

# Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum Meeting Minutes - April 20, 2022

## Table of Contents

1. Introductions .....	1
A. Recognition of Service – Mike McClintock .....	2
B. New Richmond Citizen Representative .....	6
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	6
A. Acceptance of 4th Quarter 2021 Noise Abatement Report (Receive and File).....	6
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES .....	6
A. January 19, 2022.....	6
4. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS .....	7
A. Subcommittee Report.....	7
B. FAA Regional Administrator’s Update .....	7
1. NIITE/HUSSH Departure Procedure to GOBBS.....	7
C. Oakland Five Departure .....	9
D. CLASS Noise Concerns .....	9
5. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	10
6. NOISE OFFICE REPORT .....	10
A. Update on Action Items from NF/SF Working Group and January 19, 2022 Forum Meeting.....	10
B. Viewpoint Update .....	11
7. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE .....	12
8. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE .....	14
9. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT .....	14

## 1. Introductions

The April 20, 2022 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by the Forum’s facilitator, Mike McClintock. McClintock noted that this meeting was a regular meeting and that there was a quorum. He welcomed all who were attending online or by phone.

### **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  
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward  
Bart Lounsbury, Interim Citizen Representative, Oakland  
David Drisdale, Citizen Representative, Richmond  
Amelia Berto Morgan, Citizen Representative, Richmond  
Benny Lee, Citizen Representative, San Leandro

**Staff Members/Advisors/Officials Present**

Alex Katz, Office of Rep. Barbara Lee  
Craig Simon, Assistant Director of Aviation  
Matt P. 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  
Susan Fizzell, Port Sr. Aviation Project Manager  
Colleen Liang, Port Environmental Supervisor  
Rolanda Rogers, Port Airside Operations Assistant  
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**

Tamara Swann, Acting Regional Administrator, FAA Western-Pacific Region  
Bonnie Malgarini, FAA Western Service Area Operations Support Group  
Joseph Bert, FAA Western Service Area Operations Support Group  
Alana Jaress, FAA Western-Pacific Region Community Engagement Office

[A. Recognition of Service – Mike McClintock](#)

The facilitator announced that before the recognition of himself, there was another member for which this was his last meeting. He recognized Ernie Delligatti for his service to the Forum and the community. He explained that Mr. Delligatti is one of the longest-serving members on the Forum. Mr. Delligatti thanked Mr. McClintock for the introduction and talked about his tenure on the Forum. He stated that for the past 21 years, he has been the Oakland Noise Forum Citizen Representative for Alameda County. He said that during this period of time, he tried to balance competing interests between the airlines, air freight companies and private aircraft that fly in and out of Oakland International Airport and the basic rights of citizens that are impacted by jet

noise. He stated that jet noise isn't just a Bay Area issue, it is a national issue that currently impacts everyone in the United States. He continued that for the past 21 years, he has tried his best when it came to dealing with jet noise. He expressed hope that he was able to make a small difference and left things just a little bit better than when he first joined the Noise Forum. He thanked Mike McClintock, Walt Jacobs, Benny Lee, Jim Nelson, Peter Marcuzzo, Ed Bogue, Valerie Jensen, and especially Jesse Richardson for their friendship, as well as the perspective that each of them bring to the Oakland Noise Forum. He said that he will truly miss the gatherings and back-and-forth discussions. He finished with the sentiment that it has been an honor to represent not only the residents of San Lorenzo but also those of Alameda County. He wished all blue skies, clear weather and, of course, happy trails.

Mr. Lee thanked Mr. Delligatti for his 20+ years of service. He said that in the nine years that he has been on this Forum, he's seen some changes. He continued that even if the changes don't seem like much, half of the noise report is now close to a hundred percent compliant, and that is largely due to everyone working together.

Co-Chair Jacobs said that he has been involved with the Noise Forum for as long as Mr. Delligatti, and he has had a lot to say. Mr. Jacobs continued that he's been wonderful to talk to and educate him in the process. He thinks the Forum has gone a long way in terms of their ability to work together and to do things in a really upright way. He wished Mr. Delligatti well and added that he is a terrific, terrific guy.

Co-Chair Herrera Spencer thanked Mr. Delligatti on behalf of the citizens of Alameda and the entire East Bay. She said that there is so much dedication; it is very hard work. She remarked about all of his comments in regard to making a difference, and said that rest assured, he made a difference. She said that it is so hard to get people to come and help us and represent us, so she thanked him.

