

# Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum

## DRAFT Meeting Minutes – July 17, 2024

### Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTIONS .....	1
2. ANNOUCEMENTS.....	2
A. FY 24/25 Noise Forum Membership Dues.....	2
B. FY23/24 Noise Forum Membership Dues Update .....	2
C. First Quarter 2024 Noise Abatement Report.....	3
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES .....	3
A. April 17, 2024.....	3
4. HYBRID MEETING RECAP .....	3
5. ACTION ITEM – ANNUAL CO-CHAIR ELECTIONS .....	3
A. Elected Representative Co-Chair .....	3
B. Community Representative Co-Chair .....	4
6. NEXTGEN SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE .....	4
7. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	4
8. FAA REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR’S UPDATE .....	7
9. NOISE OFFICE REPORT .....	7
A. Update on Action Items from North Field/South Field Working Group.....	7
B. Update on Action Items from April 17, 2024, Noise Forum Meeting.....	8
10. POST-METROPLEX PROCEDURES AND CHART SUPPLEMENT NOISE ABATEMENT INFORMATION ENTRIES.....	8
11. NOISE NEWS UPDATE.....	10
12. NEW BUSINESS / CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE .....	13
13. ADJOURNMENT.....	13

### 1. INTRODUCTIONS

The July 17, 2024 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum (Noise Forum) was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by the Noise Forum’s facilitator, Rhea Hanrahan. Ms. Hanrahan noted that this meeting was a regular meeting and that there was a quorum. Roll was taken.

#### **Noise Forum Members/Alternates Present**

Co-Chair Trish Herrera Spencer, Councilmember, Alameda  
Jay Seaton, Community Representative, Alameda

James Nelson, Community Representative, Berkeley  
Edward Bogue, Community Representative, Hayward  
Janani Ramachandran, Councilmember, Oakland  
Bart Lounsbury, Community Representative, Oakland  
David Drisdale, Community Representative, Richmond  
Co-Chair Benny Lee, Community Representative, San Leandro  
Craig Simon, Interim Director of Aviation, Port of Oakland

### **Staff Members/Advisors/Officials Present**

Doug Mansel, Acting Assistant Director of Aviation  
Matt P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager, Port of Oakland  
Jesse Richardson, Airport Noise and Environmental Affairs Supervisor, Port of Oakland  
Diego Gonzalez, Director of Government Affairs, Port of Oakland  
Joan Zatopek, Manager, Planning and Development, Port of Oakland  
Santiago Govea, Aviation Intern  
Rhea Hanrahan, Noise Forum Facilitator, HMMH  
Tim Middleton, Technical Consultant to the Port, HMMH  
Jason Stoddard, Consultant to the Port, HMMH  
Sarah Yenson, Consultant to the Port, HMMH  
Christian Valdes, Technical Consultant to the Noise Forum, Landrum & Brown  
Bert Ganoung, Noise Manager, San Francisco International Airport  
Carl Stallone, Chief Pilot, Spirit Airlines

### **FAA Representatives Present**

Carlette Young, Acting Supervisor and Senior Advisor, Western-Pacific Regional Administrators Office  
Joe Bert, Operations Support Group  
Bonnie Malgarini, Operations Support Group  
Harley Aronson, OAK Air Traffic Control Tower

Ms. Hanrahan reminded everyone that the meeting was being transcribed by a court report. She asked everyone to speak clearly and slowly and speak one at a time.

## 2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

### A. FY 24/25 Noise Forum Membership Dues

Facilitator Hanrahan announced that the annual Noise Forum membership dues were recently sent via email or postal mail from the Port of Oakland (Port) Finance Department to all jurisdictions for the 2024/2025 fiscal year.

### B. FY23/24 Noise Forum Membership Dues Update

Facilitator Hanrahan reminded members that payment has not been received from the City of Oakland for the annual Noise Forum membership dues for the 2023/2024 fiscal year. The Port and Facilitator Hanrahan contacted the City without success. She stated it would be appreciated if members of the Noise Forum could assist in receiving that payment.

