

MEETING SUMMARY

Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 8/21/2019 4:00 p.m.

Meeting called to order by: Heidi Gantwerk

In Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>In Attendance</u>
Community Planning Groups Within the 65 dB contour		
Anthony Bernal	Downtown Community Planning Council	Yes
Melissa Hernholm-Danzo	Community Resident at Large within 65 dB CNEL	No*
Judy Holiday	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	Yes
David Swarens	Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee	Yes
Chris Cole	Uptown Planners	Yes
Anthony Ciulla	Ocean Beach Planning Board	Yes
Fred Kosmo	Peninsula Community Planning Board	Yes
Community Planning Groups Outside the 65 dB contour		
Matthew Price	La Jolla Community Planning Association	Yes
Susan Nichols	Grossmont-Mt. Helix Improvement Association	Yes
Jason Legros	Pacific Beach Planning Group	Yes
Deborah Watkins	Mission Beach Precise Planning Board	Yes
Aviation Stakeholders		
Olivier Brackett	San Diego County Airports	Yes
Wayne Reiter	City of San Diego Airports	Yes
Carl "Rick" Huenefeld	MCRD	Yes
Robert Bates	Airline Pilot (Active)	Yes
Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
Justin Cook	Acoustical Engineer	Yes
Ashley Campbell	Congress, 53rd District, for Rep. Susan Davis	No*
Joshua Coyne	San Diego City Council, District 2, for Jennifer Campbell	No
Kiera Galloway	Congress, 52nd District, for Rep. Scott Peters	Yes
Marvin Mayorga	S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1, for Sup. Greg Cox	Yes
Keith Lusk	FAA Representatives	Yes
Kallie Glover	Performance Engineer, Delta Airlines	Yes
Speakers		
Ryk Dunkelberg	Lead Consultant, Mead & Hunt	Yes
Dennis Probst	SDCRAA Vice President, Development Division	Yes
Heidi Gantwerk	Facilitator	Yes

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

Heidi Gantwerk, facilitator for the Airport Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC), opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. Introductions were made around the table. Ms. Gantwerk briefly shared the agenda.

2. Presentations

Note: A copy of the information in the presentation can be found via our website using the following link: <http://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC>

Part 150 Noise Update

Ryk Dunkelberg, Mead & Hunt, gave an update on the Part 150 study update. The original Part 150 Study was approved by the FAA in 1991. An update was completed in 2011. The Noise Exposure Maps were recertified in 2016. This Part 150 Study update is being conducted in response to ANAC recommendations that were made to the Airport Authority Board, and is based upon changes within the 65 decibel (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour.

The study addresses aircraft noise within the 65 dB CNEL. It does not address noise effects beyond the 65 dB CNEL contour. To address concerns of citizens outside the 65 dB CNEL contour, the Airport Authority conducted the Flight Procedure Study which started in March of 2018. This study examined changes in flight tracks and operational procedures that had potential effects outside the 65 dB CNEL contour. In addition, and also in response to community concerns about flight path changes and increases in any aircraft activity and operations, Airport staff initiated this Part 150 Study update sooner than was originally planned. Normally, updates are completed every five years.

Aircraft noise contours are based upon the number of aircraft operations that occur at an airport -- an operation is either a takeoff or a landing. To determine a reasonable number of operations comparing future scenarios for noise abatement and noise mitigation, activity forecasts are necessary. This Part 150 Study update will utilize the Aviation Forecasts developed by Leigh Fisher as part of the Airport Development Program. The forecasts take into account the constrained airfield, the single runway and the curfew, both limit the actual number of operations that can be accommodated.

Mr. Dunkelberg showed a graph representing three scenarios for updated activity forecast of passengers. Operational forecasts begin with passenger enplanements and deplanements. That is followed by an analysis of the enplanements, and the anticipated fleet mix and size of aircraft in future, which gives you the activity forecast. On the handout (available in the presentation linked above), the blue color shows unconstrained passenger enplanement forecast as if there were no constraints at the Airport. The brown line shows the unconstrained terminal area forecast that the FAA prepares for each airport in the United States. The green line represents the forecast for passenger levels for this airport, taking into consideration the constraints on the air field. The passenger forecast levels out at a point in time, representing about 290,000 annual operations that can be accommodated efficiently at this airport.

The next graph shows operational breakdown, showing that in 2018 there were approximately 225,000 annual operations. Projected out to the Part 150 short-term planning horizon of 2026, the forecast shows approximately 259,000 annual operations. At certain times of the day, that bumps against the constrained number of operations that the Airport can accommodate. That number will go into the noise model to generate future predicted aircraft noise levels. Also included is a breakdown of fleet mix, or types of aircraft that make up the operational forecast, which is put into the noise model to generate noise contours.

To designate noise contours, California uses the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), which represent points of equal noise energy around an airfield complex to create an annual average cumulative noise level. A CNEL noise contour represents annual aircraft operations with a penalty for every aircraft operation occurring in the evening hours. Operations between 7 and 10 p.m. result in a 5 dB addition to their actual noise levels, because aircraft noise at night is more intrusive. Between 10:00 – 7:00 a.m., a 10 dB noise penalty is added to every aircraft operation.

