

SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY

AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ANAC)

MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, August 19, 2020, 4:00 p.m.

Electronically Via YouTube Livestream

<https://youtu.be/OyRv39XEzGs>

This meeting of the Airport Noise Advisory Committee will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of California Executive Order N-29-20 which suspends certain requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act. During the current State of Emergency and in the interest of public health, all Committee members will be participating in the meeting electronically. In accordance with the Executive Order, there will be no members of the public in attendance at the Committee Meeting. We are providing alternatives to in-person attendance for viewing and participating in the meeting.

Comments on Non-Agenda Items

Public comments on non-agenda items must be submitted to the Authority Clerk at clerk@san.org, no later than 4:00 p.m. the day prior to the posted meeting in order to be eligible to be read into the record. The Authority Clerk will read the first 30 comments received by 4:00 p.m. the day prior to the meeting into the record; each of these comments will be read for up to three minutes or for the time determined by the Facilitator. The maximum number of comments to be read into the record on a single issue will be 16. All other comments submitted, including those received after 4:00 p.m. the day prior and before 8:00 a.m. the day of the meeting, will be provided to the Committee and submitted into the written record for the meeting.

Comments on Agenda Items

Public comment on agenda items may be submitted to the Authority clerk at clerk@san.org. Comments received no later than 8:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting will be distributed to the Committee and included in the record.

Live Comments on Agenda and Non-Agenda Items

If you'd like to speak to the Committee live during the meeting, please follow these steps to request to speak:

- **Step 1:** Fill out the online [Request to Speak Form](#) to speak during the meeting via Zoom. The form must be submitted by 4:00 p.m. the day before the meeting.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY

- **Step 2:** Watch the meeting via the YouTube link <https://youtu.be/OyRv39XEzGs> and call into the number listed below followed by the Meeting ID. There is no participation code, just press #.
Dial +1 669-900-9128
Meeting ID: 815 1567 2981

NOTE: There is a delay between the Zoom meeting and the YouTube livestream. **You must mute the YouTube livestream** before speaking.

- **Step 3:** The Facilitator will request public comment during each Item. Once the Facilitator has announced the public comment period for the item on which you would like to speak, please do the following.

USING A REGULAR PHONE:

- You must mute the YouTube livestream before speaking.
- Facilitator will notify you when it is your turn to provide public comment (you will be identified by the phone number you provided in the Request to Speak Form.
- You will have three minutes to provide public comment, an audible ding will be made to identify when you have 30 seconds left.
- Once your public comment has ended, you will be muted. You may hang up and return to YouTube livestream.

How to Watch the Meeting

You may view the meeting online at the following link:

<https://youtu.be/OyRv39XEzGs>

REQUESTS FOR ACCESSIBILITY MODIFICATIONS OR ACCOMMODATIONS

As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), requests for agenda information to be made available in alternative formats, and any requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for alternatives to observing meetings and offering public comment as noted above, may be made by contacting the Authority Clerk at (619) 400-2550 or clerk@san.org. The Authority is committed to resolving accessibility requests swiftly in order to maximize accessibility.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY

AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ANAC)

MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, August 19, 2020, 4:00 p.m.

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Roll Call
3. Presentations
 - a. Part 150 Update
 - b. Status of ANAC Recommendations
 - c. Airport Authority Updates
4. Action Items
 - a. Approval of February 19, 2020 – Meeting Summary
 - b. Approval of June 17, 2020 – Meeting Summary
 - c. Discussion and Possible Direction to Staff
Regarding the General Community Member Within
65 dB Contour
5. Public Comment
6. Next Meeting: October 21, 2020
7. Adjourn

Please note: Noise Statistics are now
found on the Airport's Website at:
www.san.org/Airport-Noise

SAN NOISE STUDY ANAC MEETING

AUG.19.2020



SAN DIEGO
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Agenda

- Purpose of Study
- What we have accomplished to date
- Where we are in Study process
- Next Steps
- Questions/Comments

SAN NOISE STUDY



Purpose of Study

- Original Part 150 Study by Port of San Diego was accepted by FAA in 1991
- An update to the FAR Part 150 Study was completed in 2011
- The Noise Exposure Maps (NEMs) were recertified in November 2016
- This Part 150 Study is in response to the 2017 ANAC recommendations which may change the 65 CNEL

SAN NOISE STUDY



Purpose of Study (CONTINUED)

- The Part 150 Study addresses aircraft noise issues within the 65 CNEL noise contour only
- To address concerns from residents outside the 65 CNEL contour, the Airport Authority conducted the Flight Procedures Study, completed in 2019
- To address community concerns about flight path changes and increases in airport operations, impacting the 65 CNEL, staff initiated the Part 150 Update in 2018



To Date

- Discussed Purpose of the Part 150 Study (Oct 2018)
- Discussed Forecasts of Aviation Activity (May 2019)
- Generated Existing and Future Base Case noise contours (Aug 2019)
- Presented Existing and Future Base Case land use, population and housing units within 65 CNEL (Nov 2019)
- Identified preliminary reasonable alternatives for evaluation (Nov 2019) *Held a Public Workshop*
- Presented Draft Operational Alternatives to the TAC/CAC (May 2020)

SAN NOISE STUDY



Categories of Alternatives

- **Operational Alternatives—Federal Control**
 - Operational changes: flight track, climb profiles
 - Noise restrictions/Curfew
- **Land Use Alternatives—Local and State Control**
 - Preventative: Land Use Restrictions
 - Remedial: Sound Attenuation (Quieter Home Program)
- **Administrative Alternatives—Airport Proprietor**
 - Noise Monitoring/Flight Track Monitoring
 - Fly Quiet Program
 - Part 150 Updates



ANAC and TAC/CAC Alternatives

Lead
Flunt

Recommendation Number	Summary of Recommendation to Review	Alternative in Part 150 Study
10	Conduct portable noise monitoring	Will be included in Land Use and Administrative Alternatives Meeting
11	Review feasibility and benefits of additional noise barriers at the airport to reduce aircraft noise impacts in the surrounding communities	Facilitated discussion in meeting today to identify potential locations
14	<p>Revise PADRZ procedure to reduce noise in La Jolla, Mission Beach and Pacific Beach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed nighttime procedure designs to move traffic further south is on hold, pending ANAC 17 Potential concept procedure design to move traffic further south (all day), pending analysis of 10-degree divergent heading 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 1A Departures over Mission Bay Channel with Dispersion (ANAC 14 and 17) Alternative 1B Departures over Mission Bay Channel with Concentration (ANAC 14 and 17) Alternative 1C Departures over Mission Bay Channel with Fly-over Waypoint (ANAC 14 and 17) Alternative 2A Equivalent Lateral Spacing Operations (ELSO) for Departures with Dispersion (ANAC 14 and Other) Alternative 2B Equivalent Lateral Spacing Operations (ELSO) for Departures with Concentration (ANAC 14 and Other)
15	<p>Revise the ZZ000 procedure to reduce noise in Point Loma and Ocean Beach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move the JETTI waypoint out two miles. Proposed revised design submitted to FAA on 8/19/19 No recommendations to change initial departure heading on ZZ000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included in Flight Procedure Analysis, submitted to FAA in 2019



