

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

October 16, 2019

**INDEX TO THE PROCEEDINGS**

**Page No.**

<b>1. INTRODUCTIONS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. ANNOUNCEMENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>A. City of Union City Gives Notice of Non-Renewal .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>B. Acceptance of 2nd Quarter 2019 Noise Abatement Report .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>C. Annual Membership Dues .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>A. July 17, 2019 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. PUBLIC COMMENT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Public Comment (Continued) .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>A. Subcommittee Report .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>B. CLASS Metroplex Points of Information .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>C. FAA Noise Forum Meetings Update .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>D. FAA Deputy Regional Administrator’s Update .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>E. Santa Clara/Santa Cruz Roundtable Request Follow-Up .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>A. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>A. Update on Action Items from October 16, 2019 Meeting .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>B. Fleet Week Recap .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>C. Viewpoint Update .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>D. Cal State Visual Approach to Runway 30 Update .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATES .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>9. CONFIRM NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE (January 15, 2020) .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>10. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT.....</b>	<b>14</b>

**1. INTRODUCTIONS**

The October 16, 2019 meeting of the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by the Forum’s Facilitator, Michael McClintock. Mr. McClintock welcomed the Forum members, advisors, and guests. The facilitator asked the Forum members and advisors to introduce themselves for the benefit of the audience:

**Forum Members/Alternates Present:**

Bryant Francis, Director of Aviation, Port of Oakland  
Benny Lee, Co-Chair/Councilmember, City of San Leandro  
Walt Jacobs, Co-Chair/Citizen Representative, Alameda  
Tony Daysog, Councilmember, City of Alameda  
Ernest DelliGatti, Citizen Representative, Alameda County  
Cheryl Davila, Councilmember, City of Berkeley  
James Nelson, Citizen Representative, Berkeley  
Edward Bogue, Citizen Representative, Hayward  
Peter Marcuzzo, Metroplex Subcommittee Chair/Citizen Representative, Oakland  
Tom Wagner, Citizen Representative, San Leandro  
Jaime Patiño, Councilmember, City of Union City

**FAA Representatives**

Adam Vetter, FAA Western Service Area Operations Support Group, Analytics/Community Engagement Team Lead  
Sky Laron, FAA, Community Engagement Officer  
William E. Freeman, FAA, Community Engagement Officer

**Staff Members/Advisors/Guests:**

Mar Velez, U.S. Representative Barbara Lee's office  
Matt Davis, Port Governmental Affairs Director  
Diego Gonzalez, Port Governmental Affairs  
Matt P. Davis, Airport Operations Manager, Port of Oakland  
Jesse Richardson, Acting Noise Abatement Supervisor/Sr. Noise and Environmental Affairs Specialist  
Brian Marshall, FAA, Air Traffic Manager, Oakland Air Traffic Control Tower  
Alice Kim, City of San Leandro  
Kathleen Livermore, City of Alameda  
Rhea Gundry, HMMH, Acoustical Consultant  
Adam Scholten, HMMH, Airspace Consultant  
Tom Middleton, HMMH, Noise Consultant  
Christian Valdes, Technical Consultant, Landrum & Brown  
Bert Ganoung, SFO Noise Abatement Manager  
Valerie E. Jensen Harris, Court Reporter (CSR 4401)  
Michael McClintock, Forum Facilitator

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS****A. City of Union City Gives Notice of Non-Renewal**

Facilitator McClintock said that after the last Forum meeting, the City of Union City gave notice that they no longer wished to remain a member of the Forum. He said, he didn't have any details, but understood that Diego Gonzales from the Port Government Affairs Office was going to follow-up with Union City to find out their reason for relinquishing their Forum membership. Co-Chair Benny Lee added that he had spoken to Councilmember Jaime Patiño about the city's decision. Patiño said that this was a decision of the city's mayor. Co-Chair Lee said he urged the councilmember to have the mayor reconsider her decision, because it's better to have a seat at the table to be able to ensure that there are no impacts to their community.

## **B. Acceptance of 2nd Quarter 2019 Noise Report**

The facilitator noted that this item is to receive and file the 2nd quarter noise abatement report for 2019. Motion by Co-Chair Lee to receive and file. Seconded by Co-Chair Jacobs. Motion carried.

## **C. Annual Membership Dues**

The facilitator noted that payment of annual dues for Forum membership were due in August. There are three member organizations that have not paid their dues as yet; these are the City of Hayward, the City of Alameda, and Alameda County. He asked the representatives from these agencies to please work with their jurisdictions to make sure that their annual membership dues get paid.

## **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

### **A. July 17, 2019**

The facilitator said that Forum members had received copies of the draft meeting minutes for the July 17, 2019 Forum meeting. He asked if anyone had any questions, comments, or suggestions? There being no questions or comments, the facilitator asked for a motion to approve. Co-Chair Lee moved approval. Seconded by Peter Marcuzzo. The motion was approved.

## **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

The facilitator announced that the next item on the agenda was public comment. However, he noted, we would get to it, but in fairness to the people who came tonight, there are some things you will want to hear first. So, he said, he will move up the discussion of the NextGen related noise concerns because there have been a number of recent developments that the community may be interested in hearing first. At this end, at Co-Chair Lee's request, Jesse Richardson was called upon to present Agenda Item 7C—Viewpoint Update. The facilitator offered that the public might also find this quite interesting because Viewpoint will give them an interactive tool to check on aircraft flights and facilitate filing noise complaints. Mr. Richardson said that the Viewpoint product is an excellent tool for the community. It puts the power to perform their own noise and flight track analyses, and their own investigations into the hands of the community. Jesse said, if you go to the Port's web site ([flyquietOAK.com](http://flyquietOAK.com)), you will be able to see what he has discussed. Viewpoint is a collection of applications and tools that you can use to track flights and make noise complaints. The OAK noise complaint app can be downloaded on your cell phones. With this app you'll be able to make noise complaints through your cell phone.