Practically, this model counts every nighttime operation as twice as loud as a similar operation during the day because noise during those hours is more intrusive. The 65 dB CNEL noise contour is the threshold contour for land use compatibility. A FAR Part 150 Study is a land use compatibility study, not land use impact study. The larger the noise contour, the smaller the noise definition of that contour. A 65 dB CNEL noise contour is larger than a 75 dB CNEL. The largest contour is the 65; the second largest is 70; the smallest is the 75 dB CNEL.

The contours for our baseline conditions represents actual aircraft operations and fleet mix for the year 2018. In the future, the 2026 noise contour is a larger contour, about 4-5 CNEL larger than 2018. The reason it's so much larger is because as we hit the constrained airport number, the peak hour of aircraft operations starts to smooth out. Instead of a peak hour in the morning, two or three hours will operate at maximum capacity, and at some point the airfield will operate at capacity all day, which pushes more operations into the evening hours. Even though there is a relatively small number of additional aircraft operations in the Part 150 time frame, because they're pushed into the evening hours, they are more intrusive and the model increases noise levels accordingly.

The table shows the number of people and housing units within the 65 and greater contour for 2018 and for 2026. Operational, land use, and administrative alternatives will be developed that will be modeled and compared against the future 2026 base case contour to reduce the number of people with any of the alternatives. At some point further in the study, those alternatives which do reduce it are combined into one alternative, and then generate an overall contour to see how much reduction can be gained.

Currently, the consultant team is documenting work done to date, and will produce working paper chapters. In November, they will also be holding another set of Technical and Citizen Advisory Committee meetings and a public workshop to review: alternatives that the committees have brought forward, the ANAC recommendations that affect the area within the 65 dB contour, alternatives required by regulation, and other alternatives that the FAA may suggest to reduce noise. All information to date will be presented at the public open house, and get input from the public.

Ms. Gantwerk noted that this presentation and others are online SanNoiseStudy.com, with a bit more detail.

Questions from ANAC:

Chris Cole asked what causes the decrease in general operations between 2018 and 2026? He said the contours cover a larger area in 2026, but don't address South Mission, La Jolla, and a lot of areas. Does that mean those won't be considered in upcoming meetings?

Mr. Dunkelberg said the Part 150 only addresses the 65 dB CNEL contour and greater. Areas outside the 65 are not addressed.

Ms. Knack pointed out that they are addressing the nighttime noise heading. That was part of the ANAC recommendations and will be covered in the Part 150 update.

Mr. Dunkelberg said regarding the decrease in general operations, as an airport reaches its "capacity," it becomes congested and a lot of general aviation activity goes to other, more convenient, airports.

Matthew Price asked if the modeling for the 65 dB CNEL contours includes the nighttime noise abatement agreement flights as they currently stand, or is it based on only day traffic through 10 p.m.?

Mr. Dunkelberg said the 2018 contour is based on last year's actual aircraft operation flight tracks based on radar information. The future contour assumes the only change being the number of operations in the fleet mix. Any changes to the model that would affect inside the 65 dB contour or greater will be evaluated as a viable alternative, and those alternatives are just beginning to be studied, with all current recommendations taken into account, and any other reasonable alternatives brought up in the public forum will be looked at as well.

Mr. Price asked what procedural changes beyond land use changes might be suggested or studied?

Mr. Dunkelberg said there are not many, and may be some he doesn't know yet that the public could bring forward. What they like to get from the public is the definition of a problem they'd like to address. The public will have access to comment on the sannoisestudy.com website, which is specifically dedicated to the Part 150. The consultant team will consider every comment from the public, although they will not be able to respond to them each individually.

Robert Bates asked how the 2026 contour model is forecast based on the transition from older to newer aircraft?

Mr. Dunkelberg said they look at long-term trends in aircraft manufacturing and airline options to purchase.

Carl Huenefeld said that the MCRD barracks area, which consistently includes 3,000 recruits will be greatly affected due to the way the barracks are constructed, and that needs to be incorporated into the map.

Deborah Watkins asked for confirmation that the evening penalties and nighttime penalties have been calculated in the 2026 expansion.

Mr. Dunkelberg confirmed they have.

Chris Cole expressed confusion that in the past it was said there would not be an increase in operations because of the limiting factor of the single runway, yet now the forecast shows an increase in operations.

Dennis Probst explained that the issue with regard to operations is not driven by terminal improvements. Terminal improvements are driven by a customer service/customer experience standpoint. Growth will come regardless of whether Terminal 1 is modified or not, as demand grows. When Terminal 1 was built as the new terminal, there were about 2.5 million people going through the building. In 2018, 12 million people went through that building. Carriers are coming because people want to come to San Diego, and it's their decisions about flight and service to the community that is driving the growth in operations, and ultimately the growth in passengers. Capacity is not yet maxed out, is thought to be around 290,000 operations.

