

MEETING SUMMARY

Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 02/17/2021 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	No*
Tania Fragomeno	Downtown Community Planning Council	Yes
Anthony Ciulla	Ocean Beach Planning Board	Yes
Chris Cole	Uptown Planners	Yes
Judy Holiday	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	Yes
Char-Lou Benedict	Community Resident at Large within 65 dB CNEL - East	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 Air Lines	Yes
Dave Ryan	NBAA	No
Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
Justin Cook	Acoustical Engineer	Yes
	Congress, 53rd District	No*
Joshua Coyne	San Diego City Council, District 2, for Jennifer Campbell	Yes
Anthony Nguyen	Congress, 52nd District for Rep. Scott Peters	Yes
	S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1	No
Keith Lusk	FAA Representative	Yes
Rodney Lindbeck	FAA Representative	No
Ivan Gutierrez	FAA Representative	Yes
Presenters		
Steve Smith	Ricondo	Yes
Heidi Gantwerk	Facilitator	Yes
Jim Payne	SDCRAA	Yes
Sjohnna Knack	SDCRAA	Yes

Staff Dennis Probst (SDCRAA), McKinna Dartez (SDCRAA), Roman Lanyak (SDCRAA)

15 voting members in attendance

*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. with introductions. Ms. Gantwerk briefly shared the agenda and read the Executive Order N-29-20.

2. Roll Call

Heidi Gantwerk called a committee member roll call for attendance. Attendance is reflected on page 1.

3. Presentations

Note: A copy of the information in the presentation can be found via our website using the following link:

<https://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC?EntryId=13968>

a. Current Noise Concerns and Trends

Jim Payne reported that the 21 early turns on January 29th, were due to inclement weather. The FAA had to vector departures in order to avoid the storm cells off the coast.

He then gave an update on the Runway 27 localizer outage planned for mid-February 2021, until mid-July 2021, due to improvements being made to the Runway Safety Area. The localizer, a component of the instrument landing system, provides lateral guidance for ground based navigation. No unusual changes have been observed to date and staff will continue to monitor for changes in the future.

Questions from ANAC:

Fred Kosmo asked for an update on the percentage of current operations versus previous years.

Mr. Payne reported that the operations are down 48 percent from this time last year.

Matthew Price asked what percentage of operations are currently non-GPS.

Mr. Payne said currently they're seeing about 5 percent of the actual GPS procedure, and think it's going to increase to about 10 percent. Recently, they received notification that one of the carriers was certified to use GPS. A lot of the carriers had already switched to RNAV for the final approach, which provides stability that the localizer only does not provide.

b. Air Traffic Control Audio Replay

Roman Lanyak reported on the publicly available air traffic control audio replay streaming service, called LiveATC.net (www.LiveATC.net). The audio streaming service site provides both live and archive air traffic control (ATC) communication records worldwide.

Noise staff uses the service to investigate early turns, missed approaches, curfew violations, and other operations. And residents can access it through on the web or by downloading the app, to investigate an early turn they witnessed on WebTrak.

Mr. Lanyak then gave a demo on how to use LiveATC.net. Noise staff is available if committee members are interested in a demo or have any questions about the system.

Sjohnna Knack recognized Roman and Jorge Rubio for their efforts to make this happen and expressed her appreciation to the City of San Diego for allowing an antenna to be placed at Montgomery Field at no charge.

c. Airport Authority Updates

Sjohnna Knack gave an update on the Part 150. Since the last ANAC meeting, they held a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting on January 7th to review the consultant's draft recommendations for the Noise Compatibility Study, which recommends ways to reduce the noise impacts in communities surrounding the Airport, focusing only on those impacts within the 65 decibel contour. The recommendations were presented on January 7th. On January 21st, they held a first of its kind, virtual public workshop, where they had breakout rooms addressing different topics, to mimic stations that you would normally have in-person. She thanked the several members that attended the successful workshop.

Once they receive comments from the FAA on the draft documentation, the draft documentation will be available publicly for 30 days and the Part 150 team will hold a public workshop and hearing. The final study and recommendations will come back before ANAC in April for members to review and make a decision to submit to the Airport Authority Board for their acceptance.

Ms. Knack then reported on the FAA's Neighborhood Environmental Survey, which updated a 1970's study on levels of aircraft noise annoyance, demonstrating that there is now a higher percentage of people that are annoyed by aircraft noise. The FAA is asking for comments until March 15th. More information along with easy to understand graphics, links to the technical documents and to the presentation that the FAA gave on this study, can be found on their website linked in this presentation¹.

4. Action Items

a. Approval of December 16, 2020 Meeting Summary

Tania Fragomeno made a motion to approve the meeting summary from the December 2020 meeting, it was seconded by Olivier Brackett. The motion was approved.

b. Review and possible action on Nighttime Departure Procedures

Sjohnna Knack briefed everyone on the status of the Flight Procedure Analysis (to reduce noise impacts outside the 65 dB contour). Two nighttime RNAV departure procedures had been put on hold, pending analysis in the Part 150. This analysis has been completed and the two procedures are before ANAC for their review and possible action.

