

Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum

Meeting Minutes – October 15, 2025

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTIONS	1
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	2
A. Outstanding Annual Dues	2
B. Second Quarter 2025 Noise Abatement Report.....	2
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	2
A. July 16, 2025	2
4. Runway 28 L/R and Taxiway B Project Recap	2
5. ACTION ITEM – Change to Quarterly Compliance Summary Report.....	3
6. PUBLIC COMMENT.....	4
7. FAA REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE	4
8. NEXTGEN UPDATE	5
9. NOISE OFFICE REPORT	6
A. Update on Action Items from North Field/South Field Research Group.....	6
B. Update on Action Items from Noise Forum Meeting.	8
10. NEW BUSINESS / CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE	9
11. ADJOURNMENT.....	10

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The October 15, 2025 Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum (Noise Forum) meeting 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 Greg Boller, Councilmember, Alameda
Jon Hamilton, Community Representative, Alameda
Ben Bartlett, Councilmember, Berkeley
James Nelson, Community Representative, Berkeley
Eduardo Martinez, Mayor, City of Richmond
Gopal Krishnan, Community Representative, County of Alameda
Craig Simon, Director of Aviation, Port of Oakland

Staff Members/Advisors/Officials Present

Doug Mansel, Acting Assistant Director of Aviation, Port of Oakland
Matt P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager, Port of Oakland
Jesse Richardson, Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor, Port of Oakland
Joan Zatopek, Manager, Planning and Development, Port of Oakland
Diego Gonzalez, Government Affairs Manager, Port of Oakland
Marjon Saulon, Government Affairs, Port of Oakland
Brian McGuire, City of Alameda
Rhea Hanrahan, Noise Forum Facilitator, HMMH
Doreen Stockdale, HMMH
Jason Stoddard, HMMH

Facilitator 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. Outstanding Annual Dues

Facilitator Hanrahan noted that outstanding dues remain for the 2025–2026 fiscal year. She asked the Berkeley representatives to follow up with the appropriate contacts, noting that invoices have already been sent. She added that assistance is available if needed, but a reminder from their side would be appreciated.

B. Second Quarter 2025 Noise Abatement Report

Facilitator Hanrahan noted that the Second Quarter 2025 Noise Abatement Report was included in the meeting materials and is already posted on the OAK website. She clarified that no approval vote is required at this meeting but invited any questions or comments. With no questions raised, she reiterated that the reports remain accessible online and in the distributed meeting packet. She encouraged members to review the reports at their convenience and reach out to Jesse Richardson for any follow-up questions.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. July 16, 2025

Facilitator Hanrahan noted that Noise Forum members have received copies of the draft minutes for the July 16, 2025 Noise Forum meeting. She asked if there were any questions or comments. Hearing none, she said she would entertain a motion to approve. Moved: James Nelson, second: Eduardo Martinez.

4. Runway 28 L/R and Taxiway B Project Recap

Matt Davis provided an update on the runway rehabilitation project for Runways 28L and 28R, emphasizing that work is not yet complete. He explained that while runway work has minimal community impact, the associated Taxiway Bravo work is highly significant because it severs the connection between the north and south fields.

Mr. Davis reminded the group that Taxiway Bravo was previously closed for 14 days (from July 28 to August 10, 2025) to allow major construction. During that period, substantial work was completed, but final tasks remain, including pavement grooving, striping, and additional lighting installation. Due to pavement curing requirements, these finishing activities necessitate another closure.

Mr. Davis announced that Taxiway Bravo will be closed for an additional five days, from October 21 to October 25, 2025. This closure will mirror the previous impact, affecting approximately 30–40 daily departures and creating significant operational disruption. He noted this should be the last extended closure required to fully sever the north-south field connection.

Following this phase, intermittent nightly closures will occur for about a month, generally between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m., when traffic is minimal aside from medevac and essential operations. All major work is expected to be completed by November 26, although minor cleanup and adjustments will continue.

Mr. Davis confirmed that all updated information, including advisories, graphics, and phasing details, will be posted on the project website. He encouraged attendees to review the site for specifics and noted that current postings still reflect the July–August closure, with new details expected online by the following day. He concluded by inviting questions and reiterated that the website will remain the primary source for updates.

5. ACTION ITEM – Change to Quarterly Compliance Summary Report

Facilitator Hanrahan introduced Agenda Item 5, an action item related to the North Field/South Field Research Group. She reminded the board that any changes to the quarterly compliance summary format or content require a motion and vote, as the current format was previously approved. She then invited Mr. Davis to explain the proposed change.