Matthew Price asked in the end, beyond just mapping out changes, are there triggers or limitations of the expansion because of the expansion of the CNEL?

Mr. Dunkelberg said there are no limits on aircraft operation increases other than the capacity of the airfield. The major constraints to the number of annual operations are the single runway and curfew limitations. At some point in the future, as aircraft become quieter, the average cumulative noise contour will be reduced. In the meantime, there must be remedial efforts on the land use side, that can decrease impacts for the people living within the 65 dB CNEL contour, or possibly in the future, expand the limits of that program in some way.

Noise Statistics Update

Sjohnna Knack gave some brief updates on various items.

- Two procedures resulting from the Flight Procedure Study, presented at the last meeting, have been submitted to the FAA. An amendment to the existing ZZ000 TWO departure, requesting to move JETTI Waypoint two miles out further before turning. That amendment has been placed into the FAA's IFP Gateway. Ms. Knack couldn't say that this was on the top of their (FAA) list, but the request has been reviewed. The second request to move FAA noise dots 4 and 5 further down to the end of the peninsula was also addressed through a letter to the FAA requesting that they consider that action.
- The FAA has indicated verbally that the Quieter Home Program will receive at least \$9.2 million, as opposed to \$4 million. ***Note: Since this ANAC meeting, the FAA has increased this amount to \$14.9 million.***
- Variance No. 12 was submitted in 2015, and in early August, it was granted, and becomes effective on September 2. The new Variance is good for three years. That information is also on the Airport's website.

Online Noise Statistics: Ms. Knack explained that the Noise Team's goal is to use statistics to find trends, so that they can work with the FAA, and the airlines, to improve the overall noise impacts. The Team has been working hard on a program to make the statistics more interactive, and put them on the web, so that people can access it easily. She introduced this new analytical tool, currently in rough form, called Tableau. All statistics currently presented will be carried forward; none will be removed. She requested feedback from committee members. The Team is hopeful that by October, instead of mailing a link to a PDF, there will be a link on the Airport's website to a Tableau website with a series of dashboards where all the various statistics can be clearly seen, and trends observed. One of the things being developed is a better mapping feature, by zip code. It's an interactive map where a user can zoom in on a specific community and see the quantity of noise complaints and where they're located.

Ms. Knack showed an example of where they hope to end up, with respect to the final Tableau Dashboards. These Dashboards will have different tabs that would be labeled missed approaches, early turns, and noise complaints. They'll all be interactive with access to detailed specific information. The goal is to update statistics on a monthly basis.

Questions from ANAC:

David Swarens suggested to add the option to sort by location.

Ms. Knack said this type of visual data will be incredibly helpful when they go to meet with the FAA and the airlines. Also, instead of having to send the information to them, they will be able to pull it up themselves.

3. Approval of Minutes

Wayne Reiter moved to approve the minutes. Chris Cole seconded, and motion passed.

4. Public Comment

Cathy Ives, South Mission Beach expressed concerns about noise at her home from morning until late at night. She is concerned about the higher frequency of aircraft and the health impacts. She wants her home to be part of the Quieter Home Program.

Craig Miller, La Jolla talked about the negative impacts he has experienced after NextGen. He can no longer enjoy the quiet at his home. When he moved to La Jolla he didn't hear planes, but now he does. He is upset about what he heard at the meeting because things are going to get worse. He asked that if anything can be done to make it better, we should do it.

Carol Knott, South Mission Beach said she can't go to bed before 11:30 p.m. and is embarrassed to have people come to her home because it is so loud. She feels like Mission Beach is being ignored. Her quality of life has been impacted, she feels tense, depressed, frustrated, anxious, and tired. She wishes things could change. She wants things to be like they used to be and she would love for the airplanes to fly over the jetty.

Gary Wonacott, Mission Beach, has been a resident of South Mission Beach since 1974. He discussed that since implementation of NextGen the number of complaints in South Mission has increased significantly. There is a major concern about the potential elimination of the nighttime noise abatement agreement, the Mission Beach Council sent a letter was sent to Congressman Scott Peters, and his response came back on August 7. Mr. Wonacott feels that there are benefits of phasing out stage three aircraft. The Airport Authority waves landing fees for international flights to encourage them to come here. He doesn't know why landing fees could not be used to encourage stage four and stage five aircraft. He also feels the CNEL metric should be reviewed.

Tim Sanfelice, Mission Beach hasn't lived in South Mission Beach for more than a few years. It has changed since they moved in and now the flights are more frequent. He is concerned about the environmental impacts of the aircraft and wants to know what alternatives can be done to reduce the impacts.

Ms. Gantwerk said the Noise Office will sit down and talk with anyone and answer questions.

Kathy Austin, Mission Beach asked if the aircraft noise has gotten worse and is there anything she can do about it? She sincerely thanked the Airport Noise Office. They do what they say. They answered her questions, showed her diagrams and maps. She expressed that currently she is selling her home after remodeling and she is heartbroken. She just can't handle the noise anymore.

5. Next Meeting/Adjourn

Next meeting is October 16, 2019.

Meeting was adjourned.