

MEETING SUMMARY

Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 09/20/2023 4:00 p.m.

In Attendance

Meeting called to order by: Joan Isaacson

Name	Affiliation	In Attendance
Community Planning Groups Within the 65 dB contour		
Paul Webb	Peninsula Community Planning Board	No
Anthony Ciulla	Ocean Beach Planning Board	No*
	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	N/A
Tania Fragomeno	Downtown Community Planning Council	Yes
Celestin Fausino	Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee	No
Chris Cole	Uptown Planners	No*
Peter Shearer	Community Resident at Large within 65 dB CNEL - East	Yes
Community Planning Groups Outside the 65 dB contour		
Gloria Henson	Mission Beach Precise Planning Board	Yes
Iain Richardson	Pacific Beach Planning Group	No*
Matthew Price	La Jolla Community Planning Association	Yes
Sean Connacher	East County (La Mesa)	Yes
Aviation Stakeholders		
John Otto	San Diego County Airports	No
Jorge Rubio	City of San Diego Airports	Yes
Jim Gruny	MCRD	Yes
Robert Bates	Airline Pilot (Active)	Yes
Carl Stallone	Airline Flight Operations	Yes
Phil Derner	NBAA	No
Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
Tim Middleton	Acoustical Engineer	Yes
Cesar Solis for (Jason Bercovitch)	Congress, 50th District for Rep. Scott Peters	No
Paola Guzman	Congress, 51st District, for Rep. Sara Jacobs	No*
Randy Reyes	San Diego City Council, District 2, for Jennifer Campbell	Yes
Margaret Doyle	Assembly Member, District 77, for Tasha Horvath	No
Larri Frelow, Carlette Young	FAA Representatives	Yes - remote
David Flores	S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1	No
SDCRAA Staff		
Joan Isaacson	Facilitator	Yes
Angela-Shafer Payne	V.P. & Chief Development Officer	Yes
Sjohnna Knack	Director, Planning & Environmental Affairs	Yes
William "Billy" Hobson	Interim-Senior Aircraft Noise Specialist	Yes
Tyler Reince	Aircraft Noise Specialist	Yes

*Members contacted staff ahead of time and are considered excused.

Note: Names of airport authority staff, presenters, and consultants, are in bold, ANAC members are underlined, and public commenters are italicized.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Joan Isaacson, facilitator for the Airport Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC), opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. with introductions.

2. Roll Call

Joan Isaacson called a committee member roll call for attendance. Attendance is reflected on page 1. There were not enough voting members in attendance to constitute a quorum.

3. Action Item: Approval of meeting previous meeting summaries

February 15 and May 17, 2023 Meeting Summaries

Due to lack of a quorum, a vote could not be held to approve the previous meeting summaries from the February 15 and May 17, 2023, ANAC meetings.

3. Presentations:

Note: The information in the presentations is posted on our website and can be accessed with the following link:

<https://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC?EntryId=16083>

1. FAA Presentation on PADRZ Nighttime Procedure

Joseph Bert (FAA Manager for the Environmental Community Engagement National Airspace System Analytics and Correspondence Team - remote) started the meeting by giving a presentation on the proposed PADRZ Nighttime Procedure offering an explanation as to why the proposal from 2021 was rejected. A Performance Based Navigation (PBN) Full Work Group (FWG) convened on October 26, 2022, to collaboratively review the proposed amendment to the nighttime SID, which was the PADRZ SID. The proposed procedure was found to provide no operational benefit, little noise benefit, and would increase complexity and workload for the air traffic controllers (ATC) and pilots.

If clearance to an aircraft needed to change, ATC would have to go into the computer system, amend the clearance, coordinate with the Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) (controlling facility after Lindbergh Tower), and monitor the change for conformance. Additionally, the proposed nighttime procedure would be unable to use the Controller Pilot Data Link Communications (CPDLC), which allows for quicker, non-verbal, communications between aircraft and ATC for issuing and amending clearances.

Dr. Matthew Price mentioned that the proposed procedure was a nighttime only procedure, currently there is a change in procedure after 10:00 p.m., the concept of planes flying different after a specific time would not be new. He asked why the proposed PADRZ procedure couldn't be utilized all day long? He also asked about the process for constructing noise models and the future availability of the noise models to the public.