Mr. Davis stated that the requested change is technical and straightforward. It concerns the nighttime procedure summary included in the compliance report. Currently, the report references nighttime procedures but does not display the specific hours on the relevant slides. He noted that Jon Hamilton had suggested adding the hours for clarity, and Mr. Davis agreed this would be beneficial. While the hours are described elsewhere in the document, placing them prominently on the slides would improve clarity. Mr. Davis requested general approval to incorporate the nighttime hours into the summary moving forward, without requiring page-by-page review, unless there were objections.

Facilitator Hanrahan clarified that the requested change involves adding the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) directly into the titles of any references to nighttime procedures in the quarterly compliance summary. She confirmed there were no questions from the group and noted that a process flowchart had been developed to address future changes. This flowchart outlines the steps for handling requests: changes are reviewed by Port of Oakland (Port) staff, then either advanced for executive approval or stopped, depending on their scope. For simple changes like this one, the process bypasses executive review and goes directly to the Forum for approval.

Co-chair Greg Boller asked for clarification on the dotted line in the flowchart, specifically what bypasses executive staff review. Facilitator Hanrahan explained that minor changes, such as adding hours to a title, do not require executive approval. More substantial changes, such as those involving budget impacts, additional locations, or significant document revisions, would follow the full approval path. Mr. Boller acknowledged the explanation. Moved: Jon Hamilton, second: James Nelson.

6. 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 OAK. The following individuals provided a public comment:

- Sandra Harrison, Hayward – Ms. Harrison expressed her ongoing concern about aircraft flying over her home, noting that she has raised this issue for nearly 20 years. She reiterated her request that aircraft fly at higher altitudes when passing over her house and stated her preference that planes not fly over her home at all.
- Kristen Rommel, Bay Farm Island (Alameda) – Ms. Rommel raised a concern about the noise from jet operations departing the North Field, noting that the noise seems particularly loud in Bay Farm. She asked what measures the airport is taking to quantify this impact.

Mr. Davis responded that the airport operates 14 noise monitors throughout the community, which record noise levels for all departures. He explained that the data is published in quarterly Title 21 reports, as required by the State of California. These reports include single-event measurements and other metrics, along with maps showing monitor locations and corresponding data, providing a way to correlate noise levels with geographic areas. Craig Simon added that the airport strongly encourages jet aircraft to depart from the South Field, which is the primary air carrier runway. However, due to recent construction work on the North Field, there have been more departures from that area than usual. He offered that anyone seeking a deeper analysis of specific events could contact Mr. Richardson or his office for detailed information.

7. FAA REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE

Facilitator Hanrahan reported that, following prior meetings with the Port, a formal request was submitted to the FAA seeking an update on the CNDEL procedure, including a timeline and clarification on progress. She noted that the FAA acknowledged the request but was unable to provide a report due to the recent government shutdown. She explained that once operations resume, there may be delays due to backlog, but she will follow up to ensure the request remains on the FAA's radar.

Mr. Hamilton presented a marked-up diagram to Mr. Davis for clarification, referencing prior discussions about CNDEL headings and suggesting a change from 296 degrees to 290 degrees for simplicity in communicating with the FAA. The facilitator clarified that her original request to

the FAA focused on seeking timeline information rather than specific heading changes but agreed to incorporate clarifying details if helpful.

Mr. Davis provided additional context, stating that prior to the shutdown, the FAA indicated a positive outlook on the CNDEL update but recently postponed publication to 2027. He emphasized that efforts are underway to expedite this timeline. He explained that the current CNDEL RNAV procedure uses an initial heading of 296 degrees after reaching 520 feet, and the goal is to adjust this to 290 degrees after reaching 520 feet to align with the Oakland Six departure. He reviewed the differences between conventional and RNAV departures: conventional departures provide a simple heading (changed from 296 degrees to 290 degrees in 2024), but only account for about 22 percent of departures, while RNAV procedures (CNDEL) are more complex and widely used. The airport submitted a request through the FAA's IFP Gateway to modify CNDEL to mimic Oakland Six, and while the FAA has not opposed the change, no implementation date has been confirmed.

Mr. Davis noted that operational constraints, including proximity to San Francisco and required three-mile separation, limit how far departures can turn left during daytime operations. He stated that 290 degrees is likely the best achievable adjustment and committed to continuing advocacy for earlier implementation. He also confirmed that published charts will continue to show 296 degrees until the FAA updates them.