ANAC and TAC/CAC Alternatives

Recommendation Number	Summary of Recommendation to Review	Alternative in Part 150 Study
17	<p>Review the Nighttime Noise Abatement Procedure to improve the noise impacts for affected communities. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure ATC is turning aircraft off this procedure only for safety reasons ▪ Ensure that the procedure is monitored for adherence ▪ Determine if the current nighttime procedures still are appropriate and if different procedures would reduce impacts on residential communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternative 1A Departures over Mission Bay Channel with Dispersion (ANAC 14 and 17) ▪ Alternative 1B Departures over Mission Bay Channel with Concentration (ANAC 14 and 17) ▪ Alternative 1C Departures over Mission Bay Channel with Fly-over Waypoint (ANAC 14 and 17) ▪ Alternative 4 Nighttime (10:00 pm to 6:30 am) Eastbound Departures on ZZOOO RNAV SID (ANAC 17)
21	<p>Conduct analysis on a modified Noise Abatement Departure Procedure {Profile} (NADP) to determine if there are potential improvements that could reduce the noise impacted area surrounding the airport</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternative 6 Modified Noise Abatement Departure Procedure (NADP) (ANAC 21)
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review feasibility of 10-degree divergent heading to the right at SAN (ELSO) ▪ Limit <u>all</u> aircraft on headings between 275 and 290 ▪ Direct cargo and international flights to right turn procedure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternative 2A Equivalent Lateral Spacing Operations (ELSO) for Departures with Dispersion (ANAC 14 and Other) ▪ Alternative 2B Equivalent Lateral Spacing Operations (ELSO) for Departures with Concentration (ANAC 14 and Other) ▪ Alternative 3 All Departures Between 275 and 290 degree Heading (Other) ▪ Alternative 5 All Cargo and International Heavy Jet Flights on PADRZ RNAV SID Initial Departure Heading (Other)



NEXT STEPS

- Evaluate Additional Reasonable Operational Alternatives Suggested by TAC/CAC
- Evaluate Noise Barrier Alternatives
- Continued Evaluation of NADP
- Present Draft Land Use/Administrative Alternatives
- Hold TAC/CAC Meetings and Public Workshop

SAN NOISE STUDY



Questions & Comments

→ <https://sannoisestudy.com/>

SAN NOISE STUDY



ANAC SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS – As of June 25, 2020

CURFEW PENALTIES

Complete

On Hold Pending Part 150 Results

Analyzed in Part 150

Recommendation – PASSED: In Favor = 7, Opposed = 1	STATUS
<p>1. Increase the amount of fines assessed on the airlines for curfew violations commensurate with the increase in cost of living. Continue to maintain multiplier.</p>	<p>Complete: Presentation by SDCRAA at 10/17/18 ANAC, low levels of current curfew violations doesn't support increase.</p>
<p>2. Use 100% of curfew violations fines for noise mitigation efforts, including but not limited to, additional noise monitoring, home upgrades not covered by QHP, engineering studies, community awareness, etc. In addition, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) should make community members aware of these fines and how they are being used to reduce noise impacts.</p>	<p>Complete: Presentation by SDCRAA at 10/17/18 and 2/20/19. Penalty fines will be used for QHP treatments.</p>

SUBCOMMITTEE CONTINUATION

Recommendation - PASSED: In Favor = 4, Opposed = 2, Abstain = 1	STATUS
<p>3. Continue the subcommittee to ensure continued community input from affected neighborhoods. Post applications on the website for 2017/2018 seats.</p>	<p>Complete: SDCRAA created CAC for Part 150. The first CAC meeting was held on 3/22/18.</p>

FAA AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL RADIO FREQUENCIES

Recommendation - PASSED: Unanimous	STATUS
4. FAA to provide full public access to TRACON SoCal Arrivals and Departures live radio broadcast frequencies including live FAA feeds (as provided at LAX) via LiveATC.net or similar.	Complete: Online in December 2017.
5. SDCRAA to archive and make publically available on its website ATC of Clearance Delivery, Ground Control, Tower and Approach/Departure, SoCal Arrival and Departure Control radio communications for prior 6-month period.	Complete: Online in December 2017 with 30-day history.

ANAC COMMITTEE

Recommendation - PASSED: Unanimous	STATUS
6. SDCRAA to make all raw noise related data available to the public.	Complete: Available via request to Noise Office and online flight tracking.
7. Modify ANAC Committee Policy to add one representative each from Pacific Beach, Bird Rock, La Jolla, Point Loma Heights, and other directly impacted communities.	Complete: Policy updated in March of 2018 (presented in February of 2018). New members started in June 2018. Four new community members were added outside the 65 dB contour.

QUIETER HOME PROGRAM

Recommendation - PASSED: Unanimous	STATUS
8. Review alternative funding sources to expand the homes treated by the Quieter Home Program (QHP) to noise-impacted homes outside the current noise contour.	Complete: Presentation by SDCRAA at 2/21/18 ANAC mtg. No known alternative sources for funding.
9. SDCRAA to track and report to ANAC at each meeting the count and specific circumstances where applicants are denied Air Conditioning (AC) installations in their QHP applications so that ANAC may consider recommendations to pursue the FAA reconsider the terms of the AC prohibitions.	Complete: All owners are offered three ventilation options to be consistent with FAA eligibility.

NOISE MONITORING AND MITIGATION

Recommendation – PASSED: Unanimous	STATUS
10. Conduct portable noise monitoring in areas that express concerns about aircraft noise that do not have a permanent noise monitoring site close by. Initially these locations should include Mission Beach parallel to Noise Dot #1, Fleetridge, South Fleetridge, Point Loma Heights, Dana Middle School or the Wooded Area on the bayside of the Point.	Analyzed in Part 150: In addition to 23 noise monitoring sites, two sites, one in Point Loma and one in Mission Beach will be monitored during the Part 150 Study and documented in Chapter 7.

11. Study the feasibility and benefit of noise barriers/airport noise mitigation on the water side of the airport and runways across from the Car Rental agency.

Analyzed in Part 150: This will be analyzed in Part 150 Study and documented in Chapter 8.