Mr. Richardson said, "on behalf of myself, I want to personally thank you for all your support on the Noise Forum. I've grown professionally, thanks to you, which I am very grateful for. I've also appreciated knowing you on a personal level. And I would like to echo Trish's statement that you have made a difference. Thank you. I wish you all the best in your future endeavors."

Mr. Nelson also thanked Mr. Delligatti for his work with the Forum.

The facilitator moved on to the recognition of himself. He said that this meeting would be his last meeting though he would be available until his contract expires on June 30, 2022. He then read a prepared statement that said, "Forum members, staff and advisors, it's been my honor and privilege to serve you as the Forum Facilitator for not quite 24 years. It is with deep regret that I'm unable to continue to serve you due to a health issue that's taken its toll on my physical abilities. I commend all of you; that is, everyone who has been engaged in this process, from neighbors and the local communities all the way up to the FAA Western Pacific Region and the staff of the Western Technical Center, I guess it is, but we've had our successes, and we've had a number of significant accomplishments that have benefited Forum neighborhoods and communities. Above all, the Forum is currently engaged with the FAA to bring noise relief to its constituent communities, especially the implementation of NextGen flight paths and the Northern California Metroplex. They have been working with us. It hasn't been an easy process.

Hopefully, we'll come to some significant conclusions or positive conclusions as we move forward or as you move forward. Now, I'd be remiss if I did not thank Aviation Director Francis, Assistant Director Craig Simon and the Port of Oakland for supporting the Forum in all its endeavors, and from Kristin McKenny and Matt P. Davis for going to bat with the Forum, the Airport Noise Office staff, as well especially Jesse Richardson, Rolanda Rogers and Linda Crocket, among others, are commended for going above and beyond in dealing with community noise concerns, the other Matt Davis, Port Governmental Affairs Director, as well as Diego Gonzalez has been especially helpful in coordinating with elected officials at the local, state and national level. The Forum's current co-chairs, Alameda Councilmember Trish Herrera Spencer and Alameda Citizen Representative Walt Jacobs, have served the Forum with distinction, as has Benny Lee and others. I'm honored to have had the privilege of working with them over the past several years. Walt Jacobs is the longest-serving member of the Forum, having been on the Forum Organizing Committee in 1988 -- 1998. Walt also served as the Port's North Field Advisor prior to that. Retired San Leandro staffer Kathy Ornelas also goes back to the beginning of the Forum, having also been on the organizing committee. Edward Bogue was Hayward's original Citizen Representative to the Forum, having been appointed in 1998. The next longer-serving members are James Nelson, Berkeley Citizen Representative, and Ernest Delligatti, Alameda County Citizen Representative. Along with them, Valerie Jensen -- or Valerie Jensen Harris --has been the Forum's Court Reporter almost from the beginning and, without her meeting transcripts, I would be lost when it came to drafting the meeting Minutes. These folks deserve accolades for their persistence and dedication to helping make the communities better places to live. Before them, Carol Wedl and Larry Galindo also served the Forum while they managed the airport. Christian Valdes was also in that position at one time. Both Christian and Vince Mestre also did a great job as the Forum's Noise Advisors, as did Harvey Hartmann in airspace and HMMH as the Port's Noise Consultant. From the community, Barbara "Dela" also needs to be recognized for her long service and contributions as a founding member of Alameda's CLASS. I could go on and on but suffice it to say there are so many people I'm beholden to for their advice and support that I wish to acknowledge all of them. There are also those who are no longer with us who deserve to be recognized; most notably, our former San Leandro mayor, Tony Santos, Red Weatherill and Dave Needle from CLASS. They are all sorely missed. I want you to know I'll be there in thought. I wish the Forum great success as it continues to work with the FAA in its effort to maintain compliance for the airport noise abatement procedures. I've got to say, it's been quite a ride. I'll let you know I'll be around for a while to assist the new Forum Facilitator to get up and running. So, thank you again for almost 24 years of interesting times."

Co-Chair Jacobs spoke that he has been with the Noise Forum as long as Mike has, and he thinks that Mike has meant something to this organization that I call class. He explained that we have an organization called CLASS, but with Mike's help, he thinks that the Forum has been a very classy operation. Mr. Jacobs said that the Forum has done its job the best way that it can with the tools that it has. He explained that at the beginning, he was pretty cynical about the whole idea; it has evolved over the years. He thinks the Forum is a real voice. The real problem now is getting everybody to listen. He said it's always been a problem, and it's always been the challenge, but the Forum has handled itself in a very upright, positive kind of way, and I'm very

proud of that. He finished that the person that really established and set the tone for that was Mike McClintock. He said he will be one missed guy, as far as he is personally concerned, thank you, Michael.

