over the Oakland hills, and he can understand that, but moving it so it's over an incredibly larger population is foolish, which he doesn't understand. So, he asked, please think of safety, but also please think of other people. "The FAA's last concern should be efficiency for airlines and how they can make money," he said.

E. Santa Clara/Santa Cruz Roundtable Request

The facilitator said that Forum members had received a copy of a letter that was forwarded to him from the Santa Clara-Santa Cruz Counties Airport-Community Roundtable. This is a relatively new roundtable, he said, representing the cities of Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties. He asked Tamara Swann if she was aware of this roundtable. She said she was aware of it, and that the FAA has a person assigned to it. Facilitator McClintock asked Ms. Swann if she knew that they're trying to put together a formal coordination structure among the San Francisco Bay Area roundtables and noise forums? Ms. Swann replied that this was her understanding. McClintock said that this was the subject of the letter he received. The roundtable chairperson, Mary-Lynne Bernald, has asked if the Forum was interested in joining this coalition of roundtables to share information. The facilitator said that

his question for the Forum was, given that this request ties in very nicely with our approved work program to try to establish coordination and work with the other roundtables and airports in the Bay Area, does the Forum wish to join with the other roundtables? If so, we will need to appoint someone or find a volunteer to meet with this group. To be sure, he said, this is not an invitation to join their roundtable, but it would be more of an ad hoc group that would meet to compare notes on where the individual roundtables and airports are in their respective coordination processes with the FAA. Bert Ganoung, SFO Noise Abatement Manager, said the SFO Roundtable was in the same position as the Forum, and that they would like join. He said he would like to see the Forum there as well; that way, it would be a regional voice. There's a concern that the FAA's resources may dwindle and go down to one resource for the region. So, it's something the SFO Roundtable is concerned about. Tony Daysog asked how many meetings will there be over the next several months? He said the reason he was asking is because if there are two meetings that we know will occur, we might have our two co-chairs attend the meetings and then report back to us as to their sense the groups purpose. The facilitator expressed concern over the availability of the Co-Chairs to attend the meetings, and questioned where the meetings would be held. Bert Ganoung offered that their meetings have been held in different locations throughout the two counties, but believed they might be amenable to a centralized location. McClintock thanked Bert for helping to answer some of his questions. He said at this point, and without more information, about the only thing he could recommend that the Forum do would be to adopt a policy to follow through on this and discuss with Chairperson Bernal the structure of this group and how many meetings they anticipate, and report back. He said he could do this in the form of a memo after he got the information from her, so, he would like to get approval from the Forum to move ahead and follow up to get additional information as may be necessary. Co-Chair Lee so moved. Seconded by Councilmember Daysog. The motion carried.

Now, lastly, under NextGen-related noise concerns, the facilitator said, it's really good that Howard Hintermeister is here at the table. Howard had prepared a 30-page presentation on San Francisco International Airport departure issues which have resulted in increased noise over Harbor Bay and Alameda in the first two hours of a typical day (August 9, 2018). Unfortunately, however, Howard didn't get it to me in time for the agenda. Rather than go through this in detail, the facilitator said – there's a lot of information in here – he thought it more appropriate that either the North Field/South Field Group or the NextGen subcommittee take this up as it has to do with the TRUKN 2 departure from SFO and how these departures affect the East Bay. So, he said, he thought that there may be some additional analysis or analyses that may need to be performed on this before bringing it to the Forum. The question is, what's the proper venue? Matt P. Davis recommended that it be referred to the NextGen subcommittee. McClintock concurred, and said, he didn't think this would require a formal vote because it was not on the agenda. He said he would appreciate it if Howard could work with the subcommittee and come back to us with a report at the October meeting.

7. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT

A. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items

Matt P. Davis provided a summary of the last North Field/South Field Research Group meeting. He said that HMMH provided an update on pending legislation, which focused on the FAA Re-authorization Act of 2018 and FAA community relations. This was also forwarded to the subcommittee. He said a copy of HMMH's report was available to anyone who wished to read it. An update on pilot communications for 2019 and what the airport has done was requested. Davis said that the airport continually works with pilot groups to help them improve compliance, and to help them understand the issues at the airport. The most recent one was for a group of business jet operators, who historically used runway 33 for jet departures. At the request of our communities, he said, they engaged the operators and requested that they no longer depart on Runway 33 using jets. He said this was a good

meeting and the pilots are very interested in talking with the airport staff about a variety of airport issues. The trend analysis of jet use of Runway 33, he said, showed that the numbers spiked in 2016 with 271 annual departures. In the second quarter 2019, there were only 11 jet departures of the runway. There were 8 jet departures in April, three in May and none in June. Since meeting with the pilots, he said, they have seen no jet takeoffs on Runway 33. This was good news, he said, and they will continue to watch to make sure that this trend continues.

Matt said they also discussed how SFO and Oakland share noise complaints. Again, he said, they don't have an automated method for sharing this information, but they do advise folks who complain about San Francisco flights how to file complaints with SFO. SFO does the same thing for its citizens who have noise complaints about OAK flights. Another issue discussed was tactics for improving southeast flow compliance. In the summer, he said, we don't think about it too much; it's really the arrivals during the winter months that are problematic. The airport is almost always in west flow during the summer months. He said it was the Runway 10 arrivals that were the "trickiest" practice during inclement weather. Typically, he said, aircraft line up for the main runway (Runway 12) ILS, and then they side step to land on Runway 10. Unlike a jet departure, where it's relatively easy to provide noise instructions and have a dialogue with the pilot, in an aircraft on final, it's not appropriate to be discussing noise procedures with the pilot. Matt said they are working on ways to reach out to pilots before the winter months to ask them not make these requests. They are reaching out and continue to improve southeast flow compliance. However, he noted, in some years there is little impact and, like last year, when it was very wet, you will see more of this. So, he said, it's important they get the message out.

8. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

A. Update on Action Items from April 17, 2019 Meeting

Matt P. Davis said that there's really not too many action items. Cal State was one of them. The other action items were the three bills that were discussed earlier tonight and the noise office report. The Forum had requested copies of the April 17 report on the status of the Cal State visual approach and that was provided to them. Lastly, he said, Mr. DelliGatti had a correction to Page 5 of the draft minutes from the meeting. Those Minutes were corrected accordingly.

B. Viewpoint Update

Mr. Davis said the Viewpoint program was very close to being rolled out. It was provided to co-chairs on June 30 to look at and provide comment on. He said they are looking forward to their comments.

C. Cal State Visual Approach to Runway 30 Update

Matt said that this item was an update on the publication date for this proposed procedure, which the FAA continues to push back, basically ensuring that we have time to perform the analyses we need before registering the Forum's position. He said that Ernie DelliGatti has done some work as well in analyzing what the flight tracks could be, so by having enough time to do the needed analyses we will be better prepared to make an informed judgement. Facilitator McClintock said that he knew that Ernie has been following this very closely and has some strong opinions about it. He said there have been questions raised about the impact on underlying land uses -- particularly residential, schools, hospitals, etc. He offered that the NextGen subcommittee or the North Field/South Field Group could look into this and maybe come up with a better routing for this procedure that would minimize the impact on the noise-sensitive facilities and land uses by rerouting the procedure over industrial areas as much as possible. This would be particularly beneficial because the proposed procedure would concentrate flight tracks over a given area, much like what we've seen with WNDSR over the Oakland July 17, 2019

hills. Davis said that they have received some information -- like Mr. DelliGatti's analysis on the potential flight routes. He said he would take this to the North Field/South Field Research Group. McClintock asked Mr. DelliGatti if this was consistent with his own recommendations. He said it was, and in fact, if anything, by routing the track over the industrial area, it would also provide for an additional safety buffer for Hayward Airport as well, because light aircraft taking off out of Hayward are passing below 500 feet on aircraft under aircraft that are inbound into Oakland.

9. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

The last informational item on the agenda was Christian Valdes and Noise News and Updates, stated the facilitator. Mr. Valdes reviewed some interesting news from Congress. He said New York Representative Grace Meng re-introduced a Quiet Communities Act for 2019, which would re-establish the EPA's Office of Noise Abatement and Technology. With funding, the office would be responsible for the study of aircraft noise, promote noise control programs and research, establish technical assistance centers, assess the effectiveness of the Noise Control Act of 1972, and conduct public outreach. The EPA Office of Noise Abatement Control was defunded in 1982, and several bills have been introduced to try to revive it. None have succeeded. Now, with Democrats controlling the House of Representatives, they feel a bit more optimistic. Next, he said, Congressman Adam Smith from the State of Washington will re-introduce a bill that designates communities within one mile of jet aircraft routes that are 3,000 feet altitude or lower as aviation impacted. This would allow these communities to petition the FAA About noise. It would also include communities that experience a substantial influence from flight frequency and on neighborhoods within the 55 DNL or CNEL that experience a significant number of flight operations between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. Under this bill, communities that request and meet the criteria to be designated as aviation impacted must form community boards like the Forum or maintain existing groups of, primarily, elected officials to work on aviation noise issues.

At a recent Air Transport Action Group Committee, the Airports Council International world airport directors stated aircraft noise is still the most significant cause of a diverse community reaction to air transportation. Also, the importance of non-acoustic factors--which make up part of the reasons for community annoyance—was discussed, including the levels of trust residents have with airports and authorities in general. Further research on non-acoustic factors is needed, Christian said. On the FAA front, on May 1, the FAA released their airspace forecast for the years up to 2039. Over the next 20 years, aircraft operations are expected to increase by more than five percent. U.S. airline passengers increased by five percent between the years 2017 and 2018. The FAA estimates that commercial drone aircraft will nearly triple in the next five years to about 830 thousand aircraft. Additionally, space launch and re-entry operations will increase from 35 in 2018 to about 56 in 2021. Next, he said, Steve Dixon, the nominee for FAA Administrator, told the Senate Commerce Committee that stakeholders' engagement will be one of his top priorities. Dixon believes that FAA's inclusive and collaborative environments, which welcome diverse points of few and provide transparency, is the only way to get things done. Additionally, Dixon believes, it is important to thoughtfully manage the changes we are experiencing in the aviation system today and in the coming years, so that safety is not compromised, but innovation on the development of new technologies are supported. Dixon's career in aviation spans over 40 years, starting at the Air Force Academy, as a pilot for Delta Airlines. He retired from Delta last October as senior vice-president of flight operations.

Relative to the “Continue to Lower Energy Emissions and Noise (CLEEN) program, the FAA is anticipating two new aircraft technologies that will lower fuel burn emissions and noise will be on a path for introduction in commercial aircraft by 2026. Christian said that Section 176 of the 2018 FAA re-authorization required the FAA to do a report on the agency's community involvement practices on Metroplex projects, and the FAA has delivered. The report includes how the administration

will improve community involvement practices for NextGen projects located in Metroplexes, and how and when the administration will engage airports and communities in navigation procedure proposals, and how lessons learned from past NextGen projects will be integrated into future NextGen community involvement and practices. At this time, he noted, the FAA is determining whether it needs Congressional approval to release the report to the public.