On the website, under the community tab, there is an aircraft report dashboard, he said. He opened the app and demonstrated the flight tracking tool, offering that "This is a wonderful tool for the community to track aircraft arrivals, departures and overflights from San Francisco International Airport and the Oakland Airport. He demonstrated by placing his mouse over one of the aircraft icons to get the aircraft ID information, the aircraft type, its origin, destination, and altitude. He said, you can also file a noise complaint here, and you can perform your own investigation using one of the other tools. He said there is also a dashboard for reports. He opened one of the noise complaint summaries. He said, with this tool you can access noise data on an almost real-time basis, as well as a range of other dates. As an example, he showed that the noise office received 3,359 noise complaints from 54 complainants for the period of October 1 through October 15, 2019. These data can also be used to create separate charts, graphs, and tables for any particular day, and which can also show breakdowns of the types of disturbances, and even "zero-in" on your own zip code. He demonstrated results for a query of the Oakland Hills zip code (94611), and identified the number of complaints for a given day for that area.

Ed Downing asked why in the past when he phoned in a noise complaint, he was able to skip the introductory questions, but now has to provide a lot of basic information that had been previously saved in the

system. Jesse replied that they are discussing this issue with the vendor to see if they can provide a feature where you press one and skip the greeting if you have entered your information on a previous call. He said that they do have a new automated noise comment line, and when an individual calls the noise hotline, they'll have an all-new interactive experience. The system will ask for your name, phone number, and e-mail address, and if you wish to be contacted or not. Ed Downing was concerned because under the old system he didn't have to repeat this information each time he called. Jesse said they were working with the vendor to set up a "press 1" option to go straight to the noise complaint information. With caller contact information already in the system, it will make things easier for staff. Mr. Martin Kraus [sp?] from the Berkeley Hills asked if the Viewpoint app was similar to the stopjetnoise.com app. If so, he said, is it possible to link the two apps so that people won't have to deal with two separate apps when the flights are passing overhead. He added that he believed the voicemail recording is "completely impractical," because he cannot see himself spending his time on the phone trying to report jet noise when he has a plane overhead every two minutes and over a hundred overflights per day. We have a very good system with stopjetnoise.com, he said, and he would like the airport to find a way connect these two systems so that the burden isn't all on the caller. Richardson replied that the noise office receives stopjetnoise complaints every day and this information is input into the ANOMS database, and the numbers are reflected in the aircraft dashboard report.

Jay Garfinkle from Bay Farm Island said he sees a lot of data being collected, but it isn't clear to him that anyone does anything with the data. Are the noise complaints collected just to appease those who call them in? He said, you know who's following the noise abatement rules, and you have noise monitors strategically positioned find out who isn't. You know where the flights are noisy, but it isn't clear to him whether the violators are tracked by pilot, by tail number, or what? And, what happens when somebody does violate the rules? Do they get a wrist slap or at-a-boys or what? Mr. Richardson replied, whenever there's a non-compliant operation at the Oakland Airport, the noise office will send a letter to the owner operator with a link to "whisper track," which is also located on our web site, that describes the noise abatement procedures. So, in the future, when they visit the airport they will be aware of this information and, hopefully, not become non-compliant again. Kurt Peterson, Alameda, said that we live in an age where we should be making it easier for people to register noise complaints, not more difficult when using the phone. He said he also wondered if there are any noise monitors in the Oakland Hills. He answered his own question, noting that "No, they've all been removed." Similarly, he noted, at the west end of Alameda, where takeoff noise is primarily heard, there are no monitors there either. He said he agrees with the previous gentleman. What are we doing here, he asked, he said he has been coming to these meetings for eight years and he wants answers. He wants the FAA to do something that will make people's lives better, rather than making the air carriers richer. Matt P. Davis offered that this presentation was to be about a new interactive tool being made available for the community to investigate and file noise complaints, but it appears that we are now discussing noise monitors and other community-related issues. This presentation is not directed at a general update of the overall noise program.

Larry [last name?] from Montclair stated he has attended four of these meetings, and has "...found this to be an incredible insult to all of us who have been putting in our efforts [to get respite from NextGen, and] the fact that all this time is being put into how we can complain as opposed to having some serious action taking place to make a change is really... insulting." He said he does not see that the FAA has seriously addressed this issue. He referenced the successful Phoenix lawsuit, and added that he believes in the taxpayers' right to seek relief from an "undue burden." He said he has SFO flights coming over his head every minute and stop.jetnoise.net doesn't always detect it. He offered to have any interested to come his home and observe this for themselves. He concluded by stating that "...if you have any conscience, you have got to address this and stop making this a joke [because] our lives have been impacted in a very serious and undue way."

Co-Chair Lee commented that the Forum will be addressing some of these FAA issues in an upcoming action item. But, wanted everyone to know that Viewpoint is a very important tool because having the ability to find and understand all of the information and data is important. He said all of the noise complaints seem to come from just a few people, which means that a lot of people are not calling in to register their complaints. "We need to have folks call in when there are these issues," he said. The reason this is important, he said, is because we need to develop a fact base for the number and types of complaints to be able to analyze them properly. We need to be able to prove to the FAA empirically that there are more aircraft noise issues occurring now, in comparison to the past. Michael Bostick of Montclair said that what is happening now is "burnout." All this has been going on for a while now, and people are tired of coping with the noise. The number of complainants is really not the issue, he said. They're just the canaries. Each complaint probably represents a thousand people who would love to complain but don't have the time or the capacity to do so. He said he didn't know whether or not the noise complaint data actually serves a purpose in painting an appropriate picture of what is going on out there, but appreciates having the option to complain. So, what's being done, he asked? Nothing is being done. So, it's a futile gesture and he thinks that people have come to understand that.