### C. First Quarter 2024 Noise Abatement Report

Facilitator Hanrahan reported that the Noise Abatement Report for the first quarter of 2024 was posted on the flyquietoak.com website. Jay Seaton asked if the group could discuss the data issues that were brought up during the North/South Field Meeting. Ms. Hanrahan said the topic would be discussed during agenda item 9.

## 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### A. April 17, 2024

Facilitator Hanrahan noted that Noise Forum members have received copies of the draft minutes for the April 17, 2024 Noise Forum meeting. She said that a request from the public to update a public comment was completed. She asked if there were any questions or comments. If there were no questions, comments, errors, or omissions, the facilitator said she would entertain a motion to approve. Moved: Trish Herrera Spencer, second: Benny Lee.

## 4. HYBRID MEETING RECAP

Facilitator Hanrahan recapped the April 2024 hybrid Noise Forum meeting by stating there were four Noise Forum members, as well as Craig Simon, who attended in person. She reiterated that to have a quorum, voting members must attend in person. Co-Chair Herrera Spencer said that she liked having the meeting in person and feels that all meetings should be hybrid moving forward. She said she felt the interaction between the Noise Forum members, Port staff, and the public was much more productive than when the meetings are held on Zoom. James Nelson agreed with Co-Chair Herrera Spencer that he is in favor of the hybrid structure. Co-Chair Lee said that he has a standing meeting on the same day as the Noise Forum meeting that had the potential to make him late for the meetings. Mr. Seaton said that he is in favor of having an "in-person option" at the least. He said that there were ten members of the public who came and spoke; some of them put a lot of thought and effort and had very good comments. He said that he hasn't seen anywhere near that level of public participation when doing just virtual meetings. David Drisdale agreed with the other Noise Forum members. Ms. Hanrahan said that she will need to get clarification from the Port regarding hybrid meetings moving forward. She said that there may be a budget issue for the 2024/2025 fiscal year, but she will provide an update during the October Noise Forum meeting. She stated that the current plan is to have two hybrid and two virtual meetings for the upcoming fiscal year.

## 5. ACTION ITEM – ANNUAL CO-CHAIR ELECTIONS

### A. Elected Representative Co-Chair

Facilitator Hanrahan stated that the annual elections for the Noise Forum co-chairs are held at the July meeting each year for a one-year term. She asked for nominees for the Elected Representative Co-Chair.

#### 1. Nominations

Mr. Lee nominated Trish Herrera Spencer. Ms. Herrera Spencer accepted the nomination.

#### 2. Vote

Facilitator Hanrahan took a vote. Ms. Herrera Spencer was elected unanimously.

## B. Community Representative Co-Chair

Ms. Hanrahan asked for nominees for the Community Representative Co-Chair.

### 1. Nominations

Ms. Herrera Spencer nominated Benny. Lee. Mr. Lee accepted the nomination.

### 2. Vote

Facilitator Hanrahan took a vote. Mr. Lee was elected unanimously.

## 6. NEXTGEN SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

Co-Chair Herrera Spencer reported that the NextGen subcommittee met with the Port's airspace consultant, Paul Hannah. She said that she felt they are on a good track working with Mr. Hannah, who has been extremely helpful. He presented multiple ideas to reduce noise from flights, focusing on both Oakland and San Francisco aircraft flight paths. After discussing the options, she expressed that the subcommittee trusts Mr. Hannah to determine which options have the best chance of approval with the FAA and effectiveness in reducing noise impacts to residents. The group agreed to let Mr. Hannah guide them in this decision. She appreciated the progress made and thanked everyone involved, acknowledging the long-term efforts of the team. Co-Chair Lee said he also attended the meeting with Mr. Hannah and was very impressed. The visualizations helped the subcommittee understand their obstacles and restrictions. Mr. Lee said he now has more confidence in achieving the Noise Forum's goals.

