

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

July 21, 2021

INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Page No.

1. INTRODUCTIONS	1
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS	2
A. Acceptance of 1st Qtr. 2021 Noise Abatement Report (Receive and File)	2
B. Noise Forum Annual Dues Notices	2
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	3
A. April 21, 2021	3
4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS	3
5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS	3
A. Subcommittee Report	3
B. FAA Noise Forum Meetings Update	4
C. FAA Regional Administrator’s Update—Raquel Girvin	4
1. WNDSR TWO Approach	4
2. HUSSH TWO Departure	5
3. SLZ-1 Proposal	5
6. PUBLIC COMMENT	10
7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT	10
A. Update on Action Items from April 21, 2021 Meeting	11
B. Viewpoint Update	12
8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE	14
9. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (October 20, 2021)	16
10. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT	16

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The July 21, 2021 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:36 p.m. by the Forum’s facilitator, Mike McClintock. McClintock noted that this meeting was a regular meeting and there was a quorum. He welcomed all who were attending online or by smartphone.

Forum Members/Alternates Present

Co-Chair Trish Herrera Spencer, Councilmember, City of Alameda
Co-Chair Walt Jacobs, Citizen Representative, Alameda
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County
Councilmember Rigel Robinson, Berkeley
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley
Councilmember Treva Reid, City of Oakland
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward
Peter Marcuzzo, Citizen Representative, Oakland/Chair, NextGen Subcommittee
Benny Lee, Citizen Representative, San Leandro
Bryant L. Francis, Director of Aviation

Staff Members/Advisors/Officials Present

Craig Simon, Acting Assistant Director of Aviation
Matt Davis, Airport Operations Manager
Diego Gonzalez, Port Governmental Affairs Representative
Jesse Richardson, Airport Noise and Environmental Affairs Supervisor
Joan Zatopek, Port Aviation Planning and Development Manager
Colleen Liang, Port Environmental Supervisor
Rolanda Rogers, Port Airside Operations Assistant
Chris Whitmore, Chief of Staff, Office of Mayor Butt, Richmond
Ruben Hernandez, City of Richmond
Kathy Ornelas, City of San Leandro/NextGen Subcommittee
Rhea Hanrahan, HMMH, Principal Consultant
Sarah Yenson, HMMH, Airspace Consultant
Tim Middleton, HMMH, Consultant
Christian Valdes, Technical Consultant, Landrum & Brown
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, Court Reporter
Michael McClintock, Forum Facilitator

FAA Representatives Present

Raquel Girvin, Regional Administrator, FAA Western-Pacific Region
Bonnie Malgarini, FAA Western Service Area Operations Support Group
Joseph Bert, FAA Western Service Area Operations Support Group

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**A. Acceptance of 1st Quarter 2021 Noise Abatement Report**

The facilitator announced agenda item 2A as acceptance of the first quarter 2021 noise abatement report, adding that Forum members should have received copies of the report with their agenda materials. He asked if there were any questions or comments before he entertained a motion to receive and file. San Leandro representative Benny Lee moved to receive and file. Motion seconded. There was no discussion. Motion carried.

B. Noise Forum Annual Dues Notices (and Fleet Week)

The facilitator asked Airside Operations Assistant, Rolanda Rogers if the Port had sent out the annual dues notices on behalf of the Forum. Ms. Rogers replied yes, the notices had been sent to the finance departments of the Forum's member communities. Jesse Richardson noted that the dues were payable by the

end of August. The facilitator added that although it was not on the agenda, he had been asked to announce that Fleet Week may or may not take place from October 6 to October 10. So, he said, stay tuned for further news.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. April 21, 2021

The facilitator noted that Forum members should have received copies of the draft Minutes from the April 21, 2021 Forum meeting. He asked if there were any questions or comments? There being no questions or comments, he called for a motion to receive and file. Motion made by Alameda County citizen representative, Ernie Delli Gatti. Second by Berkeley Councilmember Rigel Robinson. The question was called. Motion carried.

4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Facilitator McClintock noted that the July meeting is when the Forum elects its officers. He said the Forum has only two officers. They're the co-chairs. One co-chair is an elected official from one of the Forum member communities and the other is a representative from the community, the citizen representative. The current Elected Co-chair is Councilmember and former mayor Trish Herrera-Spencer from the City of Alameda, and the Citizen Co-Chair is Walt Jacobs from Alameda. He noted that both co-chairs have indicated their desire to continue as co-chairs for the Forum, and had asked that their names be put in nomination. The facilitator nominated each one for their respective positions. Benny Lee seconded the motion. The facilitator called for any additional nominations. There were no additional nominations and the nomination process was closed. The facilitator congratulated the two nominees upon being re-elected by acclamation for their respective terms ending July 13, 2022.

5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

A. Subcommittee Report

Peter Marcuzzo, Chair of the Forum NextGen/Metroplex subcommittee introduced himself, saying that at the April 21 Forum meeting FAA Regional Administrator Raquel Girvin announced that the FAA was done with WNSDR TWO, and they will no longer be considering any alternatives to the WNSDR TWO arrival procedure. He said the subcommittee was a little confused by this, as were other members of the Forum; and wanted to know more about the issues arising from the 2015 NextGen changes and the implementation of the WNSDR TWO procedure. In late June, Ms. Girvin was asked for clarification, and it was his hope that she would provide additional information tonight that would allay the peoples' concerns about WNSDR TWO and the status of this procedure going forward. As to the HUSSH TWO procedure, he noted that Bonnie Malgarini from the FAA's Western Service Area Operations Support Group, had given the Forum's NextGen Subcommittee an update on the status of HUSSH TWO, noting that the FAA had looked at all the possible alternatives and had to rule them out for safety and procedural reasons. He said Ms. Malgarini had offered to consider any other feasible options that the Subcommittee might come up with to change HUSSH TWO, so it is not a dead-issue, but the Forum needs to continue to work with the FAA on this. As for the San Lorenzo One Visual Approach, he said he believed that, at one point, the FAA said they had some initial questions or concerns. But, in subsequent communications, the FAA said they had resolved these concerns and didn't have any questions for the Subcommittee that he was aware of. So, they are still working on it. Alameda County representative Ernie Delli Gatti asked if the FAA was positive or non-committal when they said they had no questions; and did the FAA indicate their timeframe to get back to the Subcommittee. Marcuzzo replied that the FAA was non-committal and would

hopefully provide an update tonight. Delli Gatti added that, in his opinion, if they had no objections it must have looked pretty good, based on both his and Peter's analyses. So, his only question was "What's the hold-up?"