Mr. Lee said that Mike brought him in when he began on the Forum. He continued that he saw all of the accomplishments that the Forum has done over the years. Mr. Lee gave the example that when he first started, there was never a FAA representative at any of the meetings; now they're at every single meeting. That's a huge accomplishment. He said that we take three steps forward and two steps back, right? He joked with the government works in dog years, i.e., the dog lives seven years in one of our lifetimes, but it takes seven years just to move one item. He said that in the nine years he has been with the Forum, Mike definitely helped with facilitating a lot of the changes. Mr. Lee explained for those in attendance that the Forum never had a subcommittee before. He said that a lot of that was done with Mike McClintock helping the Forum facilitate the process to make the engagement that much better for residents, constituents, and those in attendance. He said that it's not an easy thing. Forum members hear a lot of complaints, but that's not what drives the Forum to this issue. He explained that what drives the Forum to the issue is that they see an outcome, they are working to get there, and Mike has been instrumental in that process.

Co-Chair Herrera Spencer thanked Mr. McClintock. She said as a former mayor, she started with the Forum back in 2015, no experience as a pilot. Mike trained her up, and it's honestly through his service that she has personally learned so much. She thanked him on behalf of the citizens. She said that the Forum is very unique to have this, and it is because of Mike's leadership. She continued that everyone would say around the table, "We are inspired to continue our efforts because you have had such great leadership." She remembered taking the bus to Sacramento where Forum members got hands-on training. She said that Mike was always coming up with ideas to help the Forum be better stewards and to do our best. She said that it really takes his gentle, intelligent leadership that continues to welcome everyone, as well as members of the public, which is hard since they are dealing with experiences in very tough times, which is why the public comes to meetings, but Mike is always steadfast in his efforts to help the public express themselves and then lead the Forum on how to represent the best it possibly can. She ended with, "so truly, thank you so much."

Mr. Delligatti thanked Mr. McClintock and said, "everything that you have done for the past 24 years. You're a subject matter expert, ringmaster, head herder, enforcer of the two-minute clock, Peat Marwick and Mitchell, confidante, and, most of all, friend. I've learned a lot from you during this period of time. I'll always cherish our conversations, our time together, and I just want to say clear skies and happy trails till we meet again."

Mr. Simon thanked McClintock on behalf of the Port staff and said they sincerely appreciate everything he has done over the past 24 years. It's been great stuff. He continued that a lot of things have happened under his watch that really helped move the Noise Forum forward and really brought the teams together and gave everyone some food for thought and made some good changes to what the Forum was doing. He thanked him again and said that he will be missed.

Mr. Richardson read a statement from Port staff that read, “On behalf of Matt Davis, myself, and Rolanda, we would like to extend our personal thank you to you and to Valerie for all the work you've done on behalf of the Forum, as well as the community generally, over the past years. We greatly appreciate the chance to work with you, and your efforts have greatly impacted in developing the good working relationship that we enjoy today. And we have also ensured that we remain a solution-focused group that finds ways to partner together to mitigate noise issues. We'll miss you both professionally and personally, and we wish you all the best. Thank you, Mike, for everything.”

#### [B. New Richmond Citizen Representative](#)

The facilitator introduced Mr. David Drisdale as an additional citizen representative for the City of Richmond. He said welcome aboard, and we look forward to working with you.

## [2. ANNOUNCEMENTS](#)

The facilitator reiterated that it is important to recognize that the proposed Terminal Modernization Project is separate and apart from the role and responsibility of the Forum. Any questions or comments related to the Terminal Modernization and Development Project need to be directed to the Terminal Modernization site. CEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act, provides opportunities for public comment on the proposed project and the project Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Port environmental staff are engaged in the execution of the CEQA process for this project. However, he noted, because a lot of people have expressed interest in the proposed terminal project, the Forum will continue to provide interested parties with the dates and times for such opportunities. However, the Forum should not be expected to become engaged in a separate state-mandated procedure and legal process. The facilitator asked that interested persons seeking information about the project avail themselves of the information available on the project website.