## 7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Facilitator Hanrahan opened the public comment period with an announcement that it was an opportunity for the public to speak on issues not on the agenda but relevant to airport noise at the San Francisco Bay Oakland International Airport (OAK). The following individuals provided a public comment:

- Benjamin Maurice, Berkeley – Mr. Maurice stated he is experiencing frequent jet noise, which disrupts his sleep and daily life, despite not living near an airport. The noise varies in frequency, sometimes exceeding one jet per minute, which he finds excessive and unexpected. He expressed concerns about the health impacts, such as hypertension and tissue damage, and feels that the concentration of flight paths in the area is unfair. He suggested returning to a dispersed flight path system to alleviate the issue, acknowledging potential operational challenges. Additionally, he expressed his concern about the loss of trust in institutions at all levels and hopes for actions that demonstrate the institutions are working in the public's interest and overcoming obstacles to achieve positive results.
- Yvonne McHugh, Richmond – Ms. McHugh stated she experiences significant aircraft noise from Oakland and SFO arrivals and departures due to NextGen. She requested that Richmond be included in the Noise Abatement Report's map graphics, as its location under Oakland's flight paths is almost invisible. She said only one map clearly shows Richmond, while others obscure it. Ms. McHugh explained that including Richmond on these maps is crucial for visibility to the Oakland Noise Forum, decision-making committees, and the affected public. She added that the Fly Quiet OAK website's graphics

inaccurately represent flight tracks over Richmond, stating that in reality, low-altitude Oakland arrivals and frequent loud flights result in disturbances. She urged the Oakland Noise Office to correct these graphics and the NextGen Subcommittee to work with the FAA to deconcentrate flights over Richmond, as recent departures are flying lower, increasing noise disturbance.

- Rani Marx, Oakland – Ms. Marx stated she started using Stop Jet Noise on the computer and cell phone recently, but these devices are not with her when she is trying to sleep. She said on Monday, for example, she experienced four loud jet noise events between 12:40 a.m. and 1:00 a.m., with another flight at 1:20 a.m. that usually wakes her up. Additionally, during her evening swim between 6:30 and 7:30 p.m., seven loud planes flew overhead, which is common during her swims at Hiller Highlands, near her home in North Oakland. She emphasized that NextGen jet noise seriously compromises public health, including her own, since its implementation. She highlighted research on the health effects of jet-noise pollution and questioned when this environmental hazard will be addressed. She also expressed concern about the consideration of OAK expansion given the unresolved noise issues.
- Karen Pertschuk, Berkeley – Ms. Pertschuk stated she attended the last Noise Forum hybrid meeting and appreciated the comments from others who valued in-person attendance. She feels strongly about the importance of hybrid meetings, as virtual meetings don't provide the same connection. She mentioned a neighbor disturbed by jet noise who doesn't have Zoom but could attend the next in-person meeting. She shared her experience living in South Berkeley, directly under flight paths from Oakland and San Francisco. Using Flight Radar 24, she tracks aircraft, which helps her understand the situation. She noted that flights from Oakland, including those from Southwest, Alaska, FedEx, and UPS, make sharp turns over South Berkeley at altitudes often below 10,000 feet, sometimes as low as 4,000-5,000 feet. She said this noise pollution has increased her concern and disturbance. Having lived in Berkeley her whole life, she has never experienced such noise levels and said she is confused about why previous, effective measures were changed. She emphasized that nothing can justify the damage to public health caused by this noise pollution.
- Bob Jarman, Berkeley – Mr. Jarman said he lives in lower Berkeley Hills and attended the last Noise Forum hybrid meeting, where he requested that OAK take in the Stop Jet Noise Reports, emphasizing the difficulty of submitting them to the Oakland Airport. He said he is particularly disturbed by the late-night flights of FedEx, UPS, and SFO departures, especially those heading to Europe. He appreciates the efforts of the Noise Forum and the Board in addressing the jet noise issue and urged them to pay attention to the neighborhood impact studies conducted under NextGen.
- Sandra Harrison, Hayward – Ms. Harrison said she has been complaining about jet noise for almost 20 years. Although there were improvements, she said the situation has worsened. Monitors were installed in her backyard, but she said they didn't help. She explained that planes still fly too often and too close, especially late at night. Ms. Hayward said she finds the FAA's actions horrendous and believes they are driven by financial

concerns. She stated she will continue to complain, urging them to stop flying planes over her house, particularly at such close proximity, as it is too risky.