B. FAA Noise Forum Meetings Update

Matt Davis said they had not met with the FAA's airport noise forum for quite some time, and he was not sure when they would meet again. He said these meetings may or may not resume in the Fall. Regardless, he said, the Port is looking forward to getting back together with them.

C. FAA Regional Administrator's Update

1. WNDSR TWO Procedure

The facilitator asked Raquel Girvin, FAA Western-Pacific Regional Administrator if she could give the Forum any new or additional information on the WNDSR TWO approach, the HUSSH TWO departure and the proposed SLZ ONE approach? Joe Bert responded that Ms. Girvin had to leave the meeting, but that he and Bonnie Malgarini would cover these three subjects. The facilitator responded that in the letter the Forum sent to the FAA, it was noted that the Forum was taken aback because the FAA had decided that it had resolved the WNDSR TWO safety issue; hence, there was no reason to shift WNDSR TWO to the west -- that is, over Berkeley and Richmond—and that everything was done that could be done, and that there was no further need to look at the WNDSR approach. He asked if this summation was correct. Mr. Bert replied that it was correct, and that the FAA will not be moving WNDSR to the west. WNDSR is staying where it is, he said. Joe Bert noted that they had already briefed this to the Forum's subcommittee, and that they can't move it to the east either because of certain restrictions. He added that they've covered all these things already. So, he noted, until the Forum comes to them with another proposal or other ideas, WNDSR is staying as it is. The facilitator offered that unless the Forum or the community has additional suggestions of merit, this issue is pretty much set. Joe Bert replied that this was correct, but, like always, the FAA is willing to work with the Forum and the airport and do whatever they need to do; but they've addressed everything that's been proposed and explained why they can't do what the Forum has proposed. So, until the Forum comes up with something new, this is no longer an action item for the FAA.

Benny Lee said he thinks that the Forum had developed a very sound proposal in response to the issues and concerns raised by the community. However, he did not understand exactly what it is that the FAA would be looking for in terms of a new, sound approach. He encouraged the FAA to be more forthcoming in terms of working together with the Forum and the affected communities. Joe Bert replied that the FAA is willing to work with the Forum and its technical advisors; they are at the meeting tonight and are at the table and willing to work with whomever, whatever, wherever they need to be. Benny Lee asked if there was something different that the Forum could do, because what the Forum has submitted to date has pretty much been a no-go. He said, what we're trying to find out is what are the things that we can really do that will have a measurable effect, because we have all been working with the community for the last six years on this, and have even taken it to the level of the former U.S. Secretary of Transportation. Benny Lee thanked Ms. Girvin and her team for participating in the Forum's meetings and said that he was looking forward to seeing a more positive working relationship going forward, including gaining an understanding of what possible solutions may yet be available for the Forum to pursue. Right now, he observed, we're grasping at straws and coming up with potential solutions that we believe to be sound, but not, as it turns out. Every single recommendation that we've made is coming back to us, and we'd like to know, what are the options that may work to help solve this dilemma. We need to hear from the FAA about any possible solutions that may have been passed over because of time or other constraints; then we can work from there, rather than to just propose an idea only to suddenly see it get shot down. Benny said he could see this as a very positive working relationship with the FAA.

Co-Chair Herrera Spencer followed up, saying that she thought Benny Lee had raised some very legitimate concerns. Obviously, she said, six years of going round and round isn't working; and that she was very happy to still have the FAA at the table. It is very frustrating when suggestions are made, and people attend meetings, and nothing seems to be moving forward. So, it would be helpful to actually have some concrete suggestions from the FAA giving us some guidance; because just sitting at meetings and making suggestions has gotten us nowhere. Ernie Delli Gatti recommended that the FAA provide Peter Marcuzzo with a complete debrief on its basis for WND SR decision. He added that this would be very helpful to the Forum moving forward with any subsequent proposals or recommendations on WND SR. The facilitator asked Peter Marcuzzo for his thoughts on Ernie's recommendation. Peter replied that instead of hearing just "No. We looked into that," it would be nice to know why something didn't work out, other than "There's too much traffic down in the valley, so we can't take them that way," or "No. We can't move WND SR two miles east because of Travis Air Force Base." Well, he said, it only cuts a corner of Travis' airspace, so, he really couldn't understand that. Did the FAA check with Travis? He said he had a lot of questions-- a lot of questions, and that he guessed that the Forum will have to just be more specific in writing when they ask for things and try to get a more detailed explanation. Yes, he concluded, he'd like to know a lot more in detail as to why something won't or didn't work.

Matt Davis offered that either Joe Bert or Adam Vetter did a presentation for the Forum about a year and a half ago, which went through the various iterations of the WND SR requests and some of the issues the FAA had with them. He suggested that this might be a good place to start. Peter said that he remembered the presentation and that he would review the presentation to see if it covered all of the questions that have been raised about WND SR. The facilitator asked if Joe or Bonnie were amenable to following up with Peter Marcuzzo on a more-in-depth debrief after he's had a chance to review Adam Vetter's presentation? Joe Bert suggested that such a request should be made through Raquel Girvin's office with specifics as to what Peter would like to cover, and then they can get set up to do it. Joe did not know if Peter would like to do it in addition to our normal coordination meetings or whether he wants it to be done through the technical working committee. So, he said, just submit a request in writing to Ms. Girvin's office, then they'll work to set something up. Joe Bert added that the request does not need to come from the Forum, but since Peter Marcuzzo is the Chair of the Forum's technical working group, that will work as well. Joe Bert believed that a request from Peter to Raquel Girvin should suffice.