Joseph Bert said if an aircraft was supposed to depart at 9:30 p.m., and is delayed until 10:15 p.m., the aircraft will no longer have the correct clearance and will have to be reissued a new clearance. Regarding ZZOOO, they may have already considered that the modified nighttime ZZOOO procedure would be approved and the additional PADRZ procedure would put the workload further over the top. Lastly, for implementing the nighttime PADRZ procedure for the whole day, Joseph did not have an immediate answer. He speculated that the reason is probably a procedure issue or a conflict with other departures.

Dr. Matthew Price clarified that his last question was how the noise modeling defined the waypoints since they were vaguely put in the ANAC Subcommittee proposal and whether the noise modeling would be made public? A response at a later date would be fine.

Joseph Bert stated that on the FAA side, there was no noise modeling, it was just mentioned during the full work group that they did not see a big change or shift in noise. The FAA does not conduct modeling until a final procedure is sent to the FAA for environmental review.

Robert Bates stated that in the past, aircraft departing after 10:00 p.m. were issued an amendment to the ZZOOO SID and given a 290 heading to fly. He asked if this was still the case, or are they issued PADRZ for all departures scheduled after 10:00 p.m.?

Joseph Bert stated that he believed this to still be the case. There may be work in the future that will formalize that, but for now, it hasn't changed.

Stephen Smith clarified that ATC amends the clearance to the aircraft with the 290 heading if on the ZZOOO departure / headed eastbound. Aircraft traveling to the west or northwest are still issued the PADRZ and are not issued the 290 heading.

Joseph Bert further clarified that the amendment to the 290 heading is not a reissue of an entire departure clearance. He then reviewed the potential increased workload on the pilot's end with the proposed procedure. If an aircraft is delayed and a new clearance must be issued, a pilot would have to receive the clearance, review and accept it, reprogram the on-board flight management system, and brief the new procedure. The aircraft would have to be stopped on the taxiway and run the new performance numbers for the procedure. Airborne and ground delays are kept, but air traffic does not track specific departure times for specific aircraft vs. their actual departure time.

Public Comment:

Gary Wonacott, resident of Mission Beach, said during the Part 150 Study there was a plethora of alternatives reviewed. Gary suggested an alternative to move the PADRZ SID south during nighttime and integrate the 290 with that. He also suggested people in Mission beach would submit a letter to the FAA on the nighttime departure procedures.

Questions from ANAC:

Gloria Henson, representing the Mission Beach area, stated that Mission Beach is not within the 65 dB area, but is close and receives a lot of noise. The SID direction now hits south Mission Beach and has been increasing, as reflected from comments and observations of residents of Mission Beach. Aircraft accelerate and it causes excess noise during the night. Regarding ZZ000 Three, when was the heading changed to 290? If an aircraft was not on the nighttime procedure for ZZ000, what was the prior heading, 275?

Joseph Bert stated that he did not immediately have that answer but assumed it would be something similar to current procedures for 290.

Gloria Henson responded that there was a big difference for south Mission Beach for the 275 versus the 290. Having aircraft come over the tip of Mission Beach is raising late-night and very early morning noise levels over that area.

Steven Smith affirmed this statement by Joseph, eastbound departures go on a 275-heading over the ocean to JETTI waypoint, then turn left and come back around. For Mission Beach, PADRZ would be more of a concern.

Gloria Henson went on to say that is what people may be realizing this noise as more late night and early morning departures happen. More aircraft hit the 290 versus the original 275 heading, which can be a problem for houses on that end and the community.

Dr. Matthew Price echoed Gloria Henson in that communities north of the airport are suffering from noise, particularly in the evening and nighttime hours. The *La Jolla Community Planning Association* and *Quiet Skies San Diego* support the effort by the southern communities for noise abatement, and communities to the north would like equitable representation and distribution of nighttime noise relief. It appears that any change in the nighttime procedure will be rejected due to increased complexity due to clearances needing to be changed. It would be helpful if the FAA could continue with this committee and look at changes within the departure SIDs that go north of PADRZ for the entire day.