Matt Pourfarzaneh, president of CLASS from Alameda, said that he has been working with the airport for the past seven years. He said he wished to comment on why this data was important. During the past year, for example, CLASS went through data for over seven-thousand flights, and was able to compare past flight activities with the current activities. Matt said, they shared the data with the airport, which took action where changes could be made. He said, "It may not seem important to some of you, but this tool is very important." CLASS collects and analyzes this data and shares it with the airport to see and understand what is happening in the Bay Area's airspace, he said. On the issue of NextGen, he said it is unfortunate that there have been so many changes in the FAA leadership at the regional level. But, he said, this has not stopped us from developing the data we need to make our case with the FAA. Facilitator McClintock said there were a couple of things he personally wanted to clarify before moving on:

1. It needs to be understood that neither the Forum nor the Oakland Airport have any control whatsoever over where aircraft fly; this is entirely under the purview of the Federal Aviation Administration. In other words, the airport does not control airplanes in flight, but what the Forum can do is to take information from the community and present it to the FAA, saying, "We've got a problem here, and the community is upset, and asking "What can be done?"
2. So, after three years, we are finally starting to make a breakthrough with the FAA. They have started to listen to what we have been saying.
3. Unfortunately, the resolution of these issues will not occur overnight, or not at all for some. This is likely going to take some time.
4. Lastly, the success of the Phoenix lawsuit has been suggested as one solution to resolving the NextGen problem for the East Bay. The Forum's experienced advisors have counseled that this may not be the answer that that some may believe it is. Anyone may sue anybody they want...but, winning a judgement may be an entirely different matter...and it could be very costly over the long run.

So, the facilitator concluded, the Forum is still the community's best option for engaging the FAA because the Forum is an advisory body to the Port of Oakland, and the FAA has asked this Forum, as well as other noise forums and community roundtables around the country to work with their communities and talk with the FAA about what the issues are and what can be done about them. Lastly, he said, he thought that tonight's discussion under the NextGen related noise concerns topic would give the community some basis for hope.

[At this point the Public Comment period was suspended until after Agenda Item 5—NextGen Related Noise Concerns was completed]



#### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

The facilitator announced that this is an opportunity for people to speak on issues not on the agenda, but relevant to airport noise and air quality at the Oakland International Airport. He said if anyone wished to speak under this item, they should fill out a speaker's card. Speakers will be called in the order their cards are received, and there will be a two-minute time limit per speaker.

The facilitator called upon Mr. Tomás Colussi from the Oakland Hills. Mr. Colussi stated that he was an engineer and a big believer in data. He said used the jet tracking tool quite a bit and wanted to provide the Forum with a different kind of data; data that he collected a couple of weeks ago, on a Saturday morning between 10:30 and 11:30 a.m. He cited a series of numbers between 15 and 60, saying that these numbers represent the number of seconds of silence between planes flying over his house. In the period of one hour, he said, those seconds added up to 14 minutes. With only 14 minutes of silence per hour, one would think that he must have bought a house right by the airport, but, he said, this is not the case. He lives in the Oakland Hills and is about as far away from the airport that anyone in Oakland can be. On the day he collected the data, it was sunny and they sat down on their patio to enjoy the morning. That did not happen. Within minutes, his wife ran back inside their home due to the noise. That's when he started collecting the data he presented.

James Nelson said that Mr. Colussi had provided an excellent description of noise impact. It has to do with speech and intelligibility; how much time you have to engage in a conversation and carry through on a coherent thought with other individuals without interruption. It's the kind of a metric that he didn't think has received much attention. The facilitator added that the "respite" metric is commonly used in Australia and Great Britain, but not in the U.S. For the record it was noted that Mr. Nelson is a registered acoustical engineer with over 45-years' experience in transportation noise. Co-Chair Lee thanked Mr. Colussi for his description of the noise impacts he experienced, and said that this is one of the reasons why it's important to get this kind of data. He spoke about data intelligence and its use, and how by knowing specifics about the attributes of any given flight, you can empirically try to determine what that noise range will be. He said, he hopes that, eventually, with the availability of more open data, it will give us the opportunity to have the ability to analyze flight impacts in terms of what those prospective noise ranges are and how long they last in the community. Having this kind of data is important because it's something we can take back to the FAA in terms of how aircraft noise impacts our communities.

Daniel Richheimer of the Berkeley Hills said he starts hearing airplane noise when it wakes him up at 6:00 a.m., and afterwards there is one plane every few minutes. He said he recognizes and appreciates the Viewpoint tool and the data it can provide, but even with stop.jetnoise.net he had to take his phone out every two minutes while he was working on a ladder outside as a contractor. It was not sustainable. He said just complaining about jet noise would be a full-time job. Michael Bostick thanked the FAA for coming to the meeting, but it was long overdue. He said he has been coming to these meeting for the last three years, and heard the previous FAA Regional Administrators promise that "it wouldn't be long, be patient; soon enough they'd move WINDSR over. No problem." It's been one misery after the next, and data does not necessarily gauge the impact on one's psyche because the impact on peoples' emotional state from living underneath this unbelievable assault on ourselves and senses, is just immeasurable. No one, he said, can begin to appreciate what it's like to live underneath that constantly, over and over and over again. Every time he steps out of his house, there's a plane. When he gets out of his car, there's a plane. Every moment, there's a plane. That was not the case five years ago. He wanted to know why people have to put up with this? Why hasn't the FAA shown up, like they promised back in February, and done something about it? They have obstructed and obfuscated; it's just unbelievable. He said he appreciated that the FAA representatives were here, and asked that they take their assignment seriously, "because we are all dying here."