2. HUSSH TWO Departure

Bonnie Malgarini said that the last discussion on the HUSSH TWO departure was left at the issue of the Forum's request that the departing planes turn at 520 feet, instead of at or above 520 feet. She said that the requested turn at 520 feet did not meet current FAA criteria, and that another solution needed to be found. This was presented at the last meeting. At that point, she said, they had not come up with any more solutions, and have handed this back to the Forum. Which, she believed, had considered the possibility of having HMMH propose a solution or something else that the FAA could review. So, she said, the FAA is waiting for the Forum to come up with a recommendation for HUSSH because they could not find one that works. Peter thanked Bonnie for her update and noted that the Forum is working on this.

3. SLZ-1 Proposal

With respect to the SLZ-1 arrival proposal, the facilitator said that Peter Marcuzzo had heard the FAA say that what they had originally asked for or what they originally said they were going to ask for is off the table because they found that, within their own organization, they had the kind of information they needed to proceed with their analysis of the feasibility of this proposal. Bonnie Malgarini added that she had not realized that early on Thann McCleod at the Northern California TRACON had come up with the Cal State Visual in response to the Forum and/or a member of Forum and that air traffic doesn't actually

need the charted visual flight procedure -- because crossing the 100-degree radial has a very-high compliance rate. So, she said, she thought that Jesse Richardson had confirmed this in a subcommittee meeting, and, besides, the FAA's Air Traffic Organization doesn't really need it. Hence, they were trying to do it to support what the community wanted. Additionally, in the subcommittee working group, there was discussion about whether they really want it or not after thinking through the possibilities of putting it on a more defined procedure that would actually merge the flight tracks, as opposed to having them more dispersed. The FAA has a new Order, she said, that now says that they don't do charted visual flight procedures unless the performance-based procedure and all other options have been exhausted, so to speak. And since there's already a PBN (performance-based navigation) procedure there, they're not sure that they would be able to justify it. So, at this point, where it was left was for Forum's subcommittee to discuss whether or not they would like to move forward with this or to not concentrate the flight tracks and leave them dispersed as visual approaches directed by ATC.

Facilitator McClintock asked if the reference to concentrated flight tracks meant an RNAV (area navigation) procedure. Joe Bert responded that they were specifically looking at a required navigation performance (RNP) procedure. He added that from a technical perspective, the proposed SLZ-1 procedure would require some finessing, especially with the proposal to have arriving aircraft cross the runway centerline a little to the west and come back to line up with the runway. But, Joe said, the big hurdle with this one is the FAA's requirement that you have to be able to provide reasons why an RNAV procedure would not suffice. What the FAA is trying to do is to reduce the number of charted visual approaches in the national airspace. To be honest, he said, there are some airports out there that probably have five, six or seven different charted visual approaches, and it's kind of hard to keep track of them. He thought the bigger picture was that the FAA is trying to reduce the number of charted visuals, so that's why they're having us justify why RNAV would not suffice. Peter Marcuzzo thanked Joe and noted that he had been analyzing this. He said he found a couple of things:

- The 100-degree radial is not where it was 30 years ago, so you have to take a look at the whole thing; and
- Part of the problem is that aircraft may cross the 100-degree radial, but still cut inside, turning a final direct to the airport, crossing over a populated part of San Lorenzo that is north and east of the Hayward Airport

Peter said he was looking at this, but still needed to get with Ernie Delli Gatti. Joe added that he was asked to look at the OAKLAND FIVE Departure procedure as a possible RNAV option or to change the heading(s) for the current procedure to see if they can get it farther away from the shoreline. He said he would provide an update at the October Forum meeting.

The facilitator went to the public for any questions or comments they might have about this agenda item. He advised that it may not be possible to answer specific questions at this meeting, but staff and consultants will do what they can to provide the information requested. He noted that all questions or comments will become part of the official record in the form of the Minutes of the meeting. Dr. Antony Lepire wanted the Forum to know that he has spent over fifty years in government service, and he's served on "probably" 18 federal and state commissions. He said he appreciates what the Forum is doing, and appreciates that the Forum is dealing with some very complex problems. He said his wife is a pilot and that they live in the same house 300 feet from the top of the Berkeley hills. He called WNSDR ONE [sic] a total failure, and what the Forum needs to understand is that over the past six years, many of us are angry and frustrated because we have not felt listened to. Several people, whom he noted as not being present, have actually been very rude to us, and, he said, he's at a point after listening to Mr. Bert that he needs to say that WNSDR ONE [sic] and TWO are not fixed. He assured Mr. Bert that they are not fixed, adding that there are people on his immediate block who are good friends with the new U.S. Secretary of Transportation; and they are not going to turn their backs on moving those "air paths." He said the City of Palo Alto sued the FAA in the past three years, and the city prevailed in federal court. He and his neighbors

don't want to be litigious, but they are very tired of being ignored. It is no problem in reducing the impact of noise on 78 percent of the people if you move the path two miles east, he said, and it has no impact on the Travis Air Force Base lines. Dr. Lepire thanked the Forum for what it was trying to do and thanked them for listening to him, but noted that WNDSR is not over. He implored the FAA to listen to the community. Hope Salizar echoed what Dr. Lepire had said. She has lived in Piedmont since 2004, and now that her children are grown she has the time to become involved. She said that there has been a noticeable and perceptible increase in noise levels and in the frequency of overhead flights, which have had a discernable impact on her ability to sleep. These flights have had a negative impact on her quality of life and the air she breathes. She said she stridently objects to any expansion in the capacity of the Oakland Airport, and urges the airport to deny flight permits to the Blue Angels for Fleet Week in October if they have the capacity to do that. And, she added, she's extremely disappointed about what she's heard tonight about the run-around for six years from the FAA. Our city representatives who are here, and who are working hard on our behalf, are concerned that all of their work is just going into a black box, and they're not getting any feedback on what the impediments are is just unconscionable. She hopes that this can be rectified.