ADDITIONAL SDCRAA ANALYSIS



Recommendation – PASSED: Unanimous	STATUS
<p>12. SDCRAA to conduct additional analysis and publish this data as part of ANAC data package, this information should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Missed approaches as it relates to the noise dots (complaint vs. non-compliant both left and right), by time of day. b. Missed approaches to the left of the JETTI waypoint, in between JETTI and the original Noise Dot #1 (which is now Noise Dot #2) and to the right of the original Noise Dot #1 (which is now Noise Dot #2). c. Include the definition and calculation of early turn’s departures to the left of the JETTI waypoint and to the right of the original Noise Dot #1 (which is now Noise Dot #2). d. ZZOOO departures that are outside/south of ZZOOO waypoint, noise dot compliant but not outside ZZOOO waypoint, early turns to the left and aircraft that are cleared direct to the MTBAL waypoint. e. Include airline information associated with missed approaches, curfew violations, and early turns. f. Report on noise events using the number above (Nx or N65) to indicate how many loud aircraft noise events are occurring. g. Report all noise complaints by time, date, flight number, and neighborhood (reinstate historical noise complaint reporting). h. SDCRAA to publish 55dB CNEL contour on their website. i. Conduct an independent audit of the accuracy of web-based Flight Tracking system. j. Implement a range of ways to educate the community on how to use Flight Tracker. k. Track conformance to the “290 degree” departure heading (from end of Runway 27) to the Nighttime Noise Abatement Procedure. 	<p>Complete: Included in monthly Tableau online statistics starting in February of 2018, with the exception of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Published on 4/18/18 in ANAC member package g. Not feasible to publish all noise complaints but monthly stats are included for neighborhoods. h. Published in 4/18/18 ANAC Member package i. ANOMS system accepted by Caltrans in December of 2019 j. Five public workshops were held in various communities in 2018

FLIGHT PROCEDURE CHANGES - OVERALL

Recommendation – Combined Recommendations 13-21 – PASSED Unanimous	STATUS
<p>13. SDCRAA will engage an independent third party consultant, with public involvement, to provide a full and honest analysis and evaluation of the overall alignment of current SID's, STAR's and Procedures and Agreements. Note: ANAC would like to stay involved in the process to remain informed and provide input.</p>	<p>Complete: SDCRAA engaged an independent third-party consultant, by hiring Ricondo & Associates, Inc., to provide a full and honest analysis and evaluation to address recommendations/suggestions related to ANAC 14 through 20 Recommendations. This effort was called the Flight Procedure Study and all documentation is located on the airport's website. https://www.san.org/Airport-Noise/FAR-Part-150?EntryId=13052</p>

Flight Procedure Study Summary:

From March 2018 – May 2019, the CAC/TAC reviewed 20 flight procedure modifications. Based on parameters agreed to by the CAC/TAC, three procedures were determined to be feasible for further review by the FAA. Two of these procedures went to ANAC and were approved to move forward to the FAA and one is on hold pending results of the nighttime initial departure heading (ANAC #17) in the Part 150 study. Those three final recommendations are summarized on the next page.



NOTE: White lines connecting waypoint to waypoint may not represent actual flight path flown by aircraft.

1. To extend where aircraft turn and reduce noise in La Jolla, Pacific Beach, Mission Beach, Ocean Beach and Point Loma, request amendment to ZZOOO RNAV SID (Departures to Eastern destinations) to move JETTI waypoint out two miles. This procedure was approved by ANAC in June of 2019 and [submitted in the FAA's IFP Gateway](#) (location to request flight procedure changes) on behalf of ANAC on August 19, 2019. Currently under review by the FAA.
2. To reduce noise in La Jolla, Pacific Beach and Mission Beach, during nighttime hours requesting new waypoints to fly aircraft further away from the shoreline. This request was determined feasible for nighttime hours only but not submitted to ANAC as the CAC wanted further analysis in the Part 150 on the nighttime initial departure heading (ANAC #17). If requested by the CAC, this design as-is can be submitted to ANAC and if approved, sent to the FAA.



3. To increase compliance and reduce early turns over Point Loma, request the FAA move noise dots #4 & #5. [Request sent to the FAA on behalf of ANAC](#) on August 19, 2019 with a [response back from the FAA](#) on November 5, 2019, stating it was not feasible.

FLIGHT PROCEDURE CHANGES – PADRZ SID

Recommendation (to be included as a subset of #13)	STATUS
<p><u>PROCEDURE SUGGESTIONS – PADRZ SID:</u></p> <p>14. Revise PADRZ or create a new procedure to reduce increased noise in La Jolla, Mission Beach and Pacific Beach. Several members of the subcommittee worked to develop potential revised procedures designed to reduce noise impacts. The suggestions below are included as, and meant to be, examples to clarify the desired outcome and to bring up potential alternatives to the current procedure.</p>	
<p>a. Move the WNFLD and LNDND waypoints south so as to align with the relocated Noise Dot #1 at 290 (15 degree separation from JETI at 275 degrees) and designate as “Flyover” waypoints in the respective SID’s, consistent with JETI.</p>	<p>On Hold Pending Part 150 Results: This suggestion recommends moving Noise Dot #1 along a 290-degree magnetic heading at 1.5 NM for the shoreline and designing a procedure that provides a “fly over” waypoint at the location as well as relocating the WNFLD and LANDN waypoints south of their current location to</p>

	<p>be on the 290-degree magnetic heading from the departure end of Runway 27. This is currently on hold pending evaluation in the Part 150 Study (Alternative 1A and 1B) due to its potential to impact the 65 CNEL.</p>
<p>b. Establish within the PADRZ SID procedure a horizontal distance from end of runway (1.0 miles) along a fixed heading which must be satisfied along with altitude before a right turn can be initiated to preclude flights that quickly attain the current 520' altitude and turn right of and prior to the Noise Dot #1 before correcting to WYNFLD which results in aircraft flying farther north over Mission Beach.</p>	<p>On Hold Pending Part 150 Results: This suggestion proposes to keep Runway 27 departures on the runway heading until aircraft one mile from the end of the runway and reach an altitude of 520' before turning right. This is currently on hold pending evaluation in the Part 150 Study (Alternative 1C) due to its potential to impact the 65 CNEL.</p>
<p>c. PADRZ ONE SID As currently designed the PADRZ ONE departure leaves aircraft very close to and almost paralleling the coast along La Jolla, increasing noise impacts significantly. We recommend moving the WNFLD and KERNL waypoints 1.5NM south of their current positions. This will ensure aircraft proceed more directly off the coast without paralleling the shore and adds less than a mile of track distance to PADRZ.</p>	<p>On Hold Pending Part 150 Results: <u>Moving WNFLD</u>, Based on analysis in the Flight Procedure Study, 1) moving WNFLD south is limited to maintaining at least a 10-degree divergent heading from runway and 2) adjusting the initial departure path in PADRZ RNAV SID to a path equivalent to the 290-degree path needs to be evaluated in the Part 150 Study. Alternative 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B are evaluating initial departure headings that would provide an opportunity to move WNFLD further south assuming a 10-degree or more divergent heading from 275-degrees is maintained. This is currently on hold pending evaluation of Alternatives 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B in the Part 150 Study due to its potential to impact the 65 CNEL.</p>
<p>d. Create a new procedure BROCK-2 (Alternative 1) Request FAA to revise PADRZ SID and establish new waypoint</p>	<p>On Hold Pending Part 150 Results: The Flight Procedure Study determined this suggestion was not feasible during daytime or</p>