Steve Smith from Ricondo reviewed the previous recommendations that came out of the Flight Procedure Analysis and have been submitted to the FAA; an amendment to the ZZOOO area navigation (RNAV) standard instrument departure (SID) still under review, and a request to move Noise Dots #4 and #5 further south, which was rejected by the FAA in September 2019.

He then reviewed recommendations for nighttime RNAV departure procedures. The CAC/TAC asked that ANAC place the two procedures on hold pending results of the Part 150 and any potential procedures that may change the initial departure heading. As it currently stands, no recommendations will impact that, therefore ANAC needs to decide how to proceed with the two procedures. He presented on two options for nighttime departures. The presentation can be found in the meeting materials at <https://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC?EntryId=13968>

Questions from ANAC:

Deborah Watkins stated that she is disappointed in both of these options and the lack of relief for Mission Beach. Mission Beach gets 100% of the planes departing at night, so neither of these plans actually work,

¹ FAA's Neighborhood Environmental Survey; https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/policy_guidance/noise/survey/

and in fact would lead to an increase in noise over her community. She believes Option 1 would create excessive noise impacts for Mission Beach.

Option 2 appears to be the best option for Mission Beach at this juncture. She suggested that SLEPN be used as the new RNAV satellite based procedure for Option 2. She proposed the Airport Authority prepare noise modeling for Option 2 and requested ANAC postpone voting on this night time departure procedure until the noise modeling has been accomplished.

Steve Smith said the idea with Option 2 was to keep things status quo. It's not the best option for Mission Beach, but it would not induce any increase overflights, unlike Option 1.

Matthew Price said if ANAC accepts the status quo and quantifies the status quo, he would vote for Option 2 since it doesn't do harm to Mission Beach and may help La Jolla. He asked Steve, if there's an exact coordinate of the BROCK waypoints or is it an influx that will actually have a huge impact on the influence of the new waypoint on noise in the northern communities?

Steve Smith said they do have a latitude and longitude for the BROCK waypoint and can pass that along.

Fred Kosmo said since there's been no noise modeling he doesn't think ANAC should vote on this tonight.

Anthony Ciulla would also like clarification on what noise impacts there would be along with modeling.

Chris Cole asked if either of the two proposals would be affected by the previous submission for extending the JETTI waypoint. He also asked how substantial Deborah's SLEPN proposal is.

Mr. Smith confirmed the JETTI waypoint would not be affected. Per Deborah's proposal, he explained, in the Part 150 they looked at several options and learned, anytime you try to move those PADRZ departures at night further South, the 65 dB contour starts to shift, and yes, it will reduce noise for people on the North side of the 65, but it will also start to increase noise further out into the Ocean Beach area in the 65. He stated if the heading that is proposed is South of where PADRZ is today, he is certain the contour will extend out 65 in some residential areas that aren't exposed to it now.

Judy Holiday said she would like to table the vote until they can see the map of the contours Steve mentioned.

Ms. Knack proposed, based on the comments heard today, to do the analysis and present it with the Part 150 options. She stated that it will not be a part of the Part 150 Study, but they can add information on the analysis for the options when making the presentation.

Robert Bates stated he's not ready to vote today as he would like to see more details for Option 1 and 2, and to see the specific coding for the SIDs. He also asked per the magnetic heading issue, is the 290 on the 293 or is it codified back to the 290. He also expressed concern about Option 2 that unless there's a continued RNAV route, that ATC clearance could result in early turns.

Mr. Smith explained the term "open SID" used by the FAA, is something that the FAA has entertained for airports who want to look at dispersion. In ANAC's case, we want to maintain existing conditions which is a dispersion of the 290-heading.

He explained as it relates to the magnetic variation question, if implemented today, they're going to implement it based on the 290 magnetic degree heading that's used today.

As long as they're filing the published procedure, early turns wouldn't happen.

Michael Herron believes there needs to be more studies on this.

Tania Fragomeno said she supports additional time and information. She asked if the option being considered might increase noise impacts for communities to the South, such as Imperial Beach

Mr. Smith explained that both the waypoint and ZZOOO procedure exist today and all that this is doing is putting some nighttime departures on there.

Heidi Gantwerk closed by confirming that ANAC is not rejecting Option 1 today but considering Option 2 and that refinement, and that the team will include more information about this procedure as part of their Part 150 briefing. ANAC will then make a more informed decision.

5. Public Comment

Tony Russell (SDCRAA staff) reported there were eighteen Public Comments that were emailed to the Authority Clerk by the deadline posted on the agenda. The Public Comments were distributed to staff and Committee members and posted online².

There were five public comments submitted to be read into the record. The following people read into the record.

Mike Tarlton read his submitted public comment into the record. His public comment is located on our website³.

Carol Knott, resident of South Mission Beach, said she feels like nobody cares about South Mission Beach and have been thrown under the bus for the convenience of other areas. She thinks giving one group of people 100 percent of the problem is absolutely not fair and asked how a committee of people who are representing us can vote that way. She would like some representation to someone who's going to speak up for their group and consider something that's more equitable rather than 100 percent of those stupid flights flying over her house that are so low when they come over South Mission Beach. Maybe three years ago, she thinks there was a big change in the flight path in that it used to be mostly over the JETTI, which seems like a good solution, but that changed and she was not aware of a change that was going to be made and had no input.