#### [A. Acceptance of 4th Quarter 2021 Noise Abatement Report \(Receive and File\)](#)

The facilitator noted that Forum members had received the noise abatement report for the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 2021. He asked if there were any questions or comments, if none, he would entertain a motion to receive and file. Mr. Lee commented that at the last meeting, we had a hundred percent, and this time two are at 99 percent, which is still pretty good. He said that one has gone up to 95 percent, which is good. He complimented the staff on the great job. He did say that the Forum obviously wants to see all of them a hundred percent, but, that's a harder task to get to. Mr. Lee moved to receive and file the noise abatement report. Seconded by Rigel Robinson. There being no additional questions or comments, the Facilitator called for the question. Motion carried with two abstentions from the two representatives from Richmond.

## [3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES](#)

#### [A. January 19, 2022](#)

The facilitator noted that Forum members have received copies of the draft Minutes from the January 19, 2022 Forum meeting. He asked if there were any questions or comments? If there

were no questions, comments, errors, or omissions the facilitator said he would entertain a motion to approve.<sup>1</sup>

## 4. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS

### A. Subcommittee Report

Forum NextGen subcommittee chairperson Trish Herrera Spencer stated there has not been a subcommittee during this quarter. She stated that she received a constituent inquiry in regard to the FAA submitting and trying to get approval to shift the flight path over the Bay by five or 10 degrees. She said that the community is hoping that will happen sooner rather than later. I don't know if it would be possible to get an update on that. Mr. Richardson said that this will be covered under item C.

### B. FAA Regional Administrator's Update

Ms. Swann reported that she is now the acting Regional Administrator (RA). She explained that her position of record is the Deputy Regional Administrator, but she will be filling in as acting RA for the next six months or so. She said that she understood that Raquel notified the Forum that she would be taking a leave of absence for one year due to personal reasons.

#### 1. NIITE/HUSSH Departure Procedure to GOBBS

Ms. Jaress introduced the subject by saying that the San Francisco Roundtable made the request of the FAA to move forward with the NITE/HUSSH departures to GOBBS during the hours of 1:00 AM to 5:00 AM. She then introduced Ms. Malgarini who presented on the change to the NIITE/HUSSH departures during the hours described by Ms. Jaress. Ms. Malgarini said that the San Francisco Roundtable asked the FAA to take the nighttime south and southeast departures from San Francisco and Oakland out over the bay and then up the bay over the Golden Gate Bridge and out over the ocean before turning back on course. FAA air traffic, San Francisco Airport, San Francisco Roundtable, and the airlines all worked together and found that those two streams of traffic could be combined and use an existing departure procedure, the HUSSH off of Oakland. However, there was a limit of 30 aircraft per hour that could be combined between San Francisco and Oakland, and this constraint limited the hours to 1:00 AM to 5:00 AM. Ms. Malgarini said that the FAA completed a categorical exclusion, a CATEX, for this combined procedure. She said that the San Francisco Roundtable originally asked for longer hours of use, so the FAA will continue to study the possibility of extending the hours. The FAA will review the data after about six months.

Mr. Nelson asked in the mix of SFO and OAK flights what ratio or how many flights from SFO will fly over OAK in the nighttime hours. Ms. Malgarini said that she didn't have a number. Mr. Bert responded that there are some aircraft off of Runway 28 that won't be switched over. It's mostly the STIK departure and the 050 departures that will be changed to the NIITE.

Mr. Delligatti asked if most of the aircraft on the new departure will be FedEx and UPS heavies that will be one after the other between 1:00 AM and 5:00 AM. Ms. Malgarini responded that the heaviest at San Francisco usually depart at Runway 28 for length and depart over the ocean.

---

<sup>1</sup> After reviewing the recording from the 4-20-22 forum meeting it appears to me that Mike skip over Agenda Item number 3 "Approval of January 19, 2022 minutes"

She said that there may be a few heavies that can take the shorter runways, but, typically, they depart Runway 28. She continued that as far as the Oakland departures, the aircraft that use the SUNNE departure will be changed over to the HUSSH departure, but she believes most of the heavies already go out on the HUSSH departure.

Mr. Pourfarzaneh said that eliminating SUNNE will be disastrous for Alameda because the SUNNE has got the much-sharper left turn than the HUSSH has. He said excluding that will really have a bad effect on Alameda. He continued that the NextGen subcommittee is working to fix the HUSSH somehow. He said that adding SFO flights to the HUSSH will really have a bad effect on Alameda. Ms. Malgarini responded that the FAA is going to review the data after six months. She suggested working with the airport. She said that it is about the supplemental noise metrics and what noise is perceived or may be perceived. They are not sure if this is something people will be able to hear. She said that the FAA is trying to be transparent and say that there is an event above 60 dB, and it might be perceived, but it's not reportable under the FAA metrics. Mr. Pourfarzaneh said that he would like to record his objection to the change right now. Mr. Bert said that the FAA will, at times, be able to use the SUNNE, depending on the situation and what's going on. That's going to be an air traffic decision real-time. Mr. Pourfarzaneh said that we really appreciate your cooperation very much but eliminating SUNNE would be very disastrous because right now, as I said, the HUSSH has had a bad effect on Alameda.