Fred Schurkus of Oakland said he was one of the regular noise complainants. During September and the first part of October, he said, he and his wife reported 2,306 flights, and average of 74 per day. He said his personal record was 200 in one day, but only because stop.jetnoise.net doesn't you to report more than 200/day. These flights take place at all hours of the day and night. He cited the number of flights he had counted by airline and time of day. He asked those who work for the FAA "what it's like to work for an organization that clearly does not care about the people it harms?" He said, "we've been going through this for years, including requests from Congresswoman Lee." He said he would go home after this meeting and write another letter to Barbara Lee, suggesting that she "form a bipartisan focus group within Congress and join up with fellow Congresspeople who are similarly afflicted." There's got to be more than 100 districts just like us, he said. Kurt Peterson of West Alameda said he had been attending these meetings with his wife for the past 8 years. They have had to put up with the noise, as has their entire neighborhood. He said he was very impressed with all the functions of the new service that has been introduced, and its much quicker. He added that, yesterday, at 7:24 a.m., Southwest flight 1871 woke up his wife as it flew directly over their house at 2,200 feet. It was her birthday. Other than the fact that the flight was six minutes late, he could find no other reason for that flight to be over his house. He concluded that "the FAA is allowing us to be subjected to all of this noise and all this trouble because of money."

Bill Harrison of Hayward said he could empathize with all of the previous speakers and all of the community members who are gathered here. He said, he and his wife, Sandra, have been attending these meetings since 2003, and that their neighborhood is on the Hayward-Castro Valley border. They have been affected by incoming flights for more than 16 years. In 2005, thanks to the Noise Forum and the Oakland Airport noise office and Jesse Richardson, they had a portable noise monitor placed in their backyard in 2005. Over a period of 30 days, it recorded over 5,000 aircraft that passed over their home at altitudes of between two and five thousand feet. That's an average of 166 planes a day. Mr. Harrison said he was glad that Adam Vetter was present to hear this because now they are getting overflights between 2,000- and 3,000-foot altitude over their home at 1:00 a.m. He said he just wanted to document the fact that decisions made by the FAA, in addition to Nextgen, are also having an impact on their community. Dr. Yvonne McHugh of Point Richmond thanked the Forum for the opportunity to come to the meeting and hear all of this information, which is completely new to her. She showed the Forum a map of where Point Richmond was in relation to the Oakland Airport in order to make the point that she is being subjected to considerable overflight from aircraft both arriving and departing the Oakland Airport. She said, even though these flights may be considered to be at a reasonable altitude over Point Richmond, they are particularly disruptive of the West Contra Costa County environs, and are degrading the quality of life for the Point Richmond residents. She just wants to know why the FAA can't reroute these flights farther out over the bay.

Kathy Roth said she has lived in Montclair for about 30 years. Prior to the rollout of NextGen, during the rainy season, presumably when the winds were in a certain direction, they would get San Francisco landings every three minutes for part of the day. Since NextGen, they get San Francisco takeoffs and both Oakland arrivals and departures at the same time. From her perspective, she said, she can't tell the difference between a plane that's at 5,000 or 6,000 feet versus 11,000 feet. One morning she made 105 complaints in about four hours. Oftentimes, she said, the flights are closer together than every three minutes, and she thinks it is the rising and falling of the noise levels that makes it more difficult to listen than if it was a constant noise. She understands why NextGen will not go away, but she retired after working for 25 years and had hoped to enjoy the California indoor/outdoor lifestyle. Now, she said, she has to keep her windows closed with the air conditioner and the fan running. She said she would like to see the NextGen flight paths varied during the course of the day to avoid having the current concentrated stream directly over her neighborhood. It would be nice, she said, if we could all share the noise a little more equitably.

Reva Fabrikant of Oakland, said she was representing SOSEB for all people in the East Bay who are suffering from NextGen noise, whether it's in their homes, or on the street, or whether it's above what used to be our peaceful, meditative regional parks. She thanked everyone for coming tonight, especially the Noise Forum members who keep hearing the same story month after month, and quarter after quarter. She thanked the FAA representatives for coming, and thanked Congresswoman Barbara Lee for sending her representative again year after year to support her constituents. She said she was pleased to hear that an in-person meeting has finally taken place between the FAA and the NextGen subcommittee. But more than that, she said, we really would like to be able to thank you for truly listening to us and responding to our suffering and changing the noisy flight paths that NextGen created and put over our heads. She said she SOSEB would like to be able to thank the FAA, for acknowledging that both SFO and Oakland flight paths are extremely problematic in the East Bay. This was not the case before Nextgen. One need only to look at the noise complaints to see what it was like before NextGen and what it's been like after NextGen. The people of the East Bay are frustrated, and that's what you're hearing. She said, "We haven't slept in three years." We've been told, "Wait. Something's gonna happen." Now we're being told it's "not gonna happen overnight." Well, she said, no one considers a three-year period to be equitable with overnight. We need things to happen faster. We need these meetings to happen faster so that we can start sleeping and we can have our peace back again. There was one person who talked about what it was like before when the flights were being dispersed over our area. It was much better then. It was peaceful. We could hike. We could walk. Yes, she said, it was awful when it rained, but the complaints were minimal then because the flights were dispersed.