Sjohnna Knack mentioned that the FAA has been working on developing a SID at night for the ZZ000. Sjohnna felt this would result in a partial relief and reduce nighttime vectoring.

Stephen Smith stated the [Flight Procedure Study](#) shows all the different procedures and designs that were looked at. Regarding the PADRZ, there was one that was looked at for the full day that involved trying to get the aircraft to go west as soon as possible away from the southern shore aspect of La Jolla. The working group decided to stick with the 1.5 miles from the shoreline first. This design was determined to not meet the required separation standards.

2a. Curfew History and Update

Tyler Reince gave a history of the curfew at San Diego International Airport (SAN), leading up to the current curfew structure that SAN has today. Some of these changes through the years included expanding curfew times, adding language limiting decibel levels of aircraft, as well as establishing and updating monetary penalties. Tyler briefly reviewed the *Airport Noise & Capacity Act (ANCA)*, an act passed by Congress in 1990, that restricted airports from

implementing restrictions on aircraft operations based on noise. Lastly, the other five airports in the nation that have a curfew program were reviewed and summarized.

Sean Connacher was curious what are the factors that drive up the high numbers (of noise curfew violations) at SAN, compared to the other airports?

Tyler Reince said that the three airports who had zero curfew violations in 2022 went off decibel readings from their noise monitors. The rules at these airports were set up and based upon when older, louder (Stage 1 and 2) aircraft were in operation. Since January 1, 2000, many of these older aircraft are no longer in service.

Billy Hobson further mentioned that SAN was more comparable to John Wayne (SNA) and San Jose (SJC) when it came to curfew programs because they have hard curfew times for aircraft as opposed to decibel exceedance levels. Out of the three, SAN was on the lowest end of violations but on the highest end of fines, due to the curfew structure here at SAN. The multiplier has a big effect on the amount of fines.

Sean Connacher asked how many of the 89 violations were non-penalized?

Billy Hobson stated that last year, 48 violations were penalized with a fine and 41 violations were not fined. Each year can vary, but fines are generally excused for local weather, mechanical, and (sometimes) minor operational issues impacting all operators.

Billy Hobson introduced three of the ideas the SAN Noise Office was considering to increase the curfew fine structure. 93% of violations occur by operators who have had four or more violations, which should be kept in mind when looking at changes to curfew fines. The first proposal would be to double the current fines but keep everything else the same. The second proposal would involve adding a fourth and five base-line penalty to the structure (as opposed to capping off at three). The final proposal would increase the first fine to \$6,000, the second to \$10,000, and any subsequent fine would increase by \$10,000. These numbers for proposal #3 were used as samples. Any change to the curfew fine structure will need formal FAA approval, and this would be a multi-month process.

Public Comment:

Aldo Monges, a resident of Pacific Beach, commented that on the airport website, noise levels were listed in dB [decibel levels]. At the end of the day, what residents care about is a good night's sleep. How was it determined that 65 [dB] was a good number to stop at?

Questions from ANAC:

Jorge Rubio wanted to know about kind and length of the approval process for the multiplier, since this will fall under ANCA? Secondly, if any operator is not paying their fines, then what is the next step?

Billy Hobson stated that all curfew operators pay their fines. With regards to making the change, this is a process that will require FAA approval. This will take some time to get through though.

Peter Shearer asked if the fines being paid now were the same dollar amount that were being paid in 2006? Secondly, what was the logic of hitting repeat offenders, why focus on a multiplier?

Billy Hobson answered that the current fine amount has been the same since 2006. In regard to focusing on the multiplier, the airport wants to penalize the repeat offenders, since they make up the majority of our fines.

Peter Shearer felt that this structure comes across as initial fines being forgivable or less offensive, and asked why a first violation is more “excusable” in some way?

Tyler Reince stated that a fine is still issued to first-time offenders (assuming not local weather or maintenance-related). The goal was to hit repeat offenders harder.

Peter Shearer mentioned that 93% of repeat offenders are offenders. He ultimately felt with the current system, the cost (penalty) was simply too low for the first couple of offenses.