<p>BROCK1. Adds min increased flight time and takes aircraft further off-shore before turning to northern destinations. This will help all coastal neighborhoods with noise issues.</p>	<p>evening hours because it would not maintain minimum separation requirements from other departures. A procedure design similar to suggestion for nighttime only was considered feasible, but was put on hold by CAC until the nighttime initial departure heading was evaluated in the Part 150 Study Update (ANAC #17). Alternatives 2A and 2B involve a reduction in divergence allowed by FAA requirements which would provide an opportunity to move northbound traffic further south of La Jolla during daytime and evening hours. This concept is not the BROCK-1 design, but meets the intent to move traffic as far south as possible from La Jolla. This is currently on hold pending evaluation of Alternatives 2A and 2B in the Part 150 Study due to its potential to impact the 65 CNEL.</p>
<p>e. Create a new procedure BROCK-1 (alternative 2 – preferred) Relocate waypoints WNFLD and LNDN 0.75 miles directly south or adopt BROXK recommendation. Maintain 274 departure until Altitude 520 or greater. Maintain 274 departure heading until 520 foot altitude or greater and the aircraft have reached (new) flyover waypoint 0.25 to 0.5 miles from the end of the runway before turning toward WNFLD, LANDN or new BROCK Waypoint.</p>	<p>On Hold Pending Part 150 Results: See 14 d. response above.</p>
<p>f. Do not move the PADRZ SID further south to avoid negative noise impacts on the south side communities of the Point Loma Peninsula.</p>	<p>Analyzed in Part 150: Analysis will be completed for all feasible alternatives related to PADRZ SID initial departure path changes to evaluate potential changes to CNEL 65 CNEL. There are no</p>

proposed changes that would direct northbound jet departures at headings less than 275-degrees.

FLIGHT PROCEDURE CHANGES – ZZOOO SID

Recommendation (to be included as a subset of #13)	STATUS
<u>PROCEDURE SUGGESTIONS – ZZOOO SID:</u>	
<p>15. Revise ZZOOO to significantly reduce or eliminate flights over the Point Loma Peninsula, including Cabrillo National Park and reduce or eliminate eastbound turns over La Jolla. Several members of the subcommittee worked to develop potential revised procedures designed to reduce noise and enforce compliance with Noise Dots and the ZZOOO procedure over Point Loma. Those suggestions are included as, and meant to be, examples to clarify the desired outcome and to bring up potential alternatives to the current procedure.</p>	
<p>a. Eastbound flights should reach a minimum of 8K feet before crossing over ZZOOO to minimize thrusters and reduce duration of noise impacts over Point Loma.</p>	<p>Completed: Altitudes at the ZZOOO waypoint were evaluated in the Flight Procedure Study and found that the majority of aircraft on the ZZOOO RNAV SID are at or above 8,000'. The proposed concept submitted to FAA in August of 2019 extends the current ZZOOO RNAV flight path, which is expected to increase the frequency of jet aircraft that fly the ZZOOO RNAV SID which is published for aircraft to be at or above 8,000' at the ZZOOO waypoint.</p>
<p>b. FAA/TRACON to discourage the practice of redirecting flights off of their filed ZZOOO flight plan departure, to turn north then east over La Jolla. FAA to increase minimum SID flyover\flyby altitudes to encourage increased climb rates.</p>	<p>On Hold Pending Part 150 Results: The Flight Procedure Study found that eastbound departures that turn right over La Jolla occur primarily at night. An RNAV SID for eastbound departures between 10:00 p.m. and 6:30 a.m. would reduce the likelihood of</p>

	<p>this occurring over La Jolla. A design concept was proposed that directs eastbound departures between 10:00 p.m. and 6:30 a.m. to the left on a path to the ZZ000 waypoint. This RNAV SID request was put on hold, Committee members wanted to determine the feasibility of ELSO and adjustments to the nighttime noise abatement procedure (ANAC 17), since this design uses the same initial departure path as the existing PADRZ RNAV SID to avoid changes to CNL 65 or higher noise exposure area. This procedure design is on hold until Part 150 Alternatives 1 and 2 are evaluated in the Part 150 Study Update.</p>
<p>c. FAA/TRACON to direct that ALL SAN departure separation be limited to between JETTI (275 degrees) and the historical Red Noise Dot #1 (290 degree vectors from the end of Runway 27) for LNSAY, BORDER, PEBLE and ZZ000, etc. (plus all new Metroplex SID's) Prohibit 250 to 275 departure vector range, except for specific safety events ("Runway 27 STAR Missed Approach Wave Off").</p>	<p>Analyzed in Part 150: Because this would potentially change the CNEL 65 or higher exposure area, the Flight Procedure Study recommended it be evaluated in the Part 150 Study Update as Alternative 3. The Part 150 Study Team presented findings that indicate Alternative 3 is not feasible due to limitations it would cause to airfield capacity.</p>
<p>d. Follow ZZ000 procedure, comply with the JETTI flyover waypoint and consider the establishment of a minimum vectoring altitude for Eastbound turns.</p>	<p>Completed: The Flight Procedure Study concluded that Minimum Vector Altitude (MVA) is driven only by obstacle clearance, and it is a reference for FAA ATC when vectoring aircraft not on a defined procedure. Modifying the MVA is not a feasible method to raise altitudes.</p>
<p>e. The ZZ000 ONE departure as currently designed puts departing aircraft close to Point Loma peninsula and the</p>	<p>Completed: Consultant recommended a modification to the ZZ000 RNAV SID that extended the JETTI waypoint further west</p>

<p>southern end of coastal La Jolla, subjecting residents to increased and at times incessant noise from departing aircraft. Aircraft need to be further offshore before beginning the turn south to the ZZ000 waypoint. We recommend replacing the JETTI waypoint with a waypoint along the same track from the departure end of Runway 27 that is 2NM further west, located at approximately 32.75360N - 117.25755W.</p>	<p>and included a more predictable design. TAC, CAC and ANAC accepted the modification and requested it proceed to FAA for review and implementation. The proposed modification was submitted to FAA for consideration on August 19, 2018.</p>
--	--

FLIGHT PROCEEDURE CHANGES – COMIX STAR

Recommendation (to be included as a subset of #13)	STATUS
<p><u>PROCEEDURE SUGGESTIONS – COMIX STAR:</u></p> <p>16.Reassess and revise the entire arrival corridor in a manner that more appropriately “shares the noise” instead of concentrating arrivals from the North in a very narrow corridor. Several members of the subcommittee worked to develop potential revised procedures to COMIX STAR designed to reduce the increased noise that has resulted from the implementation of Metroplex and NextGen. Those suggestions are included as, and meant to be, examples to clarify the desired outcome and to bring up potential alternatives to the current procedure.</p>	<p>Completed: in the Flight Procedure Study the consultant evaluated multiple recommendations to revise the COMIX RNAV STAR to address noise concerns. Based on the noise screening analysis, the Consultant recommended not to proceed forward with the proposed concept because it would increase aircraft noise to noticeable levels for communities who are not frequently overflown. The TAC,</p>
<p>a. Revise COMIX STAR procedure in order to shift flights that Metroplex has moved and concentrated father South (the downwind leg) over less populated areas and restore prior altitude.</p>	
<p>b. Shift the waypoint XMANS on the COMIX STAR north to a location that is over the interstate freeway 805 and 52 with the constraint to remain clear of MCAS Miramar’s airspace. It would come ashore over Torrey Pines State Park before connecting with KLOMN.</p>	