Co-Chair Benny Lee thanked Representative Barbara Lee for bringing the communities concerns to the U.S. Secretary of Transportation and to the FAA Administrator. This was of great help in getting the feds to respond to the community's concerns. Congress, however, was a different matter. When proposed legislation only has 30 or 40 supporting co-signers it will probably never be brought to a vote by the House of Representatives. Because the House has 438 representatives, a bill needs to have at least 220 supporters to make it to the floor, assuming that it can get past the Speaker of the House. In this regard, Benny said, Barbara Lee has been great because she has encouraged her colleagues to sign on to bills we have asked her to support, and we have colleagues from across the bay who have signed on to these bills, and they are coming up with new bills. Rep. Grace Meng from New York has authored new anti-noise legislation, but it literally takes an act of Congress to move this legislation. That's why, he said, telephone calls to other Congressional representatives seeking their help are vital. It is not enough just to call Barbara Lee. We have to understand that it's also important to reach out to friends and colleagues from across the United States to get their Congressional reps to sign on to the bills too. Benny said that when we get a list of the relevant bills, we'll make sure that everybody gets a copy.

## **5. NEXTGEN RELATED NOISE CONCERNS**

### **A. Subcommittee Report**

The Chairman of the Forum's NextGen subcommittee, Peter Marcuzzo, a retired FAA air traffic controller was asked to update the Forum on his committee's activities. Mr. Marcuzzo began by saying that in mid-July the FAA sent a letter to the Forum asserting that the procedures they have approved and implemented under the Northern California Metroplex are safe and efficient for the movement of air traffic. The subcommittee was concerned about this because there was no apparent consideration of the noise and annoyance resulting from these new procedures. He said, the committee repeatedly asked the FAA to come meet with us. Finally, they freed up enough time in their schedule to meet with us, despite being very busy and having a lot of work to do. This morning, he said, Adam Vetter and Sky Laron from the FAA in Seattle came down to meet with the subcommittee. They are FAA subject matter experts, who have worked with the procedures we are concerned about; and they have worked with the FAA staff who designed and implemented the procedures. He said, they had a three-hour meeting about only two of the



topics the subcommittee wanted to discuss; the HUSSH procedure off of Alameda was priority number one, and priority number two was the Oakland WINDSR procedure. There was a lengthy discussion of the two procedures that involved a considerable number of technical issues, including aircraft flight management systems, flying the aircraft manually, some new of the new parameters the FAA has to deal with when developing RNAV approaches, and the new satellite-based navigation approaches versus the old procedures we used to have. A lot of issues were discussed.

As a result of these discussions, the committee has requested that the FAA review a couple of options for the HUSSH procedure; one of them being how to get an earlier turn at 400 feet, or 520 feet. He said they were going to review this with the FAA RNAV and procedures specialists to develop an open Oakland SID that will help aircraft departing off Runway 30 to keep the aircraft from drifting over Alameda. As for the WINDSR arrival procedure, he said the committee will be taking a look at possibly moving the current arrival track farther to the east, away from the tops of the hills. He said, the FAA has committed to reviewing these proposals and will be coming back in January to update the committee on their findings. In January, he said, we also hope to initiate discussions on the TRUKN departures and other procedures that we want them to take a look at. Peter said he was “highly encouraged, and that it was a productive meeting.” He thanked the FAA for taking the time to come down and do this, since having retired from the FAA, he knows what they're going through, and they are very, very busy trying to work with a lot of new procedures and take care of problems in other areas that are having problems because of the Metroplex and the NextGen system. The facilitator thanked Mr. Marcuzzo for his update, and added that one of the things learned from the meeting with the FAA today was that letters don't translate well. He said we must have exchanged four or five letters with the various administrators that have been in charge of the FAA's Western Pacific Region, but today for the first time -- you'll hear from the FAA a little later on about this -- we did, as Peter said, break new ground.

## **B. CLASS Metroplex Points of Information**

The facilitator introduced Dr. Matt Pourfarzaneh, president of CLASS. He said that CLASS prepared a memo for the Forum on points of information regarding Metroplex. Forum members have received copies of the memo. Dr. Pourfarzaneh began by saying that at the last North-South Research Group meeting they were discussing NextGen and the group was frustrated that there had been no opportunities for face-to-face meetings with the FAA technical experts. He said that there are a lot of issues that are technical and cannot be translated well on paper because there's always the possibility of misunderstandings. Matt expressed CLASS' concern that there have been three changes in FAA Regional Administrators since all this began, and each time things have to be started all over again. Another thing, he said, is that we have not been versed in how to go about things in the manner that the FAA would like to see, e.g. submitting our requests on a form or in a format that the FAA preferred. It was only at today's subcommittee meeting that this was made clear to us. So, he said, it appears that all this time we were not getting our message across because it was getting to the people we needed to talk to. So, he said, in the interest of clarity, CLASS has distilled its concerns into several bullet points so that everyone can understand what the issues are. First and foremost, he said, we need to meet with the FAA technical representatives face-to-face and personally in order to get our issues resolved.