Reva Fabrikant thanked the Forum members for all their hard work and for supporting the people of the East Bay communities. She also thanked the FAA for participating in the Forum meetings. She said that back when we started in 2016, the FAA wouldn't even talk to us. They wouldn't listen to complaints, and they wouldn't even acknowledge that there were problems with noise from flight paths. But, sadly, she noted, this is the only thing I can thank the FAA for doing. It's pretty clear that the FAA is not willing to do anything any community is proposing. They said the same thing at the South Bay workshops the other day. Nothing that the community suggested could be done. The FAA turns it all down. Is there a single flight path that's been changed in the U.S. because of community suffering, or a change that wasn't the result of a lawsuit or correcting an issue that the FAA had with the path they created? We're tired of hearing how complex our airspace is, she said. Wasn't the Bay Area airspace complex the day before NextGen was implemented, she asked? At that time, complaints were few, and the noise was equitably distributed, and NextGen -- all hell broke loose when NextGen was implemented. Where is the sincerity and the understanding that the FAA claims to have? The FAA are the experts in airspace management. If they were sincere, they'd be offering alternatives to the flight paths that they created that have caused so much suffering. Have they ever even considered redoing flight paths and procedures near airports to alleviate community suffering? I doubt it, she said. All they consider saying is "No."

Tomas stated that he was not going to be as diplomatic as Peter and Benny. To be honest, he said, the job that the FAA has done is truly a joke. He said he's lived in the Oakland hills for over 15 years, and the peaceful life there has changed forever. It seems like what the FAA has done is to basically put WNDSR in the worst spot, on purpose. They literally put WNDSR over the highest elevation homes and the quietest neighborhoods. Not even a five-year-old kid could do that on purpose. Not only that, he said, if you go to Google Maps you can easily see that, as soon as the planes make a left turn from over the San Pablo Bay, and they start going down Pinole, there is plenty of open space, including the San Pablo Reservoir, the upper San Leandro Reservoir, that are literally a half a mile from residences. We're talking about half a mile. And yet the FAA cannot move WNDSR a half mile. Tomas said he was asking that the FAA move the path east to alleviate the noise -- half a mile -- and they can't do it, and they don't even offer a solution. It's a joke, he said, and an embarrassment. Not only that he noted, now we have to put up with little Cessna flights landing above our tree line on Skyline Boulevard at 1600 feet, and our homes are at a thousand feet, so we can literally see the pilot.

Carla Shapreau, a resident of the Berkeley hills, thanked Jesse Richardson for providing data and being accessible to the public. She said that the current FAA NextGen flight path over the City of Berkeley has resulted in a grossly disproportionate and unfair burden on the populated areas along the SF-East Bay hills, as the other speakers and public comments have indicated. The flight path should be shifted away

from highly populated areas, and it sounds like there are solutions, and there doesn't seem to be a response as to why such movement isn't possible. So, she continued, we're experiencing increased jet noise and fuel directly caused by the NextGen regime. She cited data she had collected related to increased aircraft activity over her Berkeley neighborhood since 2015 when NextGen was implemented. These data confirm a dramatic increase in noise and jet fuel pollution over Berkeley's populated hills and neighborhoods as a direct result of NextGen implementation. She requested that the FAA reconsider its action and move the path to a less populated area either east or west to mitigate health and safety, and undo the harm to the SF-East Bay populations from continued undue and inequitable jet noise and fuel pollution. The facilitator noted that Ms. Shapreau had provided him with an e-mail expressing her concerns, which he forwarded to Forum members and the FAA.

Bill Harrison, who lives on the Hayward-Castro Valley border under the path of arriving flights to OAK, questioned the planned expansion of the Oakland Airport and the FAA's consideration of the increase in volume and the impact that it will have on the citizenry. An example of this, he said, was Sunday night, July 11, between the hours of midnight and 1 a.m., where every three to five minutes we were bombarded with approaching incoming aircraft. The noise was unbearable, he said. So, with the expansion of the airport, he asked, what consideration is being given to the impact of this increase in volume and what assurance do we have that this consideration is being taken seriously? Mr. Harrison noted that he has lived at his current location for the past 30 years, and within the last five years the air traffic volume has almost doubled. So, he concluded, with these concepts in mind and with the impacts that have taken place, what consideration has the FAA given to the citizenry that are in the path of these incoming aircraft? Kat called in to say that she likes to hike in Redwood Regional Park. But the noise from loud, low-flying airplanes over the park every 3-5 minutes has become unbearable. There once was a time when urban dwellers could get refuge from the noise pollution of the inner city by visiting the Redwood Regional Park open space; but not anymore. Redwood Regional Park sees thousands of visitors from all around the Bay Area. Most all visitors have one thing in common: wanting to get away from the noise pollution of the inner city and find peace. Kat cited NIH studies that showed that children who are exposed to persistent airplane noise have a more difficult time learning. Adults have higher rates of hypertension, cardiac events, and anxiety and depression levels are also increased. The noise pollution created by frequent, low-flying, loud jets is not far off from noise torture, she said. What NextGen has created is borderline sadistic and shows a total disregard for the mental and physical health that the noise pollution from the airplanes have on the people who live and play below.

Fred Shurkus stated his opinion that once again, the FAA has shown that it doesn't give a damn about those of us victimized by the freeway in the sky that has sneakily been imposed over our heads now for six years. It reminds us of this outrage hundreds of times per day, every day and every night. He thought that maybe we've been approaching this issue the wrong way. While the FAA owns the sky, we, the citizens of Oakland, own the airport. The seven members of the Board of Commissioners appointed by the mayor and city council are all elected by us; and the commissioners must live here, too. Maybe a noise ordinance that restricts noise between, let's say, 8 p.m. to 8 a.m., would at least let some of us sleep better and maybe generate some pressure on FedEx, UPS, Southwest Airlines and the FAA to change their attitude and change WNSDR and, possibly, even some of the outbound flights in San Francisco that also are extremely annoying to us. Maybe the Forum should think about taking a little more vocal orientation, given that we actually have influence beyond the voice of just one representative in the House out of Representatives.

Matt Pourfarzaneh, president of CLASS, asked for the FAA to elaborate on just how much weight is given to the safety of citizens living under these flight paths with regard to long-term exposure to noise as well as exposure to jet fuel. He said he knows that safety is very important in the air, but just this afternoon, in a meeting with the FAA, he heard a lot about safety and why these flight paths cannot be moved. This made him curious to just how much weight is given to the citizens living under these flight paths? Aakash

from Bay Farm in Alameda said that he had issues with the smaller planes actually going right above and making these sharp turns as they fly out of the small runway. So, he wanted to voice his concern and see if there is any way the FAA has any app means to identify the “notorious pilots or planes” which are causing these issues. And, he said, hopefully, if they do not have that, maybe the Forum can take this as a feedback and give them the ability to penalize them immediately. He said he was aware of the noise complaint hotline, but by the time he tries to call it's already a little late, and he's not able to give the full details. The facilitator noted that upcoming agenda item 7B--Viewpoint Update--has information that Aakash will find to be very timely.