<p>c. Increase Min. Altitude at LNTRN (LCOVE) at or above 10,000'. This change would result in aircraft flying over less populated areas, including industrial businesses, thus reducing the noise impact and saving time/fuel. This proposed path is closer to the historical flights pre-NextGen.</p>	<p>CAC and ANAC concurred with the consultant's recommendation.</p>
<p>d. COMIX ONE STAR The RNAV-only COMIX ONE arrival is very similar to the existing non-RNAV BAYVU arrival in terms of ground track with a key difference being that the COMIX arrival has an "at or above 8,000 feet" altitude restriction on its last offshore waypoint (LANTRN). The BAYVU arrival has an "at or above 9,000 feet" restriction at its nearly identically-located LCOVE waypoint. This has resulted in aircraft being lower and noisier over La Jolla. We recommend changing LANTRN waypoint's altitude restriction to "at or above 9,000 feet".</p>	

NIGHTTIME NOISE ABATEMENT PROCEDURE

Recommendation	STATUS
<p>17. Determine methods to increase current compliance in Nighttime Noise Abatement Procedures to improve noise impacts for affected communities and ensure that ATC is only turning aircraft off this procedure for safety reasons only.</p>	<p>Analyzed in Part 150: Consultant is reviewing this in the Part 150 Study update. Part 150 Alts 1A, 1B, 1C and 4.</p>

FAA NOISE DOTS

Recommendation	STATUS
<p>18. Review if the current definition of an early turn, and define what an early turn means and conduct comparative analysis of actual flight paths.</p>	<p>Completed: Consultant did review the three recommendations in the Flight Procedure Study. The Consultant provided a definition</p>
<p>19. Work with FAA/ATC to modify flight procedures to increase compliance and reduce early turns, with consideration of aircraft performance.</p>	

<p>20. FAA/TRACON to incorporate Red Dot waypoint locations into current and future SID's as part of the formal SID and STAR Procedures, so that Red Dots become waypoints on departure procedures and data is collected on waypoints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reposition FAA Noise Dot #1 from its current position at 295- degrees (implemented by FAA/AA without public notice) to its "original" pre 2005 position at 290 degrees from the end of SAN Runway 27 and 1.5 miles off the coast. b. Reposition FAA Noise Dot #3 from its current position at 265 degrees (implemented by the FAA/AA without public notice) to its "original" pre 2005 position of 275 degrees (JETTI) and 1.5 miles off of the coast. c. Reposition FAA Noise Dot #4 from its current location (west of Fort Rosecrans) to coincide with the ZZOO waypoint to deter regular Early left turns inside of ZZOOO which continue to occur at the direction of ATC in direct conflict with the SID routing. ZZOOO was specifically designed by FAA to provide an efficient and cost effective departure for eastbound traffic and to mitigate impacts to affected DOT Section 4(f) resources (including Fort Rosecrans, Cabrillo National Monument) and the peninsula community. 	<p>of early turns and indicated Area Navigation and current design of SID procedures comply with preventing early turns. The Consultant did recommend modifications to two FAA Noise Dots which were accepted by TAC, CAC and ANAC. The Authority sent a request to FAA to consider the modifications on August 19, 2019. FAA concluded the movements will impact efficient movement of traffic; therefore will not implement.</p>
---	--

NOISE ABATEMENT PROCEDURE (NADP)

Recommendation	STATUS
<p>21. Have SDCRAA conduct an engineering analysis of modification to the Noise Abatement Departure Procedure to assess the potential improvement to noise contours around the airport.</p>	<p>Analyzed in Part 150: Consultant is reviewing this in the Part 150 Study update, Alternative 6.</p>

MEETING SUMMARY

Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 02/19/2020 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	No
Melissa Hernholm-Danzo	Community Resident at Large within 65 dB CNEL	Yes
Judy Holiday	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	Yes
John Kroll	Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee	No
Chris Cole	Uptown Planners	Yes
Anthony Ciulla	Ocean Beach Planning Board	No*
Fred Kosmo	Peninsula Community Planning Board	Yes
Community Planning Groups Outside the 65 dB contour		
Matthew Price	La Jolla Community Planning Association	No
Lori Myers	Grossmont-Mt. Helix Improvement Association	Yes
Jim Morrison	Pacific Beach Planning Group	No
Deborah Watkins	Mission Beach Precise Planning Board	Yes
Aviation Stakeholders		
Olivier Brackett	San Diego County Airports	Yes
Jorge Rubio	City of San Diego Airports	Yes
Carl "Rick" Huenefeld	MCRD	No
Robert Bates	Airline Pilot (Active)	No
Kallie Glover	Performance Engineer, Delta Airlines	Yes
Dave Ryan	NBAA	Yes
Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
Justin Cook	Acoustical Engineer	No*
Maria Bojorquez-Gomez	Congress, 53rd District, for Rep. Susan Davis	No*
Joshua Coyne	San Diego City Council, District 2, for Jennifer Campbell	Yes
Kiera Galloway	Congress, 52nd District for Rep. Scott Peters	Yes
Marvin Mayorga	S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1, for Sup. Greg Cox	No
Keith Lusk	FAA Representative, Western Pacific Regional Office	Yes
Heidi Gantwerk	Facilitator	Yes
Staff/Presenters		
Steve Smith (Ricondo), Dennis Probst (SDCRAA), Sjohnna Knack (SDCRAA), Jim Payne (SDCRAA), Roman Lanyak (SDCRAA).		

*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. Action Items

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>

East County Working Group Update

Steve Smith from Ricondo presented regarding the East County Working Group (ECWG) Flight Procedure Evaluation. The ECWG followed a similar process to the Flight Procedure Study, exploring existing noise concerns and identifying any feasible procedural changes recommended to alleviate noise. The ECWG conducted five meetings over the course of about a year, first gathering data about noise concerns, identifying possible procedural changes and analyzing them before making final recommendations. The ECWG had observed a change in traffic patterns, in particular following the implementation of Metroplex in 2016, which they feel has led to more noise, specifically in the morning and evenings. They wanted to make sure that no matter what comes out of this study, that any new noise would not be created in other areas. They also expressed concern about low flying planes and overflight frequency.

The group's objectives were focused on the arrival procedures where they wanted to maintain flight path dispersion (to "spread out the noise"), to raise altitudes over the populated areas, and if possible, extend them as far east as possible, and then turn south over a less populated area. After discussing a number of ideas, the group identified two options for analysis. The first is a modified version of the current COMIX arrival procedure, removing the route that goes from the KLOMN waypoint to the NADDO waypoint, to be used when operations are not very busy. The second would happen when operations are lower, primarily at night. Aircraft would continue to the east much further, and then turn south over a less populated area and then join the approach. This would provide some respite by moving the arrivals and the aircraft would stay at 6,000 feet.