## **C. FAA Noise Forum Meetings Update**

Matt P. Davis was called upon to give the Forum an update on the FAA's noise forum meetings. Mr. Davis said that the fact that FAA technical representatives are present in the room tonight indicates that we are starting to see some results from these meeting. Going back about a year or so, he said, the FAA began holding these meetings with airport operators. Initially, there were six airports and 24 people in the room. At the last meeting, on August 22, there were 21 airports represented and 70 people present. The biggest takeaway from these meetings, he said, is that the FAA is now sending representatives to the

various airport community roundtables and forums, including our Forum. These meetings are generating results, e.g. better communication with the FAA on procedures development. This is the IFP [Instrument Flight Procedures] Information Gateway that Dr. Pourfarzaneh alluded to, and which is the protocol that allows airports to communicate the development of new procedures with the FAA. This creates a means for airports to speak candidly with the FAA and to work collaboratively with them. This is one of the reasons that there are FAA technical representatives present here tonight.

At the last meeting, he said, we talked about some of the noise and other challenges facing the FAA in the future: unmanned aerial systems [UAS] and drones; urban air mobility (automated helicopters and passenger-carrying drones); and the integration of these systems into the National Airspace System. So, he said, there are a lot new and different challenges that will be coming up in the future, and it is important that we continue to have these meetings to discuss issues and work on solutions upfront. The hope is we can work collaboratively moving forward. Davis said the next meeting with the group will be in Colorado on November 7. He said, he would have an update at the next Forum meeting in January.

#### **D. FAA Deputy Regional Administrator' Update**

The facilitator announced that Mr. Adam Vetter would be representing the FAA deputy regional administrator tonight. Mr. Vetter thanked Peter Marcuzzo for the opportunity to meet with the Metroplex subcommittee. He said it was a lengthy meeting, but felt that a lot had been accomplished and appreciated that the group understood that the people at the Western Service Area Operations Support Group have an immense workload. He said his group covers not only Northern California, but all the way to Denver from the Canadian border south, and that his sole responsibility is to be a representative for the technical work groups. He added that they take community engagement seriously, and are making enhanced efforts on reaching out to affected communities. He said he does not come to just Oakland, but also meets with San Francisco, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and all the way down to Southern California and up to Seattle and Denver as well. On this point, he said, the FAA has created eight new positions called "community engagement officers," whose sole responsibility within the FAA is to be a liaison with the community and to work, along with his team, with communities to have one-on-one discussions at noise forums and community meetings; instead of letter writing back and forth. But, he noted, changes won't happen overnight, and we're moving forward, and we are putting emphasis on communication.

Kurt Peterson interjected to ask Mr. Vetter what his title was and whether or not he was a spokesperson for the FAA. Vetter replied that his title is "Community Engagement and Analytics Team Lead," and that he is based in Seattle. He said he is not an official spokesperson for the FAA, but he is the liaison between technical groups, such as the Forum's NextGen [Metroplex] Subcommittee, and his primary responsibility is to be the liaison between the technical work groups of each roundtable/forum and to relay information back to the service center to get it to whomever needs the information in order to get results faster. The facilitator added that Mr. Vetter is not a PR person. He is a technical expert and that was borne out in today's meeting with the subcommittee. It was noted also, that Tamara Swann is the Deputy Regional Administrator, and that she is still the primary FAA representative to the Forum. Unfortunately, she had a medical issue and could not attend tonight's meeting. The facilitator closed by noting that, again, it was a good discussion, and that the subcommittee gave the FAA representatives a lot of information to review and consider. He said, he hoped that there will more progress to report at the January Forum meeting.

#### **E. Santa Clara/Santa Cruz Roundtable Request Follow-Up**

At the July meeting, the facilitator noted, there was a request from the new roundtable that represents Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties and San Jose International Airport to have the San Francisco Roundtable and the Oakland Forum to join with them to form a coordinating council to discuss issues of mutual concern and how to approach the FAA about how to resolve these issues. He said, he had had a

conversation with the chairperson of the Santa Clara-Santa Cruz Roundtable. They have had one organizational meeting, and they want to have another one. They are not asking for the Forum to join their roundtable, but they are seeking to have three representatives from each of the Bay Area roundtable/forums to meet and discuss these issues. There will be another coordinating session soon, and, he said, if we can get three representatives from the Forum to attend, that would be a good thing. He suggested one of the three Forum representatives should be a technical person from the airport. He said he had provided a memo to the Forum on this matter, as well.

## **6. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS REPORT**

### **A. North Field/South Field Research Group Action Items**

Matt P. Davis provided a summary of the last North Field/South Field Research Group meeting. He began the technical working group's report by saying that the group meets four times a year between the Forum's meetings. He said they have a lot of issues that they are dealing with, including work on NextGen and a number of other action items as well. There were four action items undertaken at the last group meeting. The first was the Runway 33 turbojet departure report. As you recall, he said, there was the desire by Alameda and CLASS to restrict the number of jet departures off of Runway 33. He said, they had achieved very good voluntary compliance with almost no jet takeoffs on Runway 33, and, if you go back a few years ago, there were a few hundred jets departing off there every quarter. We still have small propeller aircraft that depart there, just no jets. As for compliance with noise abatement procedures, he said they go through the reports very thoroughly, and discuss what is considered compliant, and what's non-compliant. He said they'll provide more detail on this. Right now, air traffic conflict or air traffic necessity is not a reason to consider an aircraft to be compliant for a North Field jet departure. However, for other procedures, such as early turns over Alameda and the like, air traffic continues to be considered compliant. Another action item was to reach out to Southwest and FedEx regarding their further attendance at the research group meetings. They typically attended these meetings and they worked with the airport to talk about their fleets. FedEx has a retirement schedule for its DC10 fleet and Southwest, which is the largest operator at OAK, comes to the meetings to talk about the technical capabilities of their aircraft. It's important they attend these meetings. The Viewpoint app was also discussed as it was launched recently, and it continues to be modified and adjusted. The telephone component was not discussed vis a vis its ability to store default information. Some concern was expressed that permanent data inputs were not being saved, with the result that the user had to repeat the same basic information each time the system was accessed. He said they will continue to work on this.