Sjohnna Knack gave the perspective that the airport wanted to ensure they were pursuing a resolution that could be successful with the FAA. The airport must prove to the FAA that they will not be interfering with interstate commerce.

Peter Shearer added to Sjohnna’s statement by saying it would be nice to find that number, the highest penalty amount the airport could apply and receive FAA approval, to de-incentivize bad behavior.

Angela-Shafer Payne relayed that the airport has formally mentioned to the FAA that they would be putting in some proposals. The concept of raising curfew fines is uncharted territory, there isn’t another airport they could look at for guidance on their decision making. For this reason, she believed the FAA would tread lightly on any proposals.

Peter Shearer said his final point was that no ANAC members see the money from the violations, and it wasn’t about raising revenue.

Sjohnna Knack clarified that all money from the curfew violations goes towards the Quieter Home Program (QHP).

Peter Shearer concluded by mentioning that you would see a change in demand to depart during curfew at a certain price point, this data would be interesting to show the FAA.

Tim Middleton said that ANCA must also be considered, ANCA established Part 161, “Airport Access and Use Restriction.” The logic of increasing the structure to multiple violations would most likely not be seen as a use restriction as opposed to increasing the first time an air carrier violates. Adding a fifth time shows that an air carrier had already violated four times through the pre-ANCA process. Changing the fines could have the potential to be seen as an increase in the use restrictions, the FAA has historically ruled against those use restrictions because of Part 161.

Tania Fragomeno asked if the six-months was a rolling six months, and when do the airlines have their multipliers reset to zero? For proposal #2, would the multiplier start at the sixth violation? Lastly, since SAN had more violations this year than 2022, but monetary fines were

higher in 2022, was that an indication that there were more first-time offenders this year / had the multiplier not taken effect yet?

Billy Hobson said it wasn't. It's two compliance periods, January through June, then July through December, the fines reset every six months. The multiplier goes back to the previous six months, you'd have to have six months of no violations to reset to a zero multiplier. He noted that the multiplier would stay in effect. For proposal #2, the airport is merely adding a fourth and fifth level, as well as higher fines with the multiplier taken into effect.

Tania Fragomeno also inquired since SAN had more violations this year than 2022, but monetary fines were higher in 2022, was that an indication that there were more first-time offenders this year / had the multiplier not taken effect yet?

Billy Hobson answered that there were still 15 violations that had yet to be reviewed this year, it was anticipated the total amount of collected fines would rise after review. Additionally, SAN had a lot of bad weather in May and June, leading to more local weather-related violations. As local weather events are generally not fined.

Tania Fragomeno concluded with consideration of the same carriers being repeat offenders year to year.

Billy Hobson stated that it was primarily the previous commitment made by ANAC regarding the total number of penalized violations.

Sjohnna Knack said that sometimes SAN will see the same airlines carry-over as repeat offenders. This last year, SAN did see a new operator that hadn't violated, so it can be a mix of who the repeat offenders are each year.

Billy Hobson reiterated that the multiplier structure would not change under proposal #2. If an airline violated seven times in the previous compliance period, their fines would be multiplied by seven in the next compliance period.

Dr. Matthew Price spoke in favor of the multiplier method of proposal #2. 93% of the violations are due to multiple ones. Increasing the first fee isn't necessarily going to help. As the fee stands, most people are behaving, and a few are not.

Sean Connacher was curious how 2023 numbers looked when compared to the other five airports that were compared for 2022 earlier?

Tyler Reince responded that 2023 numbers were currently not available. However, a follow-up after the meeting could be sent this the numbers for the year so far.

Sean Connacher stated he knew community interest was involved, but also to think about it from an air service standpoint as well. If 93% of curfew violators are repeat offenders, did the airport know how many air service members that was, a third, 20%, etc.?

Billy Hobson stated that an estimate would be about six airlines.

Sjohnna Knack said most years were probably three to five. She further mentioned that providing a hard number for a dollar amount towards curfew violations would be difficult to pin-point precisely. Total number of airlines at SAN was around 20 operators.

Sean Connacher concluded by mentioning that pricing hadn't change since 2006, SAN was 17 years into the current pricing model, and seven years since last discussing. Was SAN going far enough with the curfew restructure, is the five-pricing tier the right amount?