On the research front, noted Christian, Wichita State University received a \$700,000.00 grant from NASA to lead the research on the development of new sound-absorbing materials that can be directly installed over aircraft engines. He said he would keep an eye on the research and bring any results back to the Forum. Next he said, 29 members of Congress would like the General Accountability Office to study how the FAA considered noise impacts during the implementation of Metroplex projects. The member sponsoring the request stated that the FAA found Metroplex projects would not result in significant noise impacts and reduce the quality of human environments. However, it was noted, the new flight paths have caused significant concern in the affected communities. Members of Congress would also like clarification on topics covering FAA's consideration of noise impacts, its definition of less-than-significant increases in noise, the effectiveness of the DNL metric, its disclosure of noise impacts on areas away from the airport, and how it handles public outreach. Two wealthy and influential counties near Reagan National Airport will contribute \$125,000 each to fund a study to identify ways to mitigate noise from that airport. Arlington County, Virginia and Montgomery County, Maryland claim noise has had a significant and worsening impact on residents, especially since Metroplex in 2014. The selected study contractor will provide technical resources to better understand the detailed nature of airspace management and possible alternatives and to coordinate efforts with stakeholders like the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority and the FAA.

Next is news from SoCal, he said. The Forum has been following the Burbank Airport story for some time now. On June 17, the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority, which runs the Burbank Airport, approved a resolution that requests the FAA change the departure path that has increased flights over residential areas in Studio City and Sherman Oaks. The departure path shifted south with the implementation of the SoCal Metroplex in 2017. The airport has been under a lot of public pressure to do something about noise, so now it has formally asked the FAA to reduce the departure noise. Over the Hollywood Hills, he said, the City of Los Angeles filed a lawsuit against the FAA last month challenging the new north downwind arrival procedures into LAX. The city believes the procedures were done without proper environmental review and public input. The FAA performed CATEXs (categorical exclusions) on these procedures, so the agency did not have to perform more in-depth environmental analyses or offer the opportunity for or require public comment. Public comments were submitted to the FAA through its flight procedures web site, but the FAA does not consider that web site to be part of the environmental review process. In April, the FAA added a disclaimer to the web site, stating that the web site is not intended to fulfill obligations under NEPA or solicit comments about environmental impacts or proposed changes in flight procedures.

Following up on the Boeing 737 MAX situation, the FAA continues to evaluate Boeing's software and has not established when the aircraft can return to service. Optimistically, the airlines which purchased the MAX, published schedules for November of this year that include that aircraft. To add to the MAX's problems, Boeing informed the FAA that the leading-edge tracks on certain 737 NextGen and MAX series aircraft wings may have been improperly manufactured. The FAA will issue an airworthiness directive to mandate Boeing's service actions. Christian closed with some drone news. The FAA awarded the first air carrier certification to Google's Wing Aviation, a drone delivery company. They will begin commercial package deliveries in Virginia later this year. Other companies, like Amazon, UPS and DHL, are currently conducting flight testing.

Facilitator McClintock commented that at the beginning of Christian's presentation, he mentioned legislation proposed by Grace Meng and Adam Smith. McClintock said he thought for a minute that we might have to amend the 2019 Work Plan again, but realized that if we did that, we would have to do it again for every other noise abatement bill introduced in Congress. He said, what he would like to have done with these two bills, in particular, and any other bills like these that might come up, would be to review them to get the gist of them and see who the cosponsors were because, in the past, we've requested that Barbara Lee sign-on as a co-sponsor to these types of legislation. He said he didn't need a motion; he was just providing this as a matter of interest, unless the Forum determined that it would be necessary to re-amend the work plan. Co-Chair Lee said he agreed that we should review any proposed legislation to see if it covers all the details that were in the prior bills the Forum supported. McClintock said he would review the proposed legislation when he got back to his office.

Kristi McKenney said she wanted to make sure that everybody knew, that since it's right before our next meeting on October 16, it will be Fleet Week. She said it's very important for Forum members to let their constituents know that this is coming up. The Port will do its usual outreach and publications on this to make sure there are no surprises, she said. And, yes, she said in response to a question, the Blue Angels will be here.

10. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING – October 16, 2019

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

11. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

There being no new business proposed, the meeting was adjourned at 8:14 pm.

END