(Details on the proposed approaches and the analysis can be found at https://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC?EntryId=13446&Command=Core_Download) Noise analysis demonstrated that both options shifted noise onto other communities, and as such were not recommended. Instead, the group agreed to draft a letter to the FAA requesting that traffic be kept at or above 6,000 feet, which is written into the current procedure, but any deviation below 6,000 feet causes noise disturbances, and the group wanted to stress the importance of following the procedure, and encourage the Airport Authority to work with the FAA to emphasize this point.

Heidi Gantwerk suggested a motion be made asking ANAC staff to take the letter to the FAA. She pointed out there may be other letters of support, including one from Diane Jacobs' office, with Congresswoman Susan Davis CC'd, which will accompany this letter.

Lori Myers went to both the Valle De Oro Community Planning Group and the Sweetwater Community Planning Group and got unanimous vote supporting the letter. She does not have letters but got their permission to put their Planning Group name on the letter.

Chris Cole made a motion to direct staff to present the ECWG letter to the FAA. Deborah Watkins seconded the motion and the motion was unanimously approved by ANAC.

Fly Quiet Program Awards

Jim Payne reviewed the goal of Fly Quiet Program, introduced in 2017, to encourage operators to fly as quietly as possible by urging the use of quieter aircraft and improvement in maintaining the curfew. He reviewed the metric categories of curfew compliance, fleet quality index, and noise exceedance (a newly added measure that looks at actual noise measurements off the runway rather than only fleet standard noise measurements.)

For 2019, the large domestic carrier winner is United Airlines. They only had one curfew violation fined, but they canceled 14 departures that otherwise would have been a violation. Allegiant Airlines won for the small carrier because they swapped out the MD80 for the quieter A319. The international carrier winner was Japan Airlines who had no curfew violations even in the face of mechanical issues and weather conditions. He also noted that Air Canada scored highly. The most improved carrier was American Airlines. Last year they had a high amount of curfew violations. Staff worked with them to bring attention to the issue and their violations have gone down by 70 percent. Staff requested a motion from the committee to recognize these airlines publicly in front of the Airport Authority Board. Pending the outcome of a vote, they'd like to take this to the Airport Authority Board on March 5 and present each airline with an elegant crystal award the Airport Authority can display in the hope of encouraging other airlines to do the same.

Questions from ANAC:

Fred Kosmo stated that he agrees with that the awards and asked if anything can be identified that Southwest has done to lessen noise impact?

Jim Payne said Southwest was within a tenth of a point of United in fleet mix.

Chris Cole asked if the Airport PR Department will be reaching out to media?

Sjohnna Knack said she is already working with PR to get some press and social media on these awards.

Melissa Hernholm-Danzo asked if they'll be on display in the actual airport?

Sjohnna Knack said that was a good idea and she would look into it.

Fred Kosmo made a motion to publicly acknowledge airlines at the March Authority Board Meeting and also through public relations efforts. Olivier Beckett seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Part 150 Update

Sjohnna Knack said she's met with the FAA to go through assumptions as they generate the draft noise contour at the end of January. They are still in the process of reviewing that and must provide feedback before she can take the next steps. She doesn't believe it will happen before June at this point.

Mr. Kosmo expressed concerns about the Part 150 and ongoing concerns for missed approaches, as it appeared there were more missed approaches last year than ever, and the airport capacity is increasing.

Jim Payne said the high amount of missed approaches are predominantly due to weather, causing spikes in the missed approach rate.

3. Approval of Meeting Summary

Judy Holiday made a motion to approve the meeting summary from the December meeting, it was seconded by Fred Kosmo with Jorge Rubio, Dave Ryan and Lori Myers abstaining. The motion passed.

4. Public Comment

Carol Knott lives in South Mission Beach. She doesn't want the committee to think because nobody from South Mission Beach is speaking that they're accepting the noise and learning to live with it. That is not the case. The airplanes start every single morning at 6:31. She still has a problem with 100% of flights being over South Mission Beach mornings and evenings. She asked the committee to disperse the planes and put them back where they used to be.

Tony Stiegler of Quiet Skies San Diego wanted to ensure that everybody is aware that Quiet Skies San Diego. They filed a lawsuit against the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, challenging the Environmental Impact Report, and in particular, the adequacy of the EIR with regard to the Airport Development Plan, and the adverse consequences of noise on the communities that are impacted. He's happy to speak with any members of the committee or public afterwards.

Marly da Rosa lives in Point Loma. The flight paths don't show airplanes flying over her home but it happens all the time. Between 6:30 and 6:39, eight planes take off. When they were looking for a house, all the flights were going in Loma Portal area. She's 70 years old, supposed to be losing her hearing, but somehow, she hears more now. When she stays home, the whole day is a buzz of planes over and over. It's very annoying and she calls many times to complain. Things changed and it has gotten much worse.

Andrea da Rosa, also a resident of Point Loma in the Fleetridge area. They lived on Newport Avenue and they had issues with noise there so they decided to move. It took them five years to find a home. It wasn't ideal, but it worked for their budget and allowed them to stay here since they both grew up in Point Loma and allowed them to take care of elderly parents. They invested a lot in the home. There was no noise there. Then just before they moved in, all of a sudden, plane after plane after plane. She understands that all these great things are happening, but if people have lived here their whole lives and they live in homes that are of significant value, they should be paid attention to.

5. Next Meeting/Adjourn

Next meeting is April 15, 2020.

Meeting was adjourned.

Note: the April 15, 2020
ANAC meeting was
cancelled due to
COVID-19

MEETING SUMMARY

Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 06/17/2020 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		
Erika Espinosa Araiza	Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee	Yes
Anthony Bernal	Downtown Community Planning Council	No
Anthony Ciulla	Ocean Beach Planning Board	Yes
Chris Cole	Uptown Planners	Yes
Judy Holiday	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	Yes
Melissa Hernholm-Danzo	Community Resident at Large within 65 dB CNEL	Yes
Fred Kosmo	Peninsula Community Planning Board	Yes
Community Planning Groups Outside the 65 dB contour		
Jonathan Cole	Pacific Beach Planning Group	Yes
Michael Herron	Valley De Oro Community Planning Group	Yes
Matthew Price	La Jolla Community Planning Association	Yes
Deborah Watkins	Mission Beach Precise Planning Board	Yes
Aviation Stakeholders		
Olivier Brackett	San Diego County Airports	Yes
Jorge Rubio	City of San Diego Airports	Yes
Carl "Rick" Huenefeld	MCRD	Yes
Robert Bates	Airline Pilot (Active)	Yes
Kallie Glover	Performance Engineer, Delta Airlines	Yes
Dave Ryan	NBAA	Yes
Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
Justin Cook	Acoustical Engineer	Yes
Maria Bojorquez-Gomez	Congress, 53rd District, for Rep. Susan Davis	Yes
Joshua Coyne	San Diego City Council, District 2, for Jennifer Campbell	Yes
Anthony Nguyen	Congress, 52nd District for Rep. Scott Peters	No
Genevieve Fong	S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1, for Sup. Greg Cox	Yes
Keith Lusk	FAA Representative	Yes
Dave Foyle	FAA Representative	Yes
Presenters		
Heidi Gantwerk	Facilitator	Yes
Jim Payne	SDCRAA	Yes
Sjohnna Knack	SDCRAA	Yes
Staff McKinna Dartez (SDCRAA), Roman Lanyak (SDCRAA)		

*Members contacted staff ahead of time and are considered excused.
16 voting members in attendance

1. Welcome and Introductions

Heidi Gantwerk, facilitator for the Airport Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC), opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. with roll call and introductions. Ms. Gantwerk briefly shared the agenda and read the Executive Order N-29-20.