Mr. Nelson asked whether any additional noise measurements had been conducted in the community following the implementation of the 6-degree deviation on northbound departures. The facilitator explained that while the airport's noise monitors continuously record data 24/7, no new flight-by-flight comparative study has been completed since the initial report. She noted that the previous analysis showed that approximately 22 percent of operations using the modified procedure and that greater separation from the runway generally results in improved noise outcomes for nearby residents.

Mr. Nelson inquired if there were plans for further neighborhood-specific measurements. The facilitator responded that no additional targeted studies are planned at this time beyond ongoing monitoring and quarterly Title 21 reports, which reflect overall noise trends but not individual flights. Mr. Nelson expressed that his impression was the 6-degree turn had been more effective than the original report suggested and recalled prior discussions about potential follow-up studies.

Mr. Hamilton added that, based on his recollection, the three noise monitors closest to the Bay showed no significant difference at the first monitor, while the second and third monitors recorded approximately a three-decibel reduction with the 6-degree turn. Facilitator Hanrahan confirmed that while she did not recall exact decibel levels, the data indicated improvement with increased distance from the runway due to greater angular separation.

8. NEXTGEN UPDATE

Facilitator Hanrahan noted that Thann McLeod from Lean was unable to attend but has been holding weekly check-ins with Mr. Davis, who provided the update. Mr. Davis reported that

progress remains limited, with most items still pending FAA clearance. He highlighted three key areas:

- **WNDSR Arrival:** This procedure, intended for arrivals from the north and northeast over the Oakland Hills to Runway 30, is back at the conceptual stage. Previous rerouting attempts failed due to airspace constraints. The FAA and Lean are exploring new concepts, but no concrete update is available.
- **Higher Glide Path Angles:** In response to community concerns, including Ms. Harrison's comments, the team is studying the feasibility of increasing approach angles to Runways 28L/R from the standard 3.0 degrees to approximately 3.2 degrees. While this change would only raise aircraft by a few hundred feet, it could provide slight noise relief. Modeling is underway to ensure safety and avoid creating over-energy situations that require excessive flaps or gear deployment.
- **HUSSH Procedure:** This nighttime procedure aims to turn aircraft to 270 degrees sooner, pushing departures farther over water. The FAA has indicated it cannot modify the procedure directly, so efforts now focus on working with operators to climb and turn more quickly. The concept remains in the study phase.

Mr. Davis emphasized that none of these initiatives are simple and will require significant time and coordination, but they remain priorities. He noted that CNDEL is the only procedure showing tangible progress, and the team will continue advocating for earlier implementation. He concluded by inviting questions. Mr. Hamilton asked if the goal includes having aircraft reach 520 feet faster. Mr. Davis confirmed that is correct.

9. NOISE OFFICE REPORT

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

Mr. Davis reported on the North Field/South Field Research Group meeting, noting two primary action items. The first was the quarterly flight summary change, which the Noise Forum has already approved. The second involved initiating discussions with the FAA and Lean regarding the feasibility of expanding the SALAD-style right-turn procedure beyond its current nighttime limitation (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). He explained that the SALAD procedure, designed for propeller aircraft departing Runway 28 at night to avoid Bay Farm Island, may need to accommodate jet aircraft during periods when North Field departures are unavoidable, such as during construction. The group is evaluating whether jets can safely execute a modified version of the turn and whether the procedure could be extended into daytime hours without creating conflicts. Even partial extensions of a few hours are under consideration. Mr. Davis noted that updates on SALAD will be provided at a future meeting.

He also reviewed standing items, including efforts to incentivize North Field operators to comply with noise abatement procedures and outreach to chronic violators who fail to follow guidelines or participate in the noise program. He emphasized that personal engagement often improves compliance and commended Mr. Richardson for his proactive outreach. The group continues to monitor and advance other procedures such as CNDEL, HUSSH, and WNDSR as part of its ongoing work.

Gopal Krishnan asked about the types of incentives available to encourage operators to comply with noise abatement procedures. Mr. Davis explained that options are limited because financial incentives or penalties are prohibited under federal law; airports cannot impose fines or offer rent reductions. Past efforts have included sending letters to pilots and community members, creating award programs, and revising website messaging to emphasize the personal and community impact of noise rather than presenting only technical data. Despite these efforts, there is no single solution, and the group continues to explore creative approaches. Mr. Krishnan clarified that these issues primarily involve private operators rather than airlines and suggested considering whether executive jet operators could be discouraged from using the airport. Mr. Davis noted that while outreach has included industry groups such as the National Business Aircraft Association and direct engagement with pilots and CEOs, there is no centralized authority for general aviation, making enforcement challenging. He added that airports cannot deny access to certain operators because they function as public facilities under federal grant assurances, which require equal access for all users.

