

Correspondence received for the Legislative Committee of the SCSC Roundtable

Attachments:

Page 2: Marie Jo Fremont

Page 4 - 12: Jennifer T.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Marie-Jo Fremont**

Date: Mon, Apr 27, 2020 at 1:37 PM

Subject: Re: Agenda Item #4 of Legislative Committee Meeting of April 29, 2020 - Comment

To: SCSC Roundtable <[scscroundtable@gmail.com](mailto:scscroundtable@gmail.com)>

Cc: <[Lisa.Matichak](mailto:Lisa.Matichak)>, Kou, Lydia

I am not sure how the Committee will handle written comments submitted by the public before the meeting versus verbal comments that will be made by the public during the virtual meeting.

Given that I plan to attend the 04/29 Virtual Meeting, I would like to clarify that the Chair does NOT need to read the comment that I submitted by email yesterday on Agenda Item 4. I plan to make comments verbally during the meeting on this topic. Be assured that I will continue to respect the time limit for public comments.

mjf

On Sun, Apr 26, 2020 at 6:55 PM Marie-Jo Fremont wrote:

I would like to offer a practical suggestion for the SCSC RT Legislative Committee to start tracking legislative and regulatory actions (task 2.1 of the Work Plan). Given that the meeting will be held only 3 days from now, I have copied the Chair of the Legislative Committee (Lisa Matichak) and my City representative on the Roundtable (Lydia Kou) to give them as much time as possible to consider my comment.

I suggest that the Legislative Committee obtain from Steve Alverson or Congressional Staff members a status update on the 10-noise related sections of the 2018 FAA Reauthorization Bill (see attached summary):

- 7 of the sections have due dates before May 2020 and one section did not have any due date.
- The update should specify what progress if any has been made and in particular whether reports have been created and published if applicable.

The Committee should then build on the status update and identify specific actions to take on the various items.

Thank you for considering my suggestions.

Marie-Jo Fremont  
Palo Alto resident



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **tjsunnyvale1**

Date: Tue, Apr 28, 2020 at 11:18 AM

Subject: SCSC Roundtable LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE April 29, 2020 meeting - Agenda Item #5 - Review, Discussion, and Potential Action on the Proposed Noise Certification Regulations for Supersonic Airplanes

To: [scscroundtable@gmail.com](mailto:scscroundtable@gmail.com) <[scscroundtable@gmail.com](mailto:scscroundtable@gmail.com)>

Cc: Glenn Hendricks

RE: Public comment -

SCSC Roundtable Legislative Committee April 29, 2020 meeting - Agenda Item #5 - Review, Discussion, and Potential Action on the Proposed Noise Certification Regulations for Supersonic Airplanes

[Attached Sunnyvale/Cupertino Airplane Noise Group letter previously forwarded to the FAA]

Hello Madam Chair Matichak (Legislative Committee):

In preparation for Agenda Item #5 Supersonic Airplanes, discussion and possible action-

Last August 2019 our Sunnyvale/Cupertino Airplane Noise Group prepared a letter for the FAA regarding the possible reintroduction of civil supersonic flights over the U.S. I have attached that letter for your reference.

Overview of the Sunnyvale/Cupertino Airplane Noise Group letter:

- Since Nextgen implementation, our Bay Area communities have experienced problems with airplane noise.
- FAA should not compound this problem by adding supersonic aircraft to the mix while people across the country are still suffering from NextGen.
- A high hurdle must be met in order to remove the existing civil supersonic flight ban over the U.S.

If civil supersonic flights are reintroduced over U.S. land:

1. There should be no audible sonic boom at ground level (including no sonic boom over pressure, no rattling, nor any other human annoyance at ground level)
2. All supersonic aircraft must meet or exceed the same noise standards and fuel-efficiency standards that apply to newly manufactured subsonic aircraft. (Current new aircraft manufacturing noise/fuel-efficiency standards)

I am hoping this letter will be helpful during the supersonic aircraft discussion. See you (virtually) tomorrow.

I have attached both a PDF copy and a MS Word version for your convenience.

Thank you,  
Jennifer Tasseff

# ***AIRPLANE NOISE GROUPS SUNNYVALE / CUPERTINO***



Also submitted via <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=FAA-2019-0451-0001>

August 27, 2019

Docket Operations, M-30  
U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)  
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE (Room W12-140)  
West Building Ground Floor  
Washington, DC 20590-0001

**Re: Sunnyvale/Cupertino Airplane Noise Group comments on *Special Flight Authorizations for Supersonic Aircraft*, Docket: FAA-2019-0451**

Dear DOT Representative:

The Sunnyvale / Cupertino Airplane Noise Group appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) on their Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) on *Special Flight Authorizations for Supersonic Aircraft*.