2. Roll Call

Heidi Gantwerk called the committee member names for attendance.

3. 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>

a. Noise Statistics Review

Jim Payne reviewed noise statistics and the impacts on noise with COVID-19. Passenger levels were down 95 percent as compared to prior to the pandemic. However, weeks just prior to the ANAC meeting passenger enplanements were up significantly to about 1,000 passengers a day, still far below pre-COVID levels. Currently, about 52 percent of US fleet is parked and operations are down 70 percent but are picking up slightly. Air service recovery is unpredictable due to continual schedule changes. At the end of the month, approximately 200 operations were scheduled but noise staff observed about a 10 percent cancel rate. Several carriers limited their capacity by implementing social distancing standards for their operations, in particular not selling middle seats. He stated as things recover, for at least some carriers, they may see a little spike in their operations as the carriers add service to meet capacity. In terms of the peak hour, the scheduling parameters have changed significantly.

Seven nonstop international and 22 domestic operations have been suspended, and demand will dictate when they come back. The industry is suggesting there will likely be about a three to five percent reduction in the aircraft fleet, mainly in older aircraft. American is phasing out their 757s 767s, Embraer 190s and some of their older 737-800s. Delta has retired the last of the MD80s. LaGuardia was the hardest hit airport, at one point dipping under 40 operations a day at an airport that normally operates 80 to 85 percent capacity for 10 hours a day. Currently SAN has more operations than Newark, LaGuardia, DCA, and Kennedy.

Complaints per operation saw a reduction with a small spike due to weather. There were four curfew violations all from one charter company. At the last Curfew Violation Review Panel, two violations were waived for maintenance, two for an Instrument Landing System (ILS) outage, one was fined, and the other waived was due to a medical emergency. The four violations that are under review may be subject to at least to \$28,000 in fines.

With regards to aircraft noise levels starting in mid-April, decreases in aircraft operations resulted in community noise levels (cars, lawnmowers, etc.) higher than aircraft noise levels.

Missed Approach rates follow a baseline about 0.2 to 0.3 percent and peaks due to weather. The missed approach rate for June is 0.7 percent. Several members reached out to the Airport Noise team about early turns. The team reached out to the FAA and brought to their attention the spike in late April.

Questions from ANAC:

Justin Cook asked what the FAA's response was in regard to the early turns.

Dave Foyle stated they received a number of specific flights they were asked to look into by the Authority Noise office. He committed to the ANAC has been that if staff provides specific call signs and flights, they will look into whether the FAA complied with noise abatement procedures in Southern California TRACON.

Mr. Foyle stated that the left turns they were asked to review were, generally speaking, not in compliance so controllers were reminded that the reduced traffic does not affect the need to comply with existing noise abatement procedures. He also stated they were looking into a couple right turns right over La Jolla but noted they were in compliance with the noise dots.

Chris Cole asked if he was reading the data correctly on the complaints per operations graph and that there's more complaints than operations no matter whether operations go down the complaints stay almost 100% of the operations.

Jim Payne stated yes, part of it is people that file a significant number of complaints, sometimes on a single operation.

Matthew Price asked the FAA, why do they have Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs) if SIDs will not be followed? They were told that it's for weather making sure that there's enough dispersion between aircraft and here we have ZZOOO departures going over La Jolla when there's hardly any aircraft in the air. He asked how can they be sure that it's due to just weather impacts or dispersion if those are present and these flights are being directed over La Jolla?

Dave Foyle stated the two most recent, both were in the jump zone where parachute jumping activity was in play 10,000 feet and below in the vicinity of Brown Field. They can occasionally go left and get around that, but they're extraordinarily cautious when there are parachutists in the air, they want to route aircraft around that. There can be a variety of different factors for an aircraft to be taken off the SID. He pointed out that if the community of La Jolla has additional concerns, the FAA would consider modifications of noise abatement procedures when presented to us by the Airport Authority.

Fred Kosmo thanked Jim for the detailed report and Sjohnna and Dave from the FAA for investigating and addressing that issue. He reminded the committee to reach out to the noise department to report an issue. He asked the FAA if it was accurate to say the reason for fewer missed approaches because there are fewer operations.

Dave Foyle stated it was certainly a leading factor in the lower number of missed approaches. There's less pressure on the runway. When volume is in the upper 500s or 600s for daily traffic count, there isn't a lot of room between arrivals for departure and if there is anything that goes slightly awry with the timing then we're left with this way to maintain safe operations to send the arrival around. There are circumstances where weather minimum may be down and the aircraft cannot complete the approach because at the decision height they still can't see the runway in which case is a pilot executes a go-around and volume doesn't affect that piece.

b. Quieter Home Program Update

Sjohnna Knack reported that the entire Quieter Home Program (QHP) Team have been working hard over the past few months following all local and State health guidelines while working with homeowners in QHP. Because construction was deemed an essential service, QHP work was able to continue, which

allowed them to continue spending down funds so they can retain the qualified contractors that are necessary to make this program successful.

QHP staff works closely with owners and tenants that occupy properties, requiring them to sign waivers before entering properties. Continuing to spend down grant funding is important as we have yet to receive our federal fiscal year grant for this year. They made a request to the FAA that they maintain the same funding and asked for additional funding so that they may have the opportunity to start what's called a Non-Residential sound insulation program, a measure approved in our existing Part 150 plan back in 2011, to start looking at facilities such as places of worship, educational facilities and nationally designated historic properties.

Questions from ANAC:

Fred Kosmo asked how much money they think they'll get next year for the Quieter Home Program.

Sjohnna Knack explained they average about \$14.7 million a year in grant funding but couldn't speculate on the future of funding.

c. Part 150 Update

Sjohnna Knack shared that the Part 150 consultant would give a more in-depth presentation at the next meeting in August. Since they last met in February, the FAA approved a version of the aircraft noise model the consultants are using to move forward with some of their analysis. In May, a virtual Zoom meeting was held with both the Citizen and Technical Advisory Committees. Another Citizens Advisory Committee meeting will be held next Thursday to provide clarity on some of the analysis for land use density, population and housing counts, how the modeling was conducted on certain alternatives and how the both the TAC and CAC are going to receive documentation and provide further comments.

It's anticipated that this summer the consultants will finalize the alternatives along with the remaining chapters which will essentially complete the Noise Compatibility Plan. The documentation for the Noise Exposure Maps has been completed. A draft was submitted to the FAA and anticipate providing that to the members this summer. Hinging on multiple FAA approvals, a public hearing, additional CAC/TAC meetings, and a public hearing /public workshop will be held by the end of this calendar year with the hope they could submit the Part 150 by the end of the year.