Ben Bartlett raised the question of whether residents have a private right of action against operators causing excessive noise. Mr. Davis responded that he was not aware of any such legal pathway, noting that pilots operating under federal law are permitted to use the runway and that there is no formal prohibition against North Field use. Facilitator Hanrahan added that past legal actions brought by communities against individual operators typically resulted in mediation without significant outcomes, as operators were compliant with federal regulations and airports cannot impose monetary penalties or discriminatory restrictions under grant assurances.

Mr. Bartlett asked about publishing the names of noncompliant operators. Facilitator Hanrahan explained that tail numbers are generally available unless operators request to be placed on a blocked list, which removes identifying details. Mr. Bartlett suggested that publicizing names might create pressure through insurance companies or other channels. Mr. Krishnan supported brainstorming alternative approaches, noting that most committee time is spent addressing private operators rather than airlines. Ideas discussed included public awareness campaigns and reviewing practices at other airports. Facilitator Hanrahan mentioned programs such as "Fly Quiet" and "Fly Friendly" used elsewhere and agreed to research comparable initiatives for future discussion.

Mr. Nelson asked about tracking repeat offenders. Mr. Davis confirmed that the airport monitors compliance and conducts personal outreach, which has successfully reduced violations, including eliminating prior issues with Runway 33 use. He noted that overall compliance exceeds 90 percent, although the goal remains 100 percent. Mr. Hamilton noted that he has occasionally observed aircraft overnighting at OAK before repositioning to San Francisco, which Mr. Davis attributed to the greater availability of space at OAK compared to San Francisco.

Facilitator Hanrahan invited audience comments, noting available time. One audience member suggested using social media as a "shaming strategy" to pressure noncompliant operators, stating that public exposure could influence CEOs and companies to take corrective action. Another attendee proposed charging higher fees to private operators, referencing a New York Times

article about cost disparities between commercial airlines and business jets. Facilitator Hanrahan reiterated that financial penalties or differential charges are limited by federal grant assurances. Mr. Hamilton added context from the article, explaining that while a typical 737 flight generates approximately \$2,000 in FAA fees, a business jet contributes only about \$60 through fuel taxes, despite requiring similar FAA resources. Facilitator Hanrahan acknowledged the comment and noted the legal limitations on implementing such measures.

Mr. Krishnan commended the Port for its excellent work, noting that compliance rates consistently remain in the 90-percent range and that discussions largely focus on edge cases. He emphasized that the conversation should be viewed as constructive ideation rather than criticism. Facilitator Hanrahan agreed, acknowledging the decades of effort by the Noise Forum and the Port to achieve these results and reaffirmed the group's commitment to closing the remaining gap to reach full compliance.

B. Update on Action Items from Noise Forum Meeting.

Mr. Davis confirmed that item (a), the flow diagram for managing report changes, had been completed and emphasized the importance of maintaining a clear process to prevent unauthorized modifications. Item (b), proposed by Mr. Boller, requested ongoing updates to keep Noise Forum members informed of developments such as CNDEL and other procedures. Mr. Davis agreed and noted that Mr. Richardson will ensure timely communication between quarterly meetings. For item (c), the Noise Office proposed providing members access to the Airport Noise Report, a weekly publication summarizing current noise issues. Mr. Davis explained that the team is working to make this resource available, likely via email or an internal platform, and highlighted its value for quick updates and deeper insights. Facilitator Hanrahan added that the Port is exploring subscription logistics and asked members about preferred access methods, such as SharePoint or other platforms, to ensure ease of use. Members briefly discussed options, including Dropbox and mobile compatibility, and agreed to revisit logistics once subscription details are finalized.

Mr. Boller asked whether a report on the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) Roundtable was planned for this session. Mr. Davis acknowledged the oversight and invited Mr. Richardson to provide the update.

Mr. Richardson reported that the October 2025 SFO Roundtable meeting, held virtually, included no major actions affecting the East Bay but covered several developments. The roundtable discussed pursuing tools to reduce noise from air taxi services, including health impact studies and the evaluation of proposed vertiport locations on the Peninsula. The SFO program supervisor presented three sound insulation initiatives—the Second Chance Initiative, Repair Replacement Initiative, and Expanded Eligibility Initiative—that focus solely on single-family homes, prompting concerns about excluding condos and apartments. Additionally, Mr. Richardson said that HMMH presented a peer comparison of Fly Quiet Programs at similar airports, as SFO considers revamping its own program, with further discussion scheduled for December. Public comments included concerns from residents in Portola Valley about frequent overflights, Millbrae residents about go-arounds, and Pacifica residents about nighttime departures. Other updates included

SFO's summer passenger volume of 7.5 million, approval of a Waymo autonomous taxi pilot program, and confirmation that the recent government shutdown did not affect SFO staff.