The facilitator asked Forum members if there were any additional comments or questions on this agenda item. Co-Chair Herrera Spencer said she appreciated the comments from the public, and would like to see more discussion in regards to the airport expansion project and how it might impact the community. She said she had serious concerns about continuing to support the expansion if we're not going to deal with the current problems. As for the idea of a noise ordinance, she said she did not know that this was an option, and would like to have more information. The facilitator responded that one of the Port's consultants can provide an overview of the FAA's policies on noise ordinances and what can or cannot be done with respect to restricting flight hours and the imposition of curfews. He called upon Colleen Liang, project manager for the airport modernization development project, to respond to the Co-Chair's airport expansion questions. Ms. Liang replied that the modernization development project will review and address noise impacts in the required Environmental Impact Report (EIR). So, yes, she said, potential noise impacts will be analyzed.

Benny Lee thanked all of the public commenters for their expressions of concern because, obviously, there are issues that still need to be dealt with. He said he was very interested in the issue raised by Matt Pourfarzaneh concerning the safety and health impact considerations for people living under aircraft flight paths, and would like to see what kind of studies are out there, particularly from the NIH. He thought that this might be something that HMMH could do. The reason he asked, he said, was that this might be something that the Forum can advocate for at the federal level. The facilitator said that he would advise the executive director of Benny's request to the Forum to pursue this. Ernie Delli Gatti said that he wanted to make sure that he was on the record as requesting that any noise metrics that they come up with for the new terminal project EIR are relevant as of today -- not 10 years ago, nor 5 years ago-- it's today. He also asked how the noise that the residents of Alameda County are currently experiencing will be presented, because noise will be the lynch pin in all of this. He said, we need to make sure that we're using the most accurate and complete data that's out there as of today. The facilitator said that he would pass this on to the representatives from the Port of Oakland.

Edward Bogue, Hayward citizen representative, commented on the EIR for the terminal project, saying it seems like it would be an appropriate place and the perfect place to study the different flight paths from WNSDR through Hayward and into San Lorenzo. Because, he said, as you shift these things through Hayward, Hayward has more problems; So, it would be nice to see a true study with computer modeling to see what happens when you move flight tracks around. There's no reason they shouldn't be able to study them in different positions and different combinations. Then we can see what we're really getting. If this is not appropriate for the FAA, then the EIR for the terminal project should look at it. The facilitator said he understood that the work that's being proposed at the Oakland Airport is terminal work and related more to landside facilities than airside operations, but, in any case, he said he didn't know how far the noise study might have to go to answer Ed's questions, and would leave it up to the Port's environmental experts to answer if that's feasible or a part of the proposed EIR. He said he'll have to circle back to Ed with that. Nevertheless, he added, the information that Ed and others presented tonight will go into the action items that he prepares for the Port staff. *[NB all questions and comments related to the airport terminal modernization development project will be reviewed by Port environmental staff. Also, no date*

has been set, but the public will have an opportunity to comment on the proposed project and ask relevant questions. There will also be an opportunity to comment on the draft EIR when it is published—no date as yet].

Rhea Hanrahan, HMMH principal consultant, responded to the airport use restriction questions raised by Co-Chair Herrera Spencer, saying that there are airports in California that have enacted airport use restrictions in the past, but these restrictions were implemented prior to enactment of the federal Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA) of 1990. So, she said, after that date, the FAA requires airport sponsors proposing restrictions to go through the lengthy 14 CFR Part 161 “Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions” process to get approval by the FAA to implement any proposed restrictions covered under the act. Without FAA approval, an airport proprietor cannot restrict the use of its airfield if it is a public use facility and the airport has accepted federal funds. Some airports have gone down this path, she said, and they have not been successful. James Nelson, Berkeley citizen representative, said he wanted to add to Ed Bogue’s comments, noting that he would like to see, at the October Forum meeting, a detailed estimate of the increased capacity and number of flights that are anticipated for each of the various flight paths that we’re talking about here; WNDSR in particular, but also, all the rest. This is because the community needs to know this to understand what the increase in noise level and frequency of operations will be. The facilitator said that he doubted that Mr. Nelson would have an answer by the next meeting [NB this is a question for the EIR], but he would present this to Port staff and advise the Port’s executive director that these are the kind of questions the Forum members would like to see answered.

Co-Chair Walt Jacobs shared his concern that with the proposed expansion of the airport’s terminal facilities, that it’s going to encourage more corporate jet activities, and the corporate jets are all going to be closer to the North Field runways and will want to use them, thereby putting more pressure on the city of Alameda. This is why he has suggested that a citizen representative or a couple of citizen representatives be appointed to the terminal expansion project advisory committee. They can deal with these problems, so that nothing can be presented to the public as a foregone conclusion. Additional jets on the North Field could be a bad scene. The facilitator thanked Co-Chair Jacobs for his comments and noted that he would see that they get entered into the record. He said that Walt should expect a response from the Port at the appropriate time.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

The facilitator announced that this was the opportunity for the public to speak on issues not on the agenda, but relative to aircraft noise and air quality at the Oakland International Airport. Brian Maguire introduced himself as a staff member in the City of Alameda’s Planning Department, and noted that he will be monitoring the Forum and airport-related issues for city staff. He said he’s been participating in some of the North Field meetings and, unfortunately, had to miss the last Forum meeting. So, he just wanted to say hello and introduce himself. He said he was happy to be here and to learn more about these issues. The facilitator welcomed Mr. Maguire to the proceedings. Reva Fabrikant commented on the proposed Oakland Airport expansion project and the statement that noise will be analyzed. She said she would like to know specifically what noise will be analyzed. Will it include the noise under all of the Oakland flight paths? Since the number of gates are going to be increased significantly, there will clearly be more planes; otherwise, why are the gates going to be increased? If there are more planes, the noise under WNDSR is going to be even worse than it is, which she can’t possibly imagine. So, she asked, will the Port analyze the noise under all the flight paths, not just those that are close to the airport but far along? She asks this because those who live under flight paths were not informed about the proposed expansion, and they had to find out through back doors. We (SOSEB?) were not on that list from the Port of Oakland even though we are going to be impacted greatly by the proposed expansion.