- Martine Kraus, Berkeley – Ms. Kraus said she lives in the Berkeley Hills under the NextGen OAK arrivals and departures and SFO flight paths. She said the concentrated jet noise from these paths is debilitating and detrimental to health and well-being. She said she focuses on the OAK arrivals, specifically the WNDSR flight path, where planes fly at about 5,000 feet, but due to the area's elevation, the relative altitude is much lower. She explained the noise and vibrations from jets at full throttle are disruptive, starting at 7:00 a.m. and continuing with late-night arrivals and departures, leaving only about six hours of uninterrupted sleep. Ms. Berkeley said scientific studies link sleep disruption from aircraft noise to adverse health effects, including cardiovascular disease, which is worse with nighttime noise. She added that other airports, like London Heathrow and Frankfurt, have nighttime curfews, and the World Health Organization recommends aircraft noise not exceed 45 decibels at night. However, she said Oakland's draft Environmental Impact Report proposed expanding nighttime operations with larger, louder jets. She emphasized the need for a solution for WNDSR and thanked the NextGen Subcommittee and Mr. Hannah for addressing the issue.
- Michael Scott, Berkeley – Mr. Scott said he is a lifelong Berkeley resident, though he has lived overseas many times. He noted that noise levels have increased over the years. Decades ago, he said BART promised a quiet transport system, but the noise from steel wheels on rails disrupts weekends. He said noise from Oakland Airport has also increased, and he fears expansion will worsen the situation. He pointed out that cities like Sydney and Tokyo have quiet periods, even during the day, and questioned why the same can't be achieved in Berkeley. He urged for noise reduction measures, such as limiting operational hours and implementing effective noise abatement practices. He also mentioned that during winter storms, arriving aircraft from Asia at SFO and Oakland fly very low over the Berkeley/Oakland hills, creating significant noise. He said he hopes that with the talents involved, reasonable solutions can be found.
- Matt Pourfarzaneh, Alameda – Mr. Pourfarzaneh mentioned a procedure where, after each agenda item, the public is invited to comment following member comments. He appreciates this practice and requests that it be continued.
- Jon Hamilton, Alameda – Mr. Hamilton stated that Bay Farm Island, with 15,000 residents, is highly impacted by noise from Oakland and San Francisco Airports. He said he believes the Noise Forum is beneficial but suggested it needs broader representation and more frequent meetings, similar to local public meetings in Alameda. He encouraged a higher level of engagement with the FAA for better responses. He also referenced a recent meeting with a Stanford study group, which found that the FAA's Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) software used for day-night average sound level (DNL) calculations underestimates noise levels by 2.5 to 2.75 dB.
- Susan Stephenson, Oakland – Ms. Stephenson thanked everyone for their efforts and expressed sympathy for previous commenters. She highlighted the major impact of frequent, low-flying jets over her house in lower Montclair, Mountain Boulevard, on her quality of life. She said the constant noise from jets from Oakland, SFO, and possibly small

planes to Hayward Airport occurs at least every 60 seconds, sometimes more frequently. She uses a white noise machine at night to sleep. She criticized the policy of concentrating flight paths over homes, businesses, and schools, calling it hazardous and unnecessary. She suggested returning to a dispersed flight path system as a simple solution. She also warned that the proposed expansion of Oakland Airport could worsen the situation and hoped for relief from the WNDSR path issue.