Mr. Hamilton added that the roundtable plans to draft language for cities to regulate advanced air mobility landing sites, which could be relevant locally. Mr. Krishnan noted the importance of monitoring changes to SFO's Fly Quiet Program to prevent spillover impacts on East Bay communities. Facilitator Hanrahan confirmed that the Port will track these developments and alert the Noise Forum if any changes could affect OAK operations.

10. NEW BUSINESS / CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE

Facilitator Hanrahan moved to addressing new business and the next meeting, which is scheduled for Wednesday, January 21, 2026 and will be held virtually.

Mr. Nelson requested an update on electric helicopters and vertiports, asking for information on potential noise impacts, expected frequency, and timelines for implementation. He emphasized the need for education on advanced air mobility and its implications for the community. Facilitator Hanrahan noted that relevant updates often appear in the Airport Noise Report, which the Noise Forum will soon have access to. She agreed that local impacts should be monitored. Mr. Hamilton asked whether the Port has been approached by operators seeking to establish vertiport operations. Mr. Simon responded that while preliminary conversations have occurred, no agreements or term sheets exist, citing infrastructure challenges such as the significant power requirements for recharging and the lack of adequate PG&E feed capacity. Facilitator Hanrahan reiterated that future updates should focus on noise-related aspects and confirmed that any developments or test data will be shared with the Noise Forum as they become available.

Mr. Martinez asked whether different aircraft types produce varying noise levels. Facilitator Hanrahan confirmed that noise differences exist based on aircraft type, engine configuration, and generation, noting that newer aircraft meet stricter FAA noise standards. She explained that the airport maintains an inventory of aircraft types through its noise and operations monitoring system, which uses radar data to track all flights except certain military operations. This system provides highly accurate data and identifies each aircraft type and code.

Mr. Martinez then asked if noise levels are monitored by aircraft type and whether simultaneous operations by louder aircraft are managed. Facilitator Hanrahan clarified that federal regulations require noise studies to use an annual average day rather than peak-hour analysis, though the airport's monitors record data continuously and reports include daily readings. For predictive modeling, the FAA's Aviation Environmental Design Tool incorporates over 300 aircraft noise profiles, allowing scenario-based analysis such as removing specific operators to assess impact. She added that noise data can be analyzed at any granularity, including hourly or by specific time periods, and tailored for special studies such as school hours.

Mr. Boller asked whether the discussion on aircraft noise footprints was covered in the Airport Noise 101 Workshop and if that resource was still available online. Facilitator Hanrahan confirmed that the workshop is available and includes figures comparing older noise footprints with current

Stage 5 standards, showing single-event exposure for takeoff and landing. Mr. Martinez requested a link to the resource, noting difficulty navigating the Port's website. Facilitator Hanrahan agreed to send the link directly to members.

Mr. Hamilton asked for an update on previous discussions with FedEx and UPS about conducting "what-if" analyses on optimum flap and power settings to enable faster climbs and earlier turns from Runway 30. Mr. Davis reported no progress over the past year, explaining that earlier momentum stalled due to personnel changes at FedEx and Boeing, both critical partners in the process. He noted that implementing such changes requires coordination among the Port, consultants, aircraft manufacturers, and operators, making it a complex effort. Mr. Hamilton also inquired about UPS operations following observations during an airport tour. Mr. Davis clarified that while UPS conducts some Sunday afternoon flights, there are no Sunday night operations, and the Monday morning closure schedule remains unchanged.

Mr. Davis addressed a previously noted discrepancy in the North Field departure compliance rate under Visual Flight Rules (VFR) conditions, explaining that the issue was initially identified by a community member who observed that VFR aircraft departures were being undercounted. Upon review, the discrepancy was confirmed. Mr. Davis clarified that the issue originated from outdated identification rules based on transponder codes that changed under FAA regulations, causing misclassification between VFR and Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) flights. He noted that the reporting process has since been corrected, and current reports accurately reflect departure counts. While percentages remained largely unchanged, prior data lacked completeness. Mr. Davis added that a technical memo detailing the issue and resolution is available upon request.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Facilitator Hanrahan adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.