7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

The facilitator announced that Matt P. Davis and Jesse Richardson would begin by recapping the action items from the April 21, 2021 Forum meeting:

A. Update on Action Items from April 21, 2021 Meeting

Matt Davis gave the recap of the action items from the April 21st meeting, then summarized the activities of the North Field Research Group. To begin with, he said, most of the action items centered around the HUSSH and WNSDR procedures; which were previously discussed under agenda item 5. Most of them are essentially asking that the Port continue to work with the NextGen subcommittee and work with the FAA on solutions to these two procedures. As was discussed earlier, the Port will continue to work with Peter Marcuzzo and the subcommittee, as well as the FAA and our consultants to try to find solutions to these issues. So, he said, we are all committed to maintaining visibility on these and keeping after them. In terms of the issues before the North Field-South Field Research Group meeting, he highlighted the fact that the NF-SF Research group is a technical group that meets to review and consider other items related to noise at the airport, and is not necessarily involved with NextGen-related procedures per se. As for action items, the group is currently holding off working with the FAA on RNAV departure procedures to replace the conventional Oakland departure off Runway 30--the daytime departure that goes straight out. There's a concern, he said, that the conventional procedure, where departing aircraft fly a heading off the runway, may actually be blown of course towards Alameda and create additional noise. Previously, the FAA had advised they could not make this an RNAV procedure. So, again, the group is keeping an eye on it, and awaiting evolutionary changes in FAA RNAV policies.

Other action items that were completed by the NF-SF group included a list of pilot refusals; these are pilots that regularly depart off the North Field. Staff had reached out to them again, and staff continues to work hard to interface with individuals that refuse to observe the noise abatement procedures. By and large, though, he said, well over 95 percent of pilots do comply with the procedures, but there are a few operators that do not. This information is provided to CLASS and the City of Alameda as part of a multi-pronged approach to bring these pilots into the noise abatement program. In certain cases, he said, we have been successful, but we continue to do outreach. Davis said the Port is not going to stop until they achieve 100 percent compliance with the North Field jet departure procedures given the noise impacts to Alameda otherwise.

Looking at the call-in feature in the quarterly noise reports, Davis said, you'll see that there are no more call-ins listed, and people were wondering if they can still call in? Yes, he said, they can still call in and complain. However, the system now takes that information and automatically generates an electronic record of it, and now comes in like an e-mail complaint. The concern was that we stopped taking calls into the Noise Office. That's not the case. If you call in, the voice system will catalogue that call, digitize it and enter it into the database. The Noise Office still accepts calls on its office line. If folks are going through the reports and are confused by the lack of what we consider to be traditional call-ins, we're still taking those, but they show up differently in the report. He said they are always making changes and upgrades to their system as the technology evolves. Other things we work on with some success, he said, include the North Field Quiet Hours compliance rate, which continues to improve. These are basically smaller aircraft departing the North Field on Runway 28L. The NF-SF Group asked air traffic control to move these departures to Runway 28R. This was done and the aircraft compliance rate improved. This was a combined effort on the part of the community, the FAA, and the airport. He said, they will continue to monitor the procedure until 100% compliance is achieved.

As for other action items, Matt said, the group discussed the Taxiway B rehabilitation currently underway. He described the nature and extent of the project from an illustration on his shared screen, saying that

every 10 to 15 years they have to do major rehabilitation work on the taxiway system to keep it safe and compliant with standards. Like any roadway, taxiways wear out; so, they phase it in such a way to minimize the impact on the community. However, he noted, because there are certain things that cannot be interrupted, they have to avoid severing the tie between the north and the south sides of the airport. If that were to occur, business jets will depart off the North Field because there is no other way for them to get to the main runway on the South Field. Matt said there would be two periods in which North Field jet departures would be experienced: September 13 through October 3 and October 19 through November 1. During these periods an inability for jet aircraft to transition from the North Field to the South Field will exist, and North Field jet departures will happen. He said this information will be posted on the web site, and community advisories will be issued. Unfortunately, this is a necessity, and it has to be done now. But, once it is done, it should not have to be repeated for another 10 or 15 years.

The group discussed FedEx's aircraft fleet mix and the retirement of some of its older aircraft. FedEx publishes this information and it is shared with CLASS. Davis said that FedEx just announced that they have retired some of its older DC10s. They still have some of their DC10-30s still in service, but these are newer models. FedEx has a plan to retire aircraft in its fleet over the next two to three years. UPS also publishes similar information, which is also shared with the community. Ernie Delli Gatti asked about the non-compliant North Field pilots, and if the Noise Office was sending admonishment letters to their corporate headquarters advising them that their pilots are in non-compliance? Davis replied that the noise office sends such letter, as do the CLASS and the City of Alameda. Delli Gatti asked if there had been any replies to the letters. As for the noise office, replied Jesse Richardson, there have been no response, but he was not sure about CLASS or Alameda. Matt said the noise office continues to monitor compliance rates across the board, but it is a never-ending task. They will keep on it. Co-Chair Herrera Spencer thanked Jesse and the noise office for their follow-up, and for working with CLASS and everyone who are sending letters out and then following up.