- Kay Guinane reading a statement from Reva Fabrikant, Oakland – She said the community and Save Our Skies East Bay have been complaining about NextGen noise, particularly WNDSR noise, for about eight years. They question how many more years the FAA needs to understand the misery caused by this noise and demand action rather than just listening. They no longer attend Noise Forum Meetings or complain because it has only caused personal stress and wasted time. They are frustrated with the FAA's lack of responsiveness and believe the situation will worsen if OAK Airport expands. They feel frustrated, disgruntled, and miserable.
- Mark Pertschuk, Berkeley – Mr. Pertschuk agreed with previous speakers, noting that many have had similar experiences. Living in the flats in South Berkeley, he said he experiences constant, low, and loud flights, both early in the morning and late at night. Having flown frequently for work for over 30 years and lived in the area for almost 40 years, he recalled that flights used to take off to the north and stay over the bay until reaching higher altitudes. He said he finds it strange that flights are now lower and not gaining altitude as quickly, and not flying over the surrounding water. He hopes this issue, which he believes should be simple to solve, can be addressed.

## 8. FAA REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE

The Operations Support Group report was given in lieu of a Regional Administrator update under agenda Item 10.

## 9. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

### A. Update on Action Items from North Field/South Field Working Group

Mr. Davis and Jesse Richardson gave reports on the following action items from the North Field/South Field Research Group meeting held on March 20, 2024:

- Sound Exposure Level (SEL) Categories in the Quarterly Reports – Mr. Seaton had questions about the categorization in the quarterly reports, specifically the use of “buckets” for SEL elements in the nighttime SEL report. These categories, set in 5-decibel (dB) increments, help present data more clearly, showing how many flights fall within or below 80 dB, and above 80 dB. The purpose is to make the data easier to understand, not to assess the significance of the noise levels. The Port is open to reformatting the reports to improve usability and welcomed suggestions, though they aim to maintain consistency for comparison with previous years. The goal is to provide the best and most comprehensive data possible.
- North Field Noise Abatement Procedure Compliance – Port staff works with North Field operators to find incentives and address chronic violators, aiming to maximize participation in the noise program. Mr. Richardson meets with jet operators and analyzes

audio to understand compliance issues. Education on noise abatement procedures is a priority, using tools like Whispertrak and the FlyQuietOAK website. Some operators are unaware of the procedures, while others choose not to participate, requiring different approaches. The FAA's standardization of language in chart supplements will help integrate noise abatement information into flight planning software. The goal is to provide comprehensive information and highlight the human impact of noise, analyzing every noncompliant departure. Mr. Richardson plays a key role in this effort.

- ANOMS Categorizing IFR vs. VFR Flights – There have been issues with the Airport Noise Monitoring System (ANOMS) categorizing Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and Visual Flight Rules (VFR), particularly for small airplanes. While commercial jets typically fly under IFR, smaller planes like Cessnas often use VFR. The system had errors in categorizing these flights, especially in the North Field, where specific procedures route VFR. departures. The team is working to correct these mis-categorizations and expects an update soon. The goal is to ensure accurate information is provided.

#### [B. Update on Action Items from April 17, 2024, Noise Forum Meeting.](#)

Mr. Davis gave reports on the following action items from the previous Noise Forum meeting:

- Stopjetnoise.com Complaints – The stopjetnoise complaint submission process currently involves collecting information from emails. Mr. Richardson is responsible for managing and manually entering the weighted totals into ANOMS. The complaints are counted through this process. The Viewpoint app is available for those that want to use an app for complaint submission.
- Adding all Jurisdictions to Visuals Used for Noise Abatement – The discussion covered the importance of including all Noise Forum jurisdictions in graphics. While large maps can lose detail for specific areas outside of Alameda and San Leandro, it's crucial not to exclude any communities. The goal is to find better ways to present information, ensuring no community is overlooked.