The following document pertains to civil supersonic flights and aircraft.

Members of the Sunnyvale /Cupertino Airplane Noise Group have prepared a list of 5 recommendations (listed below) regarding civil supersonic aircraft reintroduction into the United States. We believe these recommendations will support new technological advances, without compromising U.S. residents on the ground. Since 1973, a ban on civil supersonic flights has existed over U.S. land. This was done to protect U.S. residents. A high hurdle should be met in order to remove this supersonic flight ban, and these new supersonic aircraft should meet stringent airplane noise and fuel-efficiency standards equivalent to newly manufactured subsonic aircraft.

## **Background:**

The cities of Sunnyvale and Cupertino are located in the San Francisco Bay Area (NorCal) Metroplex. Since the implementation of NextGen, our cities have experienced a problem with aircraft noise. The FAA should not compound this problem by adding supersonic aircraft to the mix while people across the country are still suffering from NextGen.

### **Recommendation 1 – No audible sonic boom at ground level**

**Under no circumstances should any characteristic of a sonic boom be audible/detectable at ground level over the U.S. for civil supersonic flights.**

This Recommendation includes:

- All test and normal operations
- All identifying characteristics of sonic booms at ground level including:
  - No audible boom
  - No measurable sonic boom overpressure
  - No rattling or other human annoyance related to a sonic boom event

Any civil supersonic flights that are not capable of meeting this recommendation under ALL conditions, must remain at a distance from U.S. land that ensures no audible/detectable sonic boom reaches any land surface in the United States. For these supersonic aircraft, the current ban on civil supersonic flights over land will remain in place.

### **Recommendation 2 – Same airplane noise standards for supersonic and subsonic aircraft**

**Within any U.S. Metroplex\*\* all supersonic aircraft must meet or exceed the same noise standards that apply to newly manufactured subsonic aircraft.**

This recommendation would include a stipulation that newly manufactured supersonic aircraft must meet all of the same airplane noise standards that are required for newly manufactured subsonic aircraft. Supersonic aircraft should not be exempted in any way from subsonic aircraft noise standards.

Any civil supersonic aircraft that are not capable of meeting this recommendation, shall not be permitted to enter any U.S. Metroplex\*\*.

### **Recommendation 3 – Most stringent sonic boom criteria should be used for rulemaking**

**For rulemaking, use the strictest criteria for defining a sonic boom.**

When considering the reintroduction of civil supersonic flights over the U.S., the strictest criteria should be used to confirm no detectable/audible sonic boom at ground level. The sonic boom criteria used may include a combination of no audible boom, no sonic boom overpressure, no rattling, nor any other human annoyance or environmental impact at ground level.

Note The current testing by NASA to identify “acceptable level of annoyance to sonic booms” is not acceptable. NextGen and the corresponding noise that has occurred for residents under the NextGen flights paths has shown that the FAA’s definition of no environmental impact is flawed, and should not be the sole criteria used when considering any rulemaking for civil supersonic over flights.

#### **Recommendation 4 – Same airplane fuel-efficiency standards for supersonic and subsonic aircraft**

**All supersonic aircraft must meet or exceed the same fuel-efficiency standards that apply to subsonic aircraft.**

The FAA clearly prioritizes safety and efficiency. Given the current carbon reduction goals, it is presumed that FAA considers “efficiency” to include airplane fuel-efficiency standards.

This recommendation would include a stipulation that newly manufactured supersonic aircraft must meet all of the same airplane fuel-efficiency standards that are required for newly manufactured subsonic aircraft. Supersonic aircraft should not be exempted in any way from subsonic aircraft fuel-efficiency standards.

Any planes that are not capable of meeting the above standard shall not be permitted to enter any U.S. Metroplex\*\*.