B. Viewpoint Update

Jesse Richardson shared his screen to show the airport noise office website (flyquietoak.com). He described some of the features of the site, including "Recent News," which had information on upcoming taxiway rehabilitation projects and OAK apps updates. He noted also that Forum agendas, meeting notices, and meeting minutes can be found under the "Documents" tab. There have also been significant updates to the Viewpoint app, he said, including the ability to sign up for the app. To sign up for the Viewpoint app you need to visit the web site and click on the button that says "OAK noise complaint app." You'll be asked to either log in or create an account. As for updates to the Viewpoint app, he said, now recognizes the individual's first name. As you see here, he pointed out, it says, "HI, Jesse." It's my account, which is a pretty neat feature. The second feature added is a bar graph on the history page. There are two graphs. One depicts the number of events, and the other is a breakdown by type of event. Information is also available for the numbers of daily and weekly events, and you can toggle how many complaints you, as an individual have filed with the airport. The last upgrade, he noted, was a significant one, in that there is now a "Submit Report Now" button. This allows complainants to lodge complaints more quickly. By clicking the "Submit Report Now" button, there are no other fields that need to be completed. If you have an account, you can log in on your phone and push this button and your noise complaint is submitted into the ANOMS system. The you can see the date and time the complaint was logged-in. So, Jesse concluded, those are the three significant app updates that he wanted to brief the Forum on.

Matt Davis talked about other new developments coming about as a result of the new contract the Board of Port Commissioners signed with Envirosuite that became effective on July 1. This contract includes the upgrading of the airport's permanent noise monitoring equipment in Alameda and San Leandro. He recapped the primary goals of the airport noise office, including facilitating the ability to make noise complaints, saying that they do not want the technology to be a hindrance; they want folks to be able to

get their complaints in. He said they were excited about the functionality being added to the system; noting that all the other ways of complaining still exist, but now there is the ability to hit a button, and it sends the complaint in and keeps the information to facilitate processing the complaint. Another goal of the noise office is to make sure the reporting tools are available to people who are interested in the website. We want to educate the complainants that are out there on the use of the updated app. Now, there are all sorts of information available that encourage interested folks to dig into the data available. The third goal of the noise office is to provide flexibility for the users. Some folks just want to make a complaint; others want to research historical accounts. Information is available for folks who want to learn more, and this is where we see more enhancements coming in the next year. In Toronto and San Francisco, they have a similar product called Insightful developed by Envirosuite. This app provides a series of interactive educational opportunities with videos for people who want to learn more about noise. It talks about flight patterns. It's interactive with voice overlay. It's sort of the three-pronged approach, one of which, again, is education, which is what we're focusing on for the next year for members of the community and the reporting function facilitating ease of complaining for individuals who merely want to make a complaint. Also, if someone is working with local communities, and folks have things they particularly want to see on the web site or are interested in getting feedback, this can be a very useful tool for the community. We want to get this information out to interested people, Matt said. If you have neighbors that ask similar questions, if you have questions, or things aren't clear, that's the kind of stuff we want to put there to make it a valuable educational tool for individuals in the community. So, he concluded, this is the direction the Noise Office is heading over the next year with our programs.

Benny Lee said that since he first started with the Forum in 2013 data intelligence has come a long way. He said he encourages all those who are in attendance to go to flyquiotoakland.com and really take advantage of this and learn the tools and encourage others to learn too. There are a lot of great resources there, and you can actually see information that's captured and whether it's real time or historical. Now, he said, we have tools that can actually graphically display all the different flight tracks and noise impacts for any given period. This was something that we started asking for back in 2013 and he wanted to thank Jesse and the staff for their efforts. So, he said he encourages everybody to go to flyquiotoakland.com and share this with your friends and neighbors who may want to learn more about this and also want to get engaged in terms of making noise complaints. This tool makes it much simpler.

Matt Pourfarzaneh said he wanted to commend the noise office staff for their outstanding work for the community. He responded to Mr. Delli Gatti's earlier query about getting responses from the non-compliance letters, saying that although CLASS has not received any direct replies, it is worth noting that the number of non-compliant takeoffs from the North Field has been reduced by at least 80 percent. The other part of the collaboration was also getting Mr. Berger, the new tower chief, to the table, as well as FedEx and Southwest Airlines. This has been very helpful because you can hear the complaints and the nature of the complaints firsthand versus just seeing the numbers on paper. Other things that the community has been doing through the noise office is sharing the notifications of planned repairs or maintenance with the community. This has been very helpful, he said, because they know this is part of the maintenance and safety, and it makes them aware this is going to happen on a certain date and certain times. Then people can plan around it in order to mitigate the noise for themselves. It's been very collaborative, very helpful, and we are grateful for it. It is fervent hope that someday soon we get to do this together with the FAA, and it will be a two-way conversation as opposed to they tell us, "No. No. No."

Aakash said it was interesting to hear that the Port already has a solution for raising complaints online. He said he was concerned about the terminal "expansion" project, and assumed that there will be more gates, and more flights. Common sense dictates that the greater number of planes flying overhead just increases the risks for those on the ground. He said this could be very disconcerting for those having to work from home, as more and more people are doing. So, he said, he just wanted to raise this concern and see if there is any study being done on the risk of planes crashing or things falling from flights crashing

overhead when you are at home. He said he didn't know if this would also increase the cost of home insurance or something of that nature for residents who are near to the airport. The facilitator asked Colleen Liang to what extent might these concerns be considered in the EIR under the category of safety? Ms. Liang replied that they are still in the process of developing the scope of the EIR and the impacts they're going to analyze. She said she does not have a response at this time, but has noted Aakash's concerns. James Nelson noted that there are also risks to health, noise in particular, but, also, air quality, that need to be addressed in the EIR. The facilitator replied that, from Colleen's perspective, she knows she has to look into this as well. To what extent is entirely up to the CEQA scoping protocols. Benny Lee had a question pertaining to health impacts, asking when we have all these takeoffs and landings, the amount of fuel burned adds to the emission burden for carbons in the atmosphere. The question is, what is the anticipated extent of carbon pollution and air toxins that will be coming back down and impacting the homes or the public underneath, and will this be factored into the EIR? Ms. Liang replied that, "Yes," this will be addressed, but as she noted earlier, they are still developing the scope of the EIR. She said Mr. Lee's comments have been noted. Benny added that, with the proposed terminal expansion and commensurate increase in commercial airline activity, he didn't see why the airport shouldn't add more air quality sensors around the airport. The facilitator noted that there are both state and federal air quality regulations, and both the state of California and FAA have computer models to predict future pollutant emissions. Benny noted that smoke from last year's wild fires was some of the worst in recorded history, with the Bay Area on a par with New Delhi for several days.