## 10. POST-METROPLEX PROCEDURES AND CHART SUPPLEMENT NOISE ABATEMENT INFORMATION ENTRIES

Bonnie Malgarini reported that she was attending the Noise Forum meeting to provide information requested by the Noise Forum about community-driven changes, successful approaches to dispersing aircraft, and an overview of the chart supplement noise abatement entries. Ms. Malgarini provided the following information:

### **Community-Driven Changes:**

1. Lake Arrowhead Airport: An arrival route was moved from overflying communities to mostly uninhabited land to the southeast. This took 2-3 years.
2. San Francisco International Airport: Nighttime departures were reassigned to go out over the bay and past the Golden Gate Bridge before turning back on course, instead of turning over the city. This took 2-3 years.
3. Van Nuys Airport: Two departure procedures were changed to increase the climb gradient and have aircraft turn sooner.
4. Los Angeles International Airport: Due to increased traffic, departure procedures were amended to expedite aircraft departure, allowing continued use of the nighttime over-ocean noise-abatement procedure.



5. San Diego International Airport: The nighttime noise abatement procedure was made part of a published departure procedure, simplifying compliance for controllers and aircraft.
6. Oakland International Airport: A departure was modified to restore the previous heading, turning aircraft away from the shoreline. This took approximately 18 months.

**Addressing Dispersion:** The FAA is exploring ways to disperse aircraft, though there are no obvious solutions due to modernization needs and constraints like proximity to other airports and special-use airspace. Open standard instrument departures offer some dispersion but only on a portion of the initial route. Noise cannot be eliminated, only moved, and community participation is encouraged in procedural changes.

**Chart Supplement Noise Abatement Entries:** These entries provide primary references for pilots on airport noise abatement. The FAA is streamlining this information to make it more readable, with a draft template and instructions for airport managers to submit procedures. Abbreviations are being expanded for clarity, moving towards plain-language style to help pilots adhere to the procedures.

Co-Chair Lee asked how long it took for these changes to be made. Ms. Malgarini said that there is no strict timeline. It can take up to two years, sometimes longer, but no less than 18 months. Joe Bert clarified that the timeline really depends on the complexities of the changes that are being requested.

Regarding dispersion, Mr. Seaton agreed that while systematic dispersal won't be random, it can still reduce current concentration levels. He said although it may not revert to previous patterns, the goal is improvement. He asked for clarity on the timeline and process for studying and implementing systemic dispersal, emphasizing the need for a concrete timeline and rollout plan, as "studying" is too vague. Ms. Malgarini clarified that their group isn't conducting the study due to a lack of technology and tools. The study is being handled at the FAA headquarters level and is often contracted out to entities like M.I.T. She said that currently, there is no imminent solution for aircraft dispersal. Mr. Bert said that he thinks dispersion with departures, not arrivals, is probably going to be the first set that comes out, when and if this ever does. Mr. Nelson said that clearest example of lack of dispersion is the WNDSR approach into Oakland. He said that what the community is looking for is a dispersion or multiple paths to spread the noise impact over the East Bay Hills.

Co-Chair Herrera Spencer said she really appreciated the presentation, discussion, comments, and the FAA's responses. She thought it is extremely helpful. She asked for clarification on whether Congress controls the flights or ticket purchases do. She asked if airlines could schedule flights in the middle of the night without any curfews or limitations if someone buys a ticket. Ms. Malgarini explained that due to the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA), airports cannot impose curfews. Airports without curfews before the act cannot establish new ones. She explained that while the Operations Support Group wants to minimize noise and ensure people can sleep, their actions are limited by laws enacted by Congress. They must follow these laws and cannot impose restrictions on flights. The right to fly over most of the United States is granted by Congress, not the FAA, and many federal regulations cannot be altered. Co-Chair Herrera Spencer said she appreciates the Noise Forum's role in educating everyone about the constraints and understands the focus on dispersion.

Ed Bouge emphasized that the issues discussed today have been long-standing concerns. He said initially, the concentration of flights was identified as a potential problem, which has since

been confirmed by residents as worsening. The introduction of NextGen didn't increase traffic but concentrated it, leading to more noise complaints. He noted that flights are now concentrated on a single path, causing significant noise issues, especially during final approaches. He suggested that redistributing flights across multiple paths could reduce noise and improve the situation for affected neighborhoods.