Mr. Lee asked if it is possible to actually position some mobile sound measurements just to see and record the impact, because if this is going to be in place for six months, the Forum will need some solid data. Mr. Richardson responded that the Port has noise monitors located at the fire station on Bay Farm Island. They measured the HUSSH, and they can certainly take a look at the numbers when the procedure is implemented.

Co-Chair Herrera Spencer said that it sounds like there could be an increase in planes over Alameda from this change. She said if this is the case, what can the community do. Do they all start filing complaints again? Ms. Jaress said that over the next six months, the FAA has agreed to assess and can present that data. She said she'd encourage the noise office to continue to monitor inquiries and complaints to the airport and the FAA of any noise constituents may hear because the FAA wants to have that discussion with the Forum and with San Francisco at that six-month mark. Mr. Bert clarified that it's no more than 30 per hour on these two routes combined, so we are not talking about 30 additional flights flying the HUSSH every hour. What the FAA is talking about is up to but no more than 30 aircraft can be on the combined routes per hour or else the FAA can't go to this. He added that the FAA did a noise study, and there was no change in noise that they saw. He said that is part of the reason why the FAA did the supplemental metrics was to give everyone an idea of what the FAA was looking at.

Mr. Pourfarzaneh asked if SUNNE would move to HUSSH. Mr. Bert said that he can't say how many will be able to stay on SUNNE because it is scenario based, but the controllers will try to keep them on SUNNE as much as possible. Mr. Pourfarzaneh asked if the FAA is eliminating SUNNE. Mr. Bert responded that the FAA is not eliminating the procedure; however, flights may not always fly SUNNE. It's all scenario based. He said that in other words, if the controller can safely keep an aircraft on the SUNNE, then they will keep them on the SUNNE procedure.

Mr. Drisdale asked if there are sound meters in Richmond. Mr. Simon answered that there are no sound monitors in Richmond. Mr. Lee said that WebTrak will show you where all the sound monitors are.

Mr. Nelson said that he thinks the maximum sound levels on the HUSSH are not going to change, but the DNL may change. He said if the FAA increases the volume of traffic on the HUSSH alignment, what is the change to the DNL along the shoreline in Harbor Bay Island? Mr. Bert said there was no change, which is why the FAA did the supplemental metric.

Mr. McClintock asked Ms. Malgarini for a copy of the presentation to provide to the Forum members.

### C. Oakland Five Departure

Mr. Richardson reported that the Port of Oakland submitted a request to have the Oakland Five departure, which is a straight-out departure from the main runway, shifted five to 10 degrees over the bay to help with noise mitigation. He said that the FAA thinks it's possible; however, it has to be verified and confirmed if it is possible to make a slight shift. He said that that the process usually takes around 12 to 18 months. Mr. Bert said that it has gone through the validation process, and everything is good. He said that right now, it's waiting for prioritization, and once that gets determined, then the FAA will have an update. He said that as soon as they know that information, they'll bring that to this Forum to advise them of what happened, but it is still moving forward. Co-Chair Herrera Spencer said that it is actually great news to hear that it's moving along. She said that the Forum really appreciates the FAA's efforts to move it along.

### D. CLASS Noise Concerns

Mr. Hamilton said that there were four basic topics that he wanted to cover. The first one was a Medevac flight that occurred over Bay Farm Island that was an extremely low elevation flight.

Mr. Hamilton said that the next one has to do with DCM tail numbers. He said that these are tail numbers that he thought the tail numbers keep changing. Evidently that's part of the DCM process to hide aircraft's identity. He said he would like to talk a little about that and the airport's ability to be able to send letters to non-compliant pilots. He said that he recorded a series of non-compliant flights by placing complaints and getting the feedback in writing, and about one-quarter of the non-compliant flights were DCM. He said that he got some feedback from Jesse that stated that the DCM is a blocked tail number and, through audio recordings, he can identify the aircraft and follow up with the owner operator. He asked if OAK has full access to the owner contact information for DMC flights that are non-compliant. Mr. Richardson responded that staff does not have that information, nor does any airport within California. He said that the information is blocked. Mr. Hamilton asked the FAA "why can't the airport have the information so that they can track the plane's owners and register a note with them that they have not followed the noise compliance need of the airport?" Ms. Swann said that there was no one on the call that could answer that question, but she could get back to the group.