#### **Recommendation 5 – Ban supersonic aircraft in U.S. Metroplexes if standards not met**

**If the standards designated in Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 2 (as described above) are not met, then supersonic aircraft must be banned from flying within 70 miles of any U.S. Metroplex\*\*.**

Reference (above recommendations):

Recommendation 1 (no audible/detectable sonic boom at ground level)

Recommendation 2 (Meet all subsonic aircraft noise standards)

---

#### ***\*\*Definition of U.S. Metroplex: (for purposes of this paper)***

- All areas currently defined as U.S. Metroplexes by the FAA
  - For areas not defined by the FAA as a Metroplex, the following definition should apply:
    - Any two or more cities that share a border, each with a population density of 2,500 people/square mile or more. The controlled/restricted airspace of the metroplex shall extend at minimum 20 miles in all directions from any of the legal borders of the subject cities.
-

*During Rulemaking - Please consider the risk to reward for civil supersonic flights*

**Supersonic flights over the U.S. could impact millions of residents on the ground.**

As you know, if sonic booms are permitted over land in the United States, for a single transcontinental supersonic flight, all residents across 2900 miles of the US could experience a sonic boom from the same flight. The sonic boom travels along the flight path in what is called a “boom carpet”. This would imply that thousands, maybe even millions of U.S. residents might be impacted by a single supersonic transcontinental flight.

In the past, the FAA has favored the airline industry and airline manufacturers, with little to no consideration regarding the impact of airline noise and the health ramifications to the U.S. public & environment. This favoritism toward the airline industry at the expense of U.S. residents on the ground needs to stop. Since 1973, a ban on civil supersonic flights has existed over U.S. land to protect U.S. residents.

The current testing by NASA to identify “acceptable level of annoyance to sonic booms” is not acceptable for civil supersonic flights. FAA needs to push back on industry regarding this matter – There can be no audible sonic boom at ground level under any circumstances.

The risk to reward for supersonic flights is questionable:

The reward - If a plane carries 50 passengers, and the flight time is reduced by 1 hour, then 50 total man-hours are saved. The risk - Impact to potentially millions of U.S. residents is incalculable – With loss of sleep, impact to school age children, health ramifications, etc.

The supersonic flight ban grants FAA complete control over this rulemaking process. Please do not succumb to the pressures from the industry to circumvent strict airplane noise/fuel-efficiency standards that currently exist for subsonic flights/aircraft. Newly manufactured supersonic aircraft should meet the same strict airplane noise/fuel standards that are required for newly manufactured subsonic aircraft. No exceptions.

Sincerely,

Tony Guan

Jennifer Tasseff

And members of the Sunnyvale /Cupertino Airplane Noise group  
(Over 400 members strong)



# ***AIRPLANE NOISE GROUPS SUNNYVALE / CUPERTINO***



Also submitted via <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=FAA-2019-0451-0001>

August 27, 2019

Docket Operations, M-30  
U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)  
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE (Room W12-140)  
West Building Ground Floor  
Washington, DC 20590-0001

**Re: Sunnyvale/Cupertino Airplane Noise Group comments on *Special Flight Authorizations for Supersonic Aircraft*, Docket: FAA-2019-0451**

Dear DOT Representative:

The Sunnyvale / Cupertino Airplane Noise Group appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) on their Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) on *Special Flight Authorizations for Supersonic Aircraft*.

The following document pertains to civil supersonic flights and aircraft.

Members of the Sunnyvale /Cupertino Airplane Noise Group have prepared a list of 5 recommendations (listed below) regarding civil supersonic aircraft reintroduction into the United States. We believe these recommendations will support new technological advances, without compromising U.S. residents on the ground. Since 1973, a ban on civil supersonic flights has existed over U.S. land. This was done to protect U.S. residents. A high hurdle should be met in order to remove this supersonic flight ban, and these new supersonic aircraft should meet stringent airplane noise and fuel-efficiency standards equivalent to newly manufactured subsonic aircraft.

**Background:**

The cities of Sunnyvale and Cupertino are located in the San Francisco Bay Area (NorCal) Metroplex. Since the implementation of NextGen, our cities have experienced a problem with aircraft noise. The FAA should not compound this problem by adding supersonic aircraft to the mix while people across the country are still suffering from NextGen.

### **Recommendation 1 – No audible sonic boom at ground level**

**Under no circumstances should any characteristic of a sonic boom be audible/detectable at ground level over the U.S. for civil supersonic flights.**

This Recommendation includes:

- All test and normal operations
- All identifying characteristics of sonic booms at ground level including:
  - No audible boom
  - No measurable sonic boom overpressure
  - No rattling or other human annoyance related to a sonic boom event

Any civil supersonic flights that are not capable of meeting this recommendation under ALL conditions, must remain at a distance from U.S. land that ensures no audible/detectable sonic boom reaches any land surface in the United States. For these supersonic aircraft, the current ban on civil supersonic flights over land will remain in place.

### **Recommendation 2 – Same airplane noise standards for supersonic and subsonic aircraft**

**Within any U.S. Metroplex\*\* all supersonic aircraft must meet or exceed the same noise standards that apply to newly manufactured subsonic aircraft.**

This recommendation would include a stipulation that newly manufactured supersonic aircraft must meet all of the same airplane noise standards that are required for newly manufactured subsonic aircraft. Supersonic aircraft should not be exempted in any way from subsonic aircraft noise standards.