Sjohnna Knack replied that for many years SAN did not have many violations, so there wasn't a need to increase / change the curfew fine structure. SAN was going to change the curfew years ago, but the airlines mentioned they wanted to be given a chance to fix it, they did for some time. In late 2005, violations started coming up again.

Peter Shearer mentioned that if a graduated approach would be decided on, it's important to think about where that number starts. As time goes on, prices from 17 years ago become cheaper and should be considered when determining a new curfew structure.

3. Airport Authority Updates

Sjohnna Knack began by mentioning that new Terminal 1 Mitigation Measures are on track to be completed, ANAC can expect a full update on these mitigation measures in 2024. The state of California is still reviewing our Variance, which was submitted last year. The Airport is required to submit a Variance update every three years. While the State of California is reviewing the Variance, the Airport is operating under the existing variance.

A Noise Policy Letter was submitted by the Airport to the FAA, each ANAC member received a copy, no feedback for corrections were submitted beforehand.

The next ANAC meeting will be held at the Airport's new admin building in November, located on McCain Rd.

Public Comment:

There were no Public Comments.

2b. Fly Quiet Program Update

Billy Hobson provided a review and update on the Fly Quiet Program. Currently, SAN looks at three criteria when assessing Fly Quiet Program scores: fleet quality, noise exceedances, and curfew compliance. A fourth element using the quietest aircraft during the most noise sensitive hours (10:00 p.m. – 6:59 a.m.) was looked at, based upon the request from our previous ANAC meeting.

The fourth criterion would be a 10-point scale, bringing the total Fly Quiet score to 40 points. Operators who did not utilize any Stage 5 aircraft (currently the quietest aircraft available) during the listed hours would receive zero points. Airlines who do not operate any aircraft during this time, as well as operators who only operate Stage 5 aircraft during the listed hours, would receive the full 10 points.

Dr. Matthew Price inquired, what percentage of aircraft during the proposed hours were currently less than Stage 5?

Tyler Reince mentioned that since Stage 5 aircraft were the newest aircraft, a predominate number of operating aircraft were still non-Stage 5 aircraft.

Public Comment:

Gary Wonacott Made a public comment on large aircraft flying over mission beach are loud regardless of stage.

Questions from ANAC:

Gloria Henson asked, based upon Gary Wonacott’s comment, are the Stage 5 measurements based upon a fully loaded Stage 5?

Billy Hobson answered that the measurements for stage of aircraft from the FAA are based upon three different criteria: approach, sideline, and departure end (noise). They also consider the number of engines on the aircraft and number of people; these factors are then added up and produce a value. He also added that for noise exceedance levels, the airport looks at real-time noise events, not the FAA Part 36 certification levels.

Tim Middleton chimed in that the certification models aren’t based off maximum gross takeoff weight of the aircraft. It’s more of the most common operating condition of the aircraft, Part 36 can be used for reference. It is the same criteria they have used to certify aircraft for decades. In the Part 36 standards, there is the EPNdB number for arrivals, departures, and the sideline noise; three different parameters go into the Part 36 certification.

Dr. Matthew Price resonated that it didn’t matter if an aircraft was Stage 1 or Stage 5 as it flies over your head, in terms of human impact of the sound.

Tim Middleton provided perspective that the time parameter should be considered. Two separate aircraft may be Stage 4, but the idea is to get the aircraft operator to fly the Stage 4 aircraft during the evening.

4. Public Comment (non-agenda items)

Joan Isaacson offered an opportunity for non-agenda public comment items.

Aldo Monges had public comment on the Fly Quiet program and said quieter aircraft get more leeway to fly during quiet hours. He also asked about a program to study the health effects of noise.

Gary Wonacott had public comment on missed approaches and how he thinks increased flap settings will lead to less missed approaches. He also mentioned his thoughts on the FAA policy on noise impact.

Next Meeting / Adjourn

Billy Hobson reminded ANAC that a quorum was not met for this meeting, only a draft Summary could be published for now.

The meeting was adjourned.

Billy Hobson 11/16/23