Mr. Hamilton next spoke about rubber removal operation on the evening of the 10<sup>th</sup> and the early morning of the 11<sup>th</sup>. He said he has some data having to do with that that he would like to present and get some feedback on. He said that he was told that the rubber removal work was going to be occurring between 10:30 PM and 5:30 AM. He said that what happened was there

were five flights that were non-compliant between 10:30 PM and just after midnight, but there were two flights that departed RWY 30 around the same time. He questioned why all the flights could not have departed RWY 30. Mr. Richardson responded that from the list provided, the two RWY 30 departures were at 10:35 PM and 10:51 PM. He said that most likely the workers were just getting started with their work, so they were able to pull back and get out of the way and let the two 737s depart from RWY 30. He continued that by 12:00 AM, they were well into the work, and aircraft would not be able to depart then. He said that it would be totally unsafe, and it wouldn't be permitted at all. Mr. Hamilton said that there were two flights that departed RWY 30 around midnight. Mr. Simon explained that those two flights cannot operate from the North Field because of weight restrictions. Mr. Hamilton said that he feels that the Port is optimizing rubber removal at the cost of overflights over Bay Farm Island.

Mr. Hamilton then spoke about noise reduction when departing from 30 because there was a stack of planes waiting for 5:30 AM. He said that there were several flights that took off making an early left turn and several flights that went straight out after 6:00 AM. He said that aircraft making the early turn were about 67.5 dB, where aircraft that flew straight out were 73 dB. He said that at some point we need data having to do with the benefit of the five- to 10-degree turn.

## 5. PUBLIC COMMENT

The facilitator opened the public comment period with the announcement that this is an opportunity for the public to speak on issues not on the agenda but relevant to airport noise and air quality at the Oakland International Airport. Suzanne Aberg from Save Our Skies East Bay said, "I've been retired a couple years, and I'm home much more than I used to be. And I've noticed, over the pandemic, there were fewer planes for a while, and it's now gearing up again, but it's gearing up now right over my house, and it never used to be right over my house. I get them going over Hillegas near Ashby, and we get them going toward the Oakland Airport, kind of from maybe the direction of El Cerrito right over our parking lot. I'm just wondering, has there been a change in the routing?" Mr. Richardson and Mr. Bert said that they are not aware of any changes. Mr. Richardson asked Ms. Aberg to send him an email with the date and time, and he will run a report for her.

## 6. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

### A. Update on Action Items from NF/SF Working Group and January 19, 2022 Forum Meeting

Mr. Richardson gave a report on the action items from the North Field/South Field research Group meeting on March 16, 2022. He said that the first action item was for staff to find incentive for north field operators to comply with the voluntary noise abatement procedures. He said that OAK and the noise office are working on a few different things to increase compliance. He said that staff is working with Freshtracks racks to update the website by providing some real images of real folks in the community, in Alameda and San Leandro. He said that staff is hoping that's going to get a more personal feel for the pilots. Mr. Richardson continued that staff put out signs with cards that have QR codes to our Whispertrack website. Those signs are in the North Field at the two FBOs, Signature and Kaiser.

The next action item for Port staff was to meet with the chronic violators in the North Field. He reported that he called the non-compliant operators and asked them to help us comply with the noise abatement procedure here at OAK. He said that one of them he has gotten through to, and the owner said they'll do whatever they can to try and help us be good neighbors in the future.

The third action item is a standing item which is the HUSSH/WNDSR procedure update. He reported that at this time, there are no updates on the HUSSH or WNDSR procedure.

The last action item was an analysis of pilot requests to depart the North Field. He said that he will be reaching out the subcommittee at the next meeting for what exactly the group is looking for.

Mr. Richardson continued with a report out on the action items from the last Noise Forum meeting on January 19. The first action item was by Mr. Marcuzzo. Mr. Marcuzzo suggested a six-month monitoring period to assess the noise complaint activity on the RNP Runway 30 procedure before taking action on the SLZ One procedure. The six-month monitoring period began January 20, 2022.