Any civil supersonic aircraft that are not capable of meeting this recommendation, shall not be permitted to enter any U.S. Metroplex\*\*.

### **Recommendation 3 – Most stringent sonic boom criteria should be used for rulemaking**

**For rulemaking, use the strictest criteria for defining a sonic boom.**

When considering the reintroduction of civil supersonic flights over the U.S., the strictest criteria should be used to confirm no detectable/audible sonic boom at ground level. The sonic boom criteria used may include a combination of no audible boom, no sonic boom overpressure, no rattling, nor any other human annoyance or environmental impact at ground level.

Note The current testing by NASA to identify “acceptable level of annoyance to sonic booms” is not acceptable. NextGen and the corresponding noise that has occurred for residents under the NextGen flights paths has shown that the FAA’s definition of no environmental impact is flawed, and should not be the sole criteria used when considering any rulemaking for civil supersonic over flights.

#### **Recommendation 4 – Same airplane fuel-efficiency standards for supersonic and subsonic aircraft**

**All supersonic aircraft must meet or exceed the same fuel-efficiency standards that apply to subsonic aircraft.**

The FAA clearly prioritizes safety and efficiency. Given the current carbon reduction goals, it is presumed that FAA considers “efficiency” to include airplane fuel-efficiency standards.

This recommendation would include a stipulation that newly manufactured supersonic aircraft must meet all of the same airplane fuel-efficiency standards that are required for newly manufactured subsonic aircraft. Supersonic aircraft should not be exempted in any way from subsonic aircraft fuel-efficiency standards.

Any planes that are not capable of meeting the above standard shall not be permitted to enter any U.S. Metroplex\*\*.

#### **Recommendation 5 – Ban supersonic aircraft in U.S. Metroplexes if standards not met**

**If the standards designated in Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 2 (as described above) are not met, then supersonic aircraft must be banned from flying within 70 miles of any U.S. Metroplex\*\*.**

Reference (above recommendations):

Recommendation 1 (no audible/detectable sonic boom at ground level)

Recommendation 2 (Meet all subsonic aircraft noise standards)

---

#### ***\*\*Definition of U.S. Metroplex: (for purposes of this paper)***

- All areas currently defined as U.S. Metroplexes by the FAA
  - For areas not defined by the FAA as a Metroplex, the following definition should apply:
    - Any two or more cities that share a border, each with a population density of 2,500 people/square mile or more. The controlled/restricted airspace of the metroplex shall extend at minimum 20 miles in all directions from any of the legal borders of the subject cities.
-

*During Rulemaking - Please consider the risk to reward for civil supersonic flights*

**Supersonic flights over the U.S. could impact millions of residents on the ground.**

As you know, if sonic booms are permitted over land in the United States, for a single transcontinental supersonic flight, all residents across 2900 miles of the US could experience a sonic boom from the same flight. The sonic boom travels along the flight path in what is called a “boom carpet”. This would imply that thousands, maybe even millions of U.S. residents might be impacted by a single supersonic transcontinental flight.

In the past, the FAA has favored the airline industry and airline manufacturers, with little to no consideration regarding the impact of airline noise and the health ramifications to the U.S. public & environment. This favoritism toward the airline industry at the expense of U.S. residents on the ground needs to stop. Since 1973, a ban on civil supersonic flights has existed over U.S. land to protect U.S. residents.

The current testing by NASA to identify “acceptable level of annoyance to sonic booms” is not acceptable for civil supersonic flights. FAA needs to push back on industry regarding this matter – There can be no audible sonic boom at ground level under any circumstances.

The risk to reward for supersonic flights is questionable:

The reward - If a plane carries 50 passengers, and the flight time is reduced by 1 hour, then 50 total man-hours are saved. The risk - Impact to potentially millions of U.S. residents is incalculable – With loss of sleep, impact to school age children, health ramifications, etc.

The supersonic flight ban grants FAA complete control over this rulemaking process. Please do not succumb to the pressures from the industry to circumvent strict airplane noise/fuel-efficiency standards that currently exist for subsonic flights/aircraft. Newly manufactured supersonic aircraft should meet the same strict airplane noise/fuel standards that are required for newly manufactured subsonic aircraft. No exceptions.

Sincerely,

Tony Guan

Jennifer Tasseff

And members of the Sunnyvale /Cupertino Airplane Noise group  
(Over 400 members strong)