Other more general issues discussed at the meeting included a number of unplanned jet departures off North Field over the last quarter that were a result of maintenance issues that required closure of a main taxiway connecting the North and South Fields. This had to do with pavement issues that have been taken care of, so, he said, we should be getting back to normal. However, this did have a negative impact on Alameda. Davis said, there is a construction project coming up early next year on a portion of the northern piece of Taxiway Bravo, but he does not expect that this will result in an increase in jet traffic off the North Field. If anything changes, he will advise accordingly. A couple of other projects were discussed. A signage project will get underway in the next month or so. It is intended to improve the quality of older airfield signage on the North Field. These are the signs that pilots see when they are taxiing, and this should provide better direction because the signs are brighter and easier to see. Additional noise abatement signage will also be installed. This is part of the program of the layered approach to noise abatement. It starts when the pilots are doing their flight planning, and includes software packages that remind pilots of things like preferential runway use...every business jet that's taxiing out of the North Field is reminded that Runway 30 is preferential runway for jet departures. Also, to give pilots one last chance, they are adding additional signage that reminds them, on taxi out, that they need to use runway 30 for any jet

departures. Davis said they were excited to be able to add these signs because they should help to maintain compliance.

Davis said the only other major issue they talked about was Fleet Week and the Blue Angels. The Blue Angels depart from the North Field, and this causes a lot of noise over Alameda. This happens only once a year, and they will likely be back in 2020. Ed Downing said CLASS had brought up the Runway 33 jet departure issue, more as a safety issue than a noise issue. He thanked Matt and the airport for the efforts they made in reducing the numbers of jet departures from Runway 33. He also pointed out that since the group had last met, there had been two serious accidents involving the types of jets that had been using Runway 33, which is only 3,300 feet long. Dale Earnhardt, Jr. and his family (and dog) survived the fiery crash of a Cessna Citationjet in Tennessee last August on takeoff from a 4,000-foot runway; and the other killed everyone on board another private jet taking off on a 6,000-foot runway. Downing said he would not be happy until there are no more jet departures on Runway 33.

## **7. NOISE OFFICE REPORT**

### **A. Update on Action Items from July 17, 2019 Meeting**

Jesse Richardson reported that there were four action items from the July 17 Forum meeting. The first action item was Ty Allison's assertion that there had been an increase in jet traffic noise during nighttime hours, i.e. 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The facilitator had asked Mr. Allison for a copy of his notes. The information was never provided. The second item had to do with the follow-up to the Santa Clara-Santa Cruz Roundtable request. The facilitator said he would contact the Roundtable chairperson and prepare a memo for the file. This was done with the Forum receiving the memo in the agenda packages for this meeting. The third item was a 30-page presentation prepared by Howard Hintermeister of SFO departure issues that were occurring over Alameda and Bay Farm Island. Mr. Hintermeister's presentation was referred to the NextGen subcommittee for further review. However, the subcommittee did not meet until it met with the FAA this morning. The facilitator said he had spoken with Mr. Hintermeister and that there were some mitigating circumstances, and that the data may no longer be current. Facilitator McClintock asked the CLASS representatives to have Mr. Hintermeister contact him to advise as to how he wished to proceed. Ed Downing advised that the presentation concerned the TRUKN departure procedure from SFO. Matt Pourfarzaneh added that it would be best to table this item for now.

### **B. Fleet Week Recap/Red Arrows**

Jesse Richardson explained that the Red Arrows are the British Royal Air Force aerobatics team. They are on a North American tour and were invited to participate in Fleet Week activities along with the Blue Angels. He said they flew into the Bay Area at the request of the British Consul in San Francisco. They flew over the Bay Bridge, took some photos, landed on Oakland's Runway 30 on October 1, stayed overnight, and departed off of the main runway on October 2 with no problems. There were no complaints about their operations. However, there were 21 noise complaints about the Blue Angels from two complainants in Alameda and on Bay Farm Island.

### **C. Viewpoint Update (see 4 above—Public Comment)**

### **D. Cal State Visual Approach to Runway 30 Update**

Alameda County citizen representative, Ernest DelliGatti, asked that his Cal State visual approach proposal be forwarded to the North Field/South Field Research Group for further review. The proposal is currently in the hands of HMMH for evaluation. HMMH's Adam Scholten confirmed that they had received a copy of the proposal from Mr. DelliGatti and were reviewing it. Adam said the results of their analysis would be presented at the January Forum meeting. On the same topic, it was reported that the



FAA has taken its proposal off the publication schedule. At this point in time, it doesn't appear that it's going to be published anytime in the near future. Its status will continue to be monitored.

## 8. NOISE NEWS AND UPDATE

Christian Valdes from Landrum & Brown started with some news on drones. The FAA's drone task force, led by former Oakland Airport Aviation Director, Deborah Flint and former FAA Administrator Michael Huerta, issued a report stating that drones introduced a substantial risk that can disrupt and engage the airport environment, as proven by the recent drone event at London's Gatwick Airport last year. They have urged lawmakers to fund programs and federal agencies to work with airports on detecting unauthorized drone activity in proximity to airports. The FAA is currently drafting regulations that would require small drones to have some type of ID identification on them, but this may take a year or so for these rules to come to fruition. Many of the anti-drone technologies that the FAA has tested haven't proven effective or violate federal law. On the FAA front, the agency Administrator, Daniel Elwell, went before the House Aviation Committee to answer questions about the progress of various provisions in last year's FAA Reauthorization Act. Under section 189 of the act, the FAA awarded 1.7 million dollars to MIT and Boston University School of Public Health to perform a study on potential health and economic impacts on over-flight noise that will focus on major metropolitan areas and look into the relationship between perceived increase in noise and actual noise increase. On Section 98, Mr. Elwell stated the report to evaluate alternative noise metrics to DNL will be submitted to Congress by the end of the year.