The next action item was also from Mr. Marcuzzo. He recommended updating the 103 radial to the 105 degree due to the changes in magnetic declination. Mr. Richardson said that he reached out to Northern California TRACON and asked them the question. He reported that the FAA responded with the information that the magnetic variation did not change with the OAK magnetic variation update, so the 100-degree radial has been the same since 1975. The FAA informed Mr. Richardson that if the Port were to change the radial to 105 degrees, the aircraft would come in approximately a quarter of a mile higher than they are now, which could create an unstable approach. The FAA said that it does not recommend that the Port change the 100-degree radial to 105-degrees.

The third action item was from Mr. Jacobs, He said that the Forum reps need to stimulate the communities to enter more noise complaints because the FAA needs to keep hearing from the community. Mr. Richardson stated that he is available always, and that he is always here and available to take the community complaints. He reminded the meeting attendees they can help get the message out. He said that staff has a number of ways to file noise complaints. He said that anyone can call him, and he'd be happy to log any complaints.

The fourth action item was Mr. from Delligatti, He said that it was necessary to get personal; communities need to see and hear what is happening with the aircraft noise. He also wanted to know the six-month monitoring period. Mr. Richardson reiterated that the six-month monitoring period began January 20, 2022.

The final action item was from Doctor Matt Pourfarzaneh. He asked why he was having trouble with Viewpoint. Mr. Richardson said that he is assuming the Viewpoint issue is resolved because he didn't receive an e-mail asking to check it with the vendor, so he thinks that issue is resolved. He hasn't heard of any other Viewpoint issues.

## B. Viewpoint Update

Mr. Nelson said that he checked out Viewpoint and noticed it's not identified as Viewpoint when you go into the Oakland Airport website. He said that it's not until you click on the button that

says, "Make a complaint," when you notice that there's Viewpoint in there. He said that it wasn't really clear how you go to Viewpoint on the website. Mr. Richardson thanked Mr. Nelson for the comment. He said that Viewpoint is kind of the overall program staff uses that captures the phone complaints, app complaints.

## 7. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

Mr. Valdez began by answering a question from the January meeting. The question was asked, "What is environmental justice?" He read the definition: The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin or income with respect to the disproportionately adverse human health and environmental impacts due to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies at the local state and federal level. "Low income" means a person whose median household income is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines. In the case of aircraft noise, federal projects are deemed to have significant impact if minority or low income populations are disproportionately impacted in the 65 DNL.

Mr. Valdez next reported that there's a study called "Demographic Patterns of Exposure to Civil Aircraft Noise in the United States" that was conducted under the FAA Center of Excellence for alternative jet fuels and environment, the ASCENT program. The goal of the research was to describe characteristics of population impacted by race or ethnicity, age or income. It suggests across some of the 90 airports included in the study there is an indication of sociodemographic disparities. The study found evidence that blocked groups with a higher Hispanic population and with residents with only high school education had higher odds of being exposed to aircraft noise. However, the findings showed substantial variations amongst the airports, which means associated demographic findings cannot be generalized.

There is an interesting story from East Hampton Airport in New York. In 2021, a 20-year-long FAA grant restriction expired, there's indications from the town to determine the fate of the airport. Town officials announced they will not close the airport but will seek to transition it to a private use which will allow them to impose environmental restrictions, such as curfews, which will improve town residents' quality of life. The majority of the town's noise problem is caused by helicopters going between Manhattan and Long Island resort towns. In January of this year, the town's board voted unanimously to close the public use facility on February 28 and re-open on March 4 as a private use airport. In February, the FAA Regional Administrator wrote a letter which describes the process to deactivate the airport which includes that some (\*) instrument procedures will become unstable. The FAA-operated navigational weather and communication aids will be disabled. They would have to re-analyze the airspace. And private airports cannot use publicly-funded procedures, which means that the town would have to pay to develop new procedures. Given that response, the town decided to delay the deactivation of the airport until May 17 and, two days later, re-open it as a private use airport under its new name, East Hampton's Town Airport, with new airport code JPX. The FAA approved the conversion.

In NASA news, NASA gathered public comments on a test of human response to UAM vehicles. The study will involve multiple testing locations. The goal is to obtain a wide range of UAM aircraft sounds to use in human response studies to provide insight into the human response of UAM aircraft noise that would collectively be challenging any single entity to acquire and to create an open database of human response to UAM noise for future sites. The study will be

two phases. In phase I, they will refine the methodology to be applied in phase II. Phase I is to begin in August or September of this year, and there is no date to start phase II yet. The tests will allow subjects to use their own computers, devices, headphones to listen to sounds provided by NASA over the Internet and register their annoyance rating for each of the sounds.