Questions from ANAC:

Matthew Price asked in terms of the base case model for the Part 150 study and the 65 CNEL, what's the impact of the pandemic on the long-term 65 CNEL and whether those models still apply?

Sjohnna Knack explained that this is a planning document and in a planning effort you don't want to be shortsighted and base your planning efforts on something temporary, but it is something that they are taking into consideration.

Fred Kosmo agreed with having the consultant come to our August meeting. He asked where they stand with the ANAC recommendations being considered as part of the Part 150.

Sjohnna Knack said they received a request on Monday from several CAC members and are in the process of reviewing every ANAC recommendation and providing a status update. She encouraged members to attend the CAC meeting.

The Part 150 Study update has a separate website where information about the meetings and all documentation from the TAC and CAC meetings are uploaded. The site address is: sannoisestudy.com

d. Membership Term Limits – New Appointments

Heidi Gantwerk reported due to COVID, many planning groups have not met to provide them with their new representatives. Both the Downtown Community Planning Council and the Peninsula Community Planning Board have members whose terms are up. Erica Espinosa Araiza is the new representative from the Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee for the next two years. The amended Airport Authority Board policy for ANAC rotates the general community resident position from west of the airport to east of the airport for a two year term, and is appointed by the President/CEO, Kim Becker. The representatives outside of the 65 CNEL with the most households filing complaints, for the next two years are Mission Beach Community Precise Planning Board and Pacific Beach Planning Group, and Valle De Oro Community Planning Group from outside the City of San Diego.

Questions from ANAC:

Melissa Hernholm-Danzo said she doesn't understand why her seat on ANAC is transferring over to a member east of the airport with the timing of the Part 150 as it pertains almost entirely to communities to the west.

Heidi Gantwerk explained it was an amendment in the last ANAC Membership Policy update to have a balance of members both east and west of the airport so it was presented to alternate the "general community member" every two years. (Note: This has been a position for many years) There are candidates who are interested in representing the seat east of the airport. She also indicated that she would be welcome to continue on the Technical Advisory Committee until the Part 150 study is completed.

Fred Kosmo echoed Melissa's concern about the loss of institutional knowledge.

Deborah Watkins voiced her concern that when the ANAC membership term limits were proposed they weren't in the process of the Part 150 Study. She asked if there's any way to push back the switching of the east and the west for a year.

Chris Cole said he fears representation taken away from the landing track noise impacted areas on the east side. If anything is to be done, it would be to add another person.

Heidi Gantwerk indicated that this could be added to the August agenda to further discuss and make a determination on the community seat from West to East. Then it would go to the Airport Authority Board because it is board policy.

4. Action Items Approval of Meeting Summary

a. Approval of Meeting Summary

Fred Kosmo made a motion to approve the meeting summary from the February meeting, it was seconded by Olivier Brackett. However, because a quorum was not present, the motion was tabled until the August meeting.

5. Public Comment

There were four Public Comments emailed to the Authority Clerk. All were distributed to committee members as well as posted on the website, and read into the record by Tony Russell (SDCRAA staff).

6. Next Meeting/Adjourn

Next meeting is August 19, 2020.

Meeting was adjourned.

DRAFT

JUNE 17, 2020

**AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE (ANAC) MEETING**

ITEM 3 – PRESENTATION

PUBLIC COMMENT:

(C) PART 150 UPDATE

Comments of Anthony M. Stiegler
Quiet Skies San Diego
ANAC Meeting June 17, 2020

My name is Anthony Stiegler and I offer these comments:

1. The Part 150 Study Requires More Time for Community Engagement:

Flight operations and passenger traffic at San Diego International Airport are down 85% since COVID-19. If the airline industry recovers and there is a return to pre-COVID-19 passenger traffic and flight operations, commercial jet noise will return with serious consequences for human cardiovascular and cognitive health. We have asked the Airport Authority for sufficient time for community engagement on the Part 150 Study. The Airport Authority's proposed schedule would prejudice the impacted communities by sharply limiting the time for community participation and foreclosing meaningful future engagement. This is egregious in context of the 20 months taken so far by the Airport Authority for their part of the Part 150 Study and the ten months taken by the FAA to approve the Airport Authority's forecasts.


2. The SDCRAA's Airport Development Plan Should Be Withdrawn in Light of the COVID-19 Pandemic and Airline Industry Economic Collapse:

According to Tori Barnes, of the U.S. Travel Association "while the rest of the country is moving into a recession, the travel industry is already in a depression". Industry insiders predict a much smaller airline industry if and when consumer demand returns. On April 17, the San Diego Airport Authority declared a local emergency. CARE Act airline industry taxpayer dollars are being used to give at least \$38M in fee waivers to the airlines in San Diego. But the airline usage fees were projected by SDCRAA's President & CEO Kim Becker to "pay for a good part of the \$3B Airport Development Plan" ("ADP"). Remarkably against this backdrop the SDCRAA is moving forward with its Airport Development Plan to add eleven new gates and Remain Overnight jet parking places. Groundbreaking is scheduled for 2021. SDCRAA's plan is imprudent at best.

The Airport Authority's disregard for human health and disconnection from economic reality regretfully requires Quiet Skies San Diego to continue its California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") legal challenge to the Airport Development Plan. The lawsuit says that the SDCRAA puts profit above human health. SDCRAA calls the noise "significant but unavoidable". We say otherwise. If you support what we're doing, thank you, and please consider a contribution by going to our GoFundMe page at: <https://www.gofundme.com/f/quiet-skies-san-diego-ceqa-challenge> or our website at www.quietskieslajolla.org.

3. Early Turns Over La Jolla: Even with the 85% fewer planes in the sky over the last three months, the FAA is now routing commercial jets directly over La Jolla. The skies are

wide open, there is no need to fly new paths directly over highly concentrated residential areas. Why? Is there an untoward motive? Is this a case of being tone deaf to the community or retribution for exercising La Jolla's legal rights? The path looks like this:



JUNE 17, 2020

**AIRPORT NOISE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(ANAC) MEETING**

ITEM 5

PUBLIC COMMENT

From: [Michelle Marie Barnett](#)
To: [SDCRAA clerk](#)
Subject: Non Agenda Item / Airport Noise Advisory Committee
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 10:53:05 AM

Hello,

I have recently moved to our family home in Pt. Loma to care for an elderly parent who has Alzheimer's disease. Our family purchased this home in the late 60's. I have lived my life in the busy Mission District of San Francisco for the past 30 plus years, so I am used to much activity around me.

I would like the Airport Noise Advisory Committee to know that it is shocking the amount of air traffic that comes over our house. I had no idea my poor family member was being subject to this amount of both noise pollution and pollution. It's a shame what you have done to this community. My neighbors say they don't even go into their yard due to the amount of air traffic. I don't either.

I find myself constantly needing to hose off windows, screens, walls, cars and plants from the black soot that covers our home. I wonder if this has contributed to my family members demise. I wonder how this is impacting mine.

Thank you.

--

Michelle M. Barnett