Of interest, is that during the three-hour meeting, Elwell assured committee members the FAA takes community engagement quite seriously, but around the two-hour mark of the meeting, things got a little heated when Congressman Lynch from Massachusetts disagreed with him, stating that, in the past 18 years, the FAA has met with his constituents in the town of Milton only once. At that meeting, about 700 unhappy residents from Milton showed up. Lynch continued to express his discontent about the FAA's commitment to community engagement, but closed out his comments by re-inviting the FAA to talk to his constituents about the health studies and flight dispersion analyses that the agency is working on. Community engagement is no longer just what proactive groups do or proactive airports do; community engagement is now an integral part in the process to address aircraft noise. To this extent, the Airports Council International and the Civil Air Navigation Services Organization urged the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), to formally recognize community engagement as the fifth element to ICAO's balanced approach. The current four elements are reduction of noise at the source, land use planning, noise abatement procedures and flight restrictions. Additionally, the two groups also encouraged ICAO to explore the understanding of non-acoustic factors, because research shows actual noise exposure is only responsible for about 30 percent of community concerns. Further encouragement was given by a senior scientist in the field of acoustics, who stated that some non-acoustic factors can be managed or controlled by airport authorities, which means noise tolerance could be reduced without reducing noise exposure. The concept is known as "the community tolerance level," which was co-authored by former Forum acoustical expert Vince Mestre and others. A professor at the Manchester Metropolitan University in the UK, is part of a European Union project called "Aviation Noise Impact Management Through Novel Approaches" that's looking to move the impact of non-acoustic factors in aircraft and noise and developing a tool kit to help.

Next, Valdes noted, ICAO has published a working paper entitled "Global Environmental Trends, Present and Future Aircraft Noise and Emissions." In this paper, ICAO predicts, by year 2045, international air traffic may grow by a factor of 3.3, fuel burn may increase between 2.2 and 3.0, and the total area around airports within the 55 DNL contour may grow to over twice as large as it was in 2015. However, from about the year 2030, the total yearly average DNL contours may no longer increase with the growth in air traffic. Admittedly, a lot of stars need to be aligned for that scenario, but it's plausible, nevertheless. Four years of hard work and coordination by the airport commission, communities, airlines and the FAA finally paid off for Chicago's O'Hare Airport. They released a 17-week schedule of an interim fly quiet program



which, essentially, is a respite or rotational program that will relieve communities of noise on a pre-determined schedule. Next, the British Medical Journal warns that if the World Health Organization guidelines are not adopted, the health of communities living near airports will continue to deteriorate. If you recall, the 2018 guidelines recommend a threshold of 45 DNL during the day and 40 DNL at night. Can these guidelines influence courts in the U.S.? Yes, they can. The guidelines are not mandatory but were cited in recent recommendations by several state administrative law judges. Regarding the requirements of a company seeking to build a wind farm in Northern New York State, they must secure an environmental certificate allowing construction to begin. However, aviation attorney Peter Kurz commented that the FAA has successfully defended the use of the DNL metric and the 65 DNL threshold in many cases, and the law is pretty clear: without a substantial case against the 65 DNL standard, the courts will likely continue to support the metric. Hopefully, the FAA annoyance study will shine more light on the subject.

Christian said he found two contrasting articles on supersonic transport. On one side there were over two dozen public interest groups that urged the FAA to reverse its course and stop the comeback of supersonic commercial aircraft due to the projected high rate of fuel burn and sonic boom that could double the area exposed to harmful noise pollution. On the other side of the issue, NASA reached a milestone in its X15 quiet supersonic program, which focuses on changing loud sonic booms to quiet sonic “thumps.” Prior to test flying over communities, NASA will undertake an acoustical validation phase during which a 30-mile-long array of microphones will verify that the thump is as quiet as predicted. This array was successfully tested and is ready to measure supersonic overflights. The Southern San Fernando Valley's Airplane Noise Task Force was created to address the shifts in flight paths and increased number of flights out of Hollywood/Burbank and Van Nuys Airports. Thirteen elected officials, along with airport, airline and FAA representatives, and HMMH, as their technical consultant, are expected to have six monthly meetings to try to mitigate local noise impacts.

Continuing on to the MAX saga, Christian said that FAA Administrator Steve Dixon recently received the Joint Authority technical review of the B737 MAX and will take appropriate actions soon. In the meantime, American Airlines announced their MAX is expected to return to service on January 16. Southwest said they're adjusting their schedule through January 5. While this is all taking place, Southwest pilots are suing Boeing for deliberately misleading them and the airline about the aircraft, resulting in more than 100 million dollars in lost pilot wages. Boeing calls it "a meritless lawsuit." Finally. In closing and on a lighter, interesting note, researchers at a UK university found that a certain bird living close to airports, were five times more likely to attack a speaker emitting birdsong than those living away from the airport. The birds living close to the airports also changed their songs by singing at a lower frequency, indicating possible impacts. The facilitator thanked Mr. Valdes for a very interesting presentation.

## **9. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING – January 15, 2020**

The next Forum meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 15, 2020

## **10. NEW BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT**

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

END