In SoCal Metroplex news, in 2017, the FAA revised certain procedures in Southern California, which, according to Malibu residents, increased aircraft noise and emissions over their city. To remedy this, they petitioned the FAA to lower the threshold of significant noise impact from 65 to 45 DNL. They may have the option to present the findings of FAA's Neighborhood and Environmental Survey, which estimates 60 to 70 percent of the population residing there in the 65 DNL will be highly annoyed. Extrapolating the findings, the new threshold of significance will be somewhere around 45 DNL. In addition to the threshold change, the city is requesting that the FAA prepare a supplemental draft EA based on a 45 DNL threshold of significant noise, also to amend Environmental Order 1050.1F to require the use of ISO 1996-1, which recognizes that, around airports, there are different tolerances to aircraft noise, and some communities are likely to be less tolerant of aircraft noise and, also, to create a special flight rules area over Malibu and the Santa Monica mountains to keep aircraft on assigned routes and above 2,000 feet, and, lastly, to conduct noise monitoring within the Malibu airspace and bar any commercial aircraft that exceeds noise levels above 86.1 decibels.

The United Nations Environmental Program published its Frontiers Report which highlights three critical, similar issues. One, urban noise pollution in general, not specific to aircraft noise, is a major environmental problem. Two, in recent years, we have seen devastating wildfires in many regions which can be attributed to land use changes and fire management approaches that don't appreciate the close relationship between vegetation and fire. Three, phenological mismatches are causing ecological consequences. These are mismatches of recurrent life cycle systems due to global management. Related to noise pollution, unwanted and high level sounds from roadways, railways or leisure activities impair human health and well-being. In the European Union, noise pollution led to over 12 thousand premature deaths and 48 thousand new cases of ischemic heart disease each year, and 22 million people suffer from chronic noise annoyance.

In UAM news, about two years ago, there was news about an MIT project which involves electro-aerodynamic propulsion which can propel aircraft and make it totally silent. On the top right you see an illustration of the aircraft, and at the bottom you see an illustration of how air monitors and air in general moves from a positive to a negative charge over the wing, creating a draft. The project caught NASA's attention and will receive a \$175,000 grant from the Innovative Advance Concepts Program, which supports research to evaluate technologies that could support future aeronautics and space missions. The MIT professor leading this program sees using this with UAM specifically for packaged delivery, enabling transportation that would not be possible in the more sensitive areas.

In news from Washington, DC, the House Aviation Subcommittee met to discuss the preparation of the next FAA Reauthorization bill because the act expires next year. They plan to evaluate how the FAA implemented the provisions in their Reauthorization Act of 2018 that addressed noise. They would like the next reauthorization to include what are the metrics used by the FAA, whether they accurately defray the effects on communities, whether disadvantaged communities are protected from being disproportionately impacted, what can Congress do and

the aviation industry do to foster further improvement in engines and aircraft propulsion systems and aircraft. They want the communities and the general public to continue to have a voice in the ongoing effort to alleviate aviation noise and whether the performance-based navigation communication tools, for example, can be improved.

In international news, last month Swiss International Airlines became the world's first airline to use "sun to liquid" solar fuel. Synhelion uses concentrated sunlight to produce carbon-neutral kerosene, which then can only produce as much carbon dioxide as went into the manufacture. This is a major contribution to decarbonizing air transport. Swiss International and Lufthansa have been pursuing methods for years to minimize carbon dioxide, but the use of solar fuel is a major contribution to decarbonizing air transportation.

On his last topic, Mr. Valdez talked about the SFO GBAS program. For the past six years, SFO received FAA approval to use a Ground-Based Augmentation system -- GBAS -- technology. A unit was installed late last year, and the insulation -- you see the unit's highlighted on the graphic. That's the location. It was installed last year, and just last month the FAA approved it for use. The GBAS technology enhances the GPS satellite signals to greater precision, especially under foggy and low visibility conditions. Some aircraft now use GBAS overlays which replicate existing landing procedures. The GBAS technology can also be used for noise abatement purposes, innovative approach procedures that will allow aircraft to approach at much steeper angles and use virtual random thresholds and other measures. A couple weeks ago the SFO Roundtable voted to move forward on seven innovative procedures, and this week SFO submitted those procedures into the IFP Gateway so they can be operational in the near future.

## 8. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting is scheduled for July 20, 2022.

## 9. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT

Facilitator McClintock again thanked the FAA, elected officials, and all who participated in tonight's meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.