Will Schussel, resident of Mission Beach, asked if you would vote to have it over their own house, that he doesn't think anyone would. He hopes, as a minimum, that the committee will reconsider their decision until the noise abatement office consultants have provided the critical information promised by the public records request. The 290 nighttime departure should be, by all accounts, moved back to ZZOOO

Gary Wonacott, resident of South Mission Beach, said he is opposed to the procedure that would move all of the nighttime departures on PADRZ over Mission Beach. He believes the 290 vector departure is illegal and that it was never subjected to a 1050.1 environmental assessment to determine if by moving all of the post 10:00 p.m. departures from what is now ZZOOO to the channel opening, resulting in a noise impact on Mission Beach greater than 1.5 dB. The 290 nighttime departure should be moved back to ZZOOO which would be the most equitable and fair solutions with nighttime departures going east put on ZZOOO, and those going north put on PADRZ. In the flight procedure analysis, he believes the Airport Authority made false assumptions about the relative location of the 290 and PADRZ backbone and dispersion tracks and then drew conclusions from the results obtained from the AEDT model. He also believes they use the 2018 operations data for screening which would be fine except for the disparate difference between the nighttime departures for 2018, eleven split with seven on 290 and four on PADRZ, but then in 2026, four nighttime departures, which if this proposal goes through would end up on PADRZ. He said there are many cases ran by the consultant in the Part 150 potentially replacing PADRZ with

² ANAC February 17, 2021 Public Comment, <https://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC?EntryId=13969>

³ Additional ANAC Public Comments 021721 (revised); pgs. 6-9, https://www.san.org/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/API/Entries/Download?EntryId=14116&Command=Core_Download&language=en-US&PortalId=0&TabId=487

alternatives south of the Mission Beach peninsula, but they were all rejected based on erroneous criterion that a shift that adds new people is 65 dB CNEL that is not allowed and that there is no such FAA criterion, but there was a net decrease in population in houses in the 65 for all the cases analyzed. He said the key is that one analysis in the Part 150 was not ran to quantify the effect on the 65, this is the case where the 290 tracks were moved to PADRZ. He believes that this analysis would show a shift in the 65 but even worse with result in a net increase in the population in houses in the 65, also that all of these analysis and data have been requested but the Airport Authority has so far not been forthcoming, that they are hoping to blow all this by ANAC members without a fair and complete assessment. He hopes ANAC will not allow this to happen and will vote in opposition to the proposed new nighttime departure or at least vote to the furthest decision until the data is made available.

Tina Clippinger, a 30 year resident of Pacific Beach, said that she is opposed to the increase of noise and flights in any way that would impact the areas of Mission Beach, South Mission Beach, Point Loma, and Pacific Beach. She recognizes that growth is important but there needs to be a balance with the quality of living. She asked how is increasing the nighttime flight and the subsequent noise that they will have to endure, making the lives of San Diegans better. Currently they have a choice of over 500 flight off of a single-runway airport. She thinks that's plenty of flights for everybody to get in and out of the beautiful city. I'm in opposition to increasing any nighttime flights.


Cathy Ives, resident of South Mission Beach, said at the high time, pre-pandemic, she was recording an average of 750 flights a week starting at 6:31 a.m., that doesn't count all the business aviation that goes out between 2:00 o'clock and 5:30 a.m. and then arriving as well at any time. It is destructive to equality of life, sleeps and general mental wellbeing. She doesn't think it's fair that you're saving La Jolla for us that live here. She is opposed to really anymore flights and especially changing any flights that once again throw Mission Beach under the bus. They will have a flight almost every 3 minutes if this continues. The only time they have more than 20 minutes without an airplane is after 8:00 o'clock and to increase that time you can't have the out time life. Not only are they not involved in the Quieter Home Program, now you want to continue with the noise level here. She is opposed to any changes.

Albert Caravelli, resident of South Mission Beach for the last seven years, said over the last two to three years the noise has become pretty much unbearable with the exception of the pandemic. It's one of the positive things that have happened. Since I have to work from home I start my work day at 4:30 a.m., and will probably be like that post pandemic as well. The flights continue in the night time and go more through the night. The quality of life from the noise is unbearable and also the amount of soot and dirt on my patio furniture is ridiculous, that comes from the planes flying over. I would love to know who made the approvals because as I said three years ago I didn't feel as many planes flying overhead as pre pandemic and over the last three years it's just successively gotten worse. Over my house they start at 6:32 a.m. and it seems like every two minutes until about 7:10 a.m... There's several flights that fly lower than others and are louder than others. I plead to you to please don't create more traffic over South Mission Beach. Have them fly over the JETTI like they have before and don't put Mission Beach in such a bind like you have before.

6. Next Meeting/Adjourn

Next meeting is April 21, 2021.

Meeting was adjourned.


Sjohnna Knack (May 10, 2021 10:27 PDT)