## 11. NOISE NEWS UPDATE

Christian Valdes reported on the current news of the aviation and noise industries. The following items were discussed:

- FAA Reauthorization: Title II – Title II is the FAA Oversight and Organization Reform. It talks about the leadership of the FAA and improvements to regulatory materials, and the future of NextGen.
  - Section 206: FAA to operationalize the programs under NextGen by the end of next year and then to sunset the Office of NextGen.
    - Airspace Modernization Office that will be responsible for the modernization of the National Airspace System.
  - Section 619, NextGen Programs: FAA to expedite the implementation of NextGen programs, especially Performance-Based Navigation and the rate in which equipage of NextGen avionics gets on commercial aircraft fleets.
  - Section 924: FAA to establish a comprehensive plan for the integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems into the National Airspace System. Section 952 states that Congress would like the US to position itself as a global leader in Advanced Air Mobility (AAM) and that the FAA shall work with relevant stakeholders to enable the safe entry of these aircraft in the National Airspace System.
  - Section C – Noise and Environmental Programs and Streaming
    - Section 786: Part 150 noise standards update. Review and revise part 150, clarify existing and future noise policies and standards and seek feedback from airports, airport users, and individuals living in the vicinity of airports and adjacent communities.
    - Section 787: Reduce community aircraft noise exposure. Requires the FAA take actions to reduce undesirable aircraft noise when implementing or revising a flight procedure, and work with airport sponsors and impacted neighborhoods in establishing or modifying arrival and departure routes.
    - Section 791: To study the effects of airborne ultrafine particles on humans.
    - Section 792: For the FAA to establish an Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee to advise the FAA on issues facing the aviation community that are related to aircraft noise exposure and existing FAA noise policies and regulations.
    - Section 793: To harmonize policies and procedures across the FAA relating to community engagement through a Community Collaboration Program.
    - Section 961: Directs the FAA to create a plan to establish a Center for Advanced Aviation Technologies that would support the testing advancement of new and emerging aviation technologies and develop testing corridors to integrate AAM into the National Airspace System.
  - Title X – Research and Development

- Section 1011: FAA is to establish the proper altitude where supersonic flight will not produce an “appreciable” sonic boom on the ground.
  - Section 1012: GAO to study the safe integration of electric aircraft into the National Airspace System.
  - Section 1042: National Science and Technology Council to establish an interagency working group to coordinate with Federal research, development, deployment, testing, and education activities to enable AAM and UAA.
- Boom Supersonic flew its XB-1 Demonstrator from the Mojave Air & Space Port, reaching 7,000 feet of altitude at speeds up to 273 mph. The FAA authorized Boom to conduct supersonic test flights of the XB-1 and a chase plane within a pre-existing military corridor located in Southern California. Twenty test flights at or above 30,000 feet exceeding Mach 1, 670 mph. The FAA concluded in an Environmental Assessment that the test flights would have no significant environmental impacts. Boom’s plan is to reach Mach 1.1, then 1.2, then 1.3 all in separate flights because each flight takes up so much air space of the corridor.
  - The world’s first in-flight study of the impact of using 100 percent sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) on both engines of a commercial aircraft for soot particle emissions and the formation of contrail ice crystals was conducted by the German Aerospace Center in 2021 (an Airbus A350 powered by Rolls-Royce Trent XWB engines followed by a Falcon 20 business jet). The results show that compared to using conventional Jet A-1 fuel, SAF produces less carbon dioxide, less soot, and 56 percent fewer ice crystals, which could significantly reduce the climate-warming effect of contrails.
  - In November 2023, the FAA and the National Park Service finalized the Mount Rushmore National Monument Air Tour Management Plan. The plan prohibits air tour flights within 5,000 feet over the park or within a half mile from the park boundary. The purpose of this restriction is to protect the park’s natural and cultural resources, tribal sacred sites and ceremonial areas, and visitor experience. Air tour noise was audible more than 4 hours a day throughout much of the park, and at many locations visitors experienced noise above 52 dB for almost 2 hours per day, which disrupted some of the programs offered by the park. Three air tour operators challenged the plan, claiming that the plan would cause irreparable harm in the form of unrecoverable economic loss, which would threaten the businesses’ existence. The court sided with implementing the plan. Air Tour Management Plans to four San Francisco Bay Area national parks are currently being challenged in court (the Golden Gate National Recreational Area, Point Reyes National Seashore, Muir Woods National Monument, and the San Francisco Maritime National Historic Park). The plans are being challenged by a group called Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER).
  - Boeing announced that in 2024, it will use its special 777-200 ER to test over three dozen technologies as part of its Eco Demonstrator Program. This program aims to enhance operational efficiencies and sustainability, particularly in cabin interiors, which are challenging to recycle.
    - Key areas of focus include:

- Noise-related technologies: Testing single-engine taxi and optimizing taxi duration to reduce fuel use and pilot workload. They will also test steeper glide slopes and continuous descent approaches to reduce community noise and fuel burn.
- Weight-reducing materials: Using lighter, recyclable, and more durable floor coverings and recycled fiber ceiling panels.
- Cabin noise and insulation: Projects to better reduce noise, regulate humidity and temperature, and use fabric-cover acoustic panels.
- Future cabin concepts: Economy and business-class seats with sensors to detect if someone is seated during taxi, takeoff, and landing, improving safety and reducing crew workload.
- Since its inception in 2012, the Eco Demonstrator Program has tested over 250 technologies.
- The FAA issued a Draft Advisory Circular providing guidance that will form the foundation for establishing certification criteria for electric vertical takeoff and landing (eVTOL) air taxis. Last year the FAA added the category of “powered lift” to the agency’s existing regulatory framework for commercial aircraft operations. Section 7.5 of the Draft Advisory Circular addresses noise certification of eVTOL aircraft but does not define specific acoustic criteria for certification. The FAA is mandated to establish noise standards and regulations to protect the public. The agency will examine each powered-lift application and determine whether the existing FAR Part 36 requirements are appropriate as a noise certification basis. The FAA prescribed a rule and noise requirements for that powered-lift aircraft in the Federal Register on a case-by-case basis. The FAA is seeking comments on this Draft Advisory Circular until August 12.
- Archer and Signature Aviation partnered to electrify Signature’s network of over 200 airport terminals across the U.S. and globally. They will also partner with BETA Technologies to install BETA’s interoperable rapid aviation terminals, which use the Combined Charging system that can charge electric forms of transportation. The first installations will be likely at United Airline hubs at Newark International and Chicago O’Hare International Airports.
- Archer Midnight Aircraft completed the transition flight reaching speeds of over 100 mph over the skies of Salinas, California. The final phase of Archer’s FAA Type Certification program flight testing will start later this year and will involve piloted flights.
- Joby Aviation announced that two of its pre-production prototypes completed more than 1,500 flights (100 of which were piloted) with a total distance of more than 33,000 miles. They will begin the next phase of testing and “for-credit” flight testing that will allow the FAA to gauge the aircraft’s performance against the powered-lift certification standards.
- In recent years, with the widespread application of advanced noise reduction technologies such as large high-bypass ratio engines, and acoustic liners, the importance of airframe noise reduction has become more critical. A typical landing gear generally accounts for 30 percent of the total aircraft noise during the approach and landing segments of flight. The landing gear consists of many components that are

usually not acoustically treated or aerodynamic, which cause turbulence and noise. Shanghai studied four different configurations of the wavy strut.

## 12. NEW BUSINESS / CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE

An action item for the October Noise Forum agenda will be to have a determination regarding all Noise Forum meetings being held in a hybrid format. The next Noise Forum meeting is scheduled to be a hybrid meeting on October 16, 2024.

## 13. ADJOURNMENT

Facilitator Hanrahan adjourned the meeting at 9:01 p.m.