8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

Christian Valdes of Landrum & Brown began his presentation with some comments received by the FAA relative to its neighborhood environmental survey (NES). As most of us are aware, he said, the NES findings showed a large increase in aircraft noise annoyance. The FAA stated it will not act on these findings until it considers public and other stakeholders' comments and further research ideas submitted in response to the FAA's request to be informed on its noise policy. The Airport Council International (ACI) proposed 20 new areas of research to support a science-based update to the FAA noise policy. The airline trade group, Airlines for America (A4A) and cities and community groups also weighed in and proposed new research ideas in light of the NES findings. There are differing opinions among stakeholders. On one side, some say the FAA should proceed immediately with interim noise policy responses to the findings. The other side says the FAA should wait until additional research is performed which could delay policy changes for decades or even longer. Ninety-five percent of the four thousand or so comments received by the FAA on the NES were from community groups and by individuals. Not surprisingly, they sided with the recommendations for "immediate answers to improve noise policy." ACI urged the FAA to consider two factors. One, members with experience in dealing with noise think there's no guaranteed one-size-fits-all solution to address noise problems across the country. Two, the aviation industries will work hard on the COVID 19 pandemic and resulting economic crisis. Any potential new noise policy needs to reflect these challenges as well as the limited ability for airports to absorb new costs.

In a May 10 letter to FAA Administrator Dickson, they requested an explanation on how the FAA plans to proceed and move forward in light of the NES findings. Administrator Dickson responded they are continuing to lay additional foundation to the noise policy review. As part of the effort, they bring onboard the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to help design a policy review framework that will include input from substantially-affected stakeholders and local communities. The FMCS would also facilitate dialogue among these stakeholders. The policy review process will be robust, data driven and will challenge long-standing assumptions relative to the use of metrics and environmental risks and tradeoffs. Administrator Dickson also said the FAA would review continued use of the DNL metric. If they determine it would remain the primary metric, then the FAA will review whether the DNL or CNL 65 should remain the threshold for residential land use capability and significant noise expansion. They called this policy review a victory.

A recent decision reported in Airport Noise News, and written by founding members of the Aviation-Impacted Community Alliance in Palo Alto, describes and outlines problems with the FAA community engagement process and several fundamental issues, including: (1) The term "community" is ambiguous and must be defined to avoid misunderstanding. The term should be changed to "communities" and be used exclusively to refer to residents who are directly impacted by aviation noise and other pollutants. Under this definition, an airport operator would no longer be considered a community representative; (2) Two, the FAA provides insufficient information. The FAA should disclose all the factors involved in proposed changes, such as noise level changes, increases in altitude, increasing concentration and change in ground track end points, landing gear settings, flap settings, air brakes, et cetera; (3) Communities are involved too late in the participation stage, as opposed to participation in the early stages of developing procedure objectives and design; and [skipping to slide No.7] (7) The FAA's community engagement structure and strategy fosters disengagement. For example, on the FAA's noise program, they describe that the FAA will not respond to the same general complaint or inquiry from the same individual more than once. They see this as complaint suppression, and it guarantees the number of complaints about NextGen will decline while the impact on the residents remains the same or gets worse. As part of its community engagement, the FAA held two workshops recently in the Bay Area. They showed a video with an overview of the Bay Area flight procedures and answered a few questions from the public. One item that was stressed several times was the FAA's number one priority being safety. In analyzing new procedures or, as mentioned, existing procedures, community recommendations are considered by the FAA, but, unfortunately, not always implemented due to airspace and safety conflicts.

There were two questions on WNDSR that were asked of the FAA. One of the residents stated that, while living under the WNDSR arrival procedures, they noticed aircraft are underpowered instead of near idle power or idle power. The FAA responded that aircraft, at times, on the WNDSR, have to be taken off the optimum four-thousand-foot descent as part of the procedure to keep them under SFO departures over the East Bay. Another item was whether the REBAS intersection over Richmond can be moved. At the meeting, the FAA did not say whether it could be moved or not moved, but after the workshop, Christian said he was informed that the FAA had "rejected" this idea.

Across the bay, SFO is installing a ground-based augmentation system, "GBAS," to implement high-precision landing procedures. This will provide greater precision guidance for arriving aircraft, reduce delays during poor weather and reduce aircraft noise and emissions. SFO is the third U.S. airport to get GBAS installed behind Newark International Airport and George Bush Intercontinental Airport. On the college front, Christian said, the University of Bath, England developed a foam-like material that could reduce aircraft engine noise as much as 16 decibels. It's considered the lightest sound insulation material at 0.13 pounds per cubic foot. It can be inserted within the engine covering, reducing engine noise to passengers and people on the ground. They claim the material may have several applications, including residential building and construction. Local government entities in the Midwest and East Coast signed agreements to work with NASA on how cargo-carrying drones and passenger-carrying air taxi services can be best included in civic air transportation plans. They plan to hold at least four workshops through the summer of 2022 and find the best way to implement and advance the system and develop a best practice document.

Joby Aviation, based in California, that develops all electric air taxis, partnered with Reef Technology to develop takeoff and landing sites for its aerial ride-sharing. Reef is the company's largest parking and garage operator and reaches over 70 percent of the America public. It targets money hubs. It will give access to a large "roof" application across key metropolitan areas in LA, Miami, New York and San Francisco Bay Area. They will offer air taxi services within a 150-mile range starting in 2024. American Airlines has committed to a potential one billion dollars pre-order for up to 250 electric vertical takeoff and landing aircraft with an option to buy an additional 100 aircraft. The "EVAX" can carry up to four

people, one pilot, and fly a range of 100 miles at a cruising speed of 200 miles per hour. The first flight tests will take place later this year with certification as early as 2024. In related news, earlier this year United Airlines placed a one-billion-dollar order which will start service also in 2024. On the Internet, Christian found this nice, little snapshot of the big players in "EVTOL" or UAM air taxi services. It also shows those who are financially supporting them. Rolls Royce, Microsoft, Honeywell, and Toyota are big investors in these companies.

9. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2021.

10. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

Facilitator McClintock again thanked the FAA, elected officials, and all who participated in tonight's meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

END