SAN DIEGO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
LET'S GO.

# Airport Noise Advisory Committee

*Date | time* 4/26/2017 4:00 p.m.

*Meeting called to order by:* Heidi Gantwerk

## In Attendance

| Name | Affiliation | In Attendance |
|---|---|---|
| Captain (Ret.) Jack Bewley | Airline Pilot (Retired) | Yes |
| Lee Steuer | Representative for Congresswoman Susan Davis | Yes |
| Emmet Aquino | County of San Diego | No |
| Conrad Wear | Representative for San Diego City Council, District 2 | Yes |
| Carl "Rick" Huenefeld | MCRD | No |
| Susan Ranft | Downtown Community Planning Council | Yes |
| Kirk Hansen | Community at Large | Yes |
| David Swarens | Greater Golden Hill Community Planning Committee | Yes |
| Deborah Watkins | Mission Beach Precise Planning Board | Yes |
| Fred Kosmo | Peninsula Community Planning Board | Yes |
| Tom Gawronski | Ocean Beach Planning Board | Yes |
| Victoria White | City of San Diego, Planning Department | No* |
| Robert Cook | FAA | Yes |
| Brian Elliott | Representative for Congressman Scott Peters | Yes |
| Chris Cole | Uptown Planners | Yes |
| Justin Cook | Acoustical Engineer | Yes |
| Vacant | Commercial Airline Pilot Representative | No |
| Victor Avina | Representative for San Diego County Supervisor Greg Cox | Yes |
| Randall LaRocco | Midway/Pacific Highway Community Planning Board | No |
| Melissa Hernholm-Danzo | Peninsula Steering Committee | Yes |
| Angela Jamison | Authority Staff | |
| Sjohnna Knack | Authority Staff | |
| Heidi Gantwerk | Facilitator | |

*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. She welcomed Fred Kosmo, new to the committee. He represents the Point Loma Peninsula. Introductions were made.

### Presentation 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-Noise/Initiatives#405494-meeting-schedule

**Quieter Home Program Update** – Craig Mayer, Deputy Program Manager, Quieter Home Program (Program), provided an update on the Program's status.

**Craig** Mayer: For the last couple of months, our current applicant count on our wait list is 660, with a total number of homes or units of **1402**. That number is down a little bit from the last meeting that we had. The reason for that is we actually put new project in progress since then. And I'll talk a little bit more about why we did that, and what direction we're moving in here in a second. To date, in 2017, we haven't completed any homes, and we'll talk about that here in a second as well. And total homes completed to date are 3453. The update based on the last time we **got together** on where we're at with moving the program forward and starting some new projects—I think the last time we spoke, I let you know that we had submitted two projects to the FAA for review; Project 8.12, which was an 84-unit, non-historic, multi-family project that is designed to receive a **foundation** package in addition to the windows and the doors. And then the second group, Project 8.10, was a historic **group** of 13 single-family homes that are designed to receive a more elaborate air-conditioning system. Earlier this month, the airport executives met with FAA to discuss the issues that had been holding up us moving forward with some of these projects, and specifically to talk about these two projects that have been submitted. And as a result of that meeting, we received a verbal approval from the FAA to move project 8.12 forward with the bid process. While that's going on, we're still working with the FAA to resolve some of those other issues specific to air-conditioning systems and contract provisions that the FAA still has not allowed us to move forward with. So, we have the verbal approval to move forward with 8.12. We are implementing that process to move those contracts through the initial points of the bid process. But it really is not our policy to move forward on a verbal. And so, we're hoping that while we're going through this process again, the bid documents out on the street and contractor interest is generated in those bids, we're going to get some resolution with the FAA in writing, to be able to officially move those. In addition to that, I mentioned the number on our wait list has reduced a little bit, and that is because in anticipation of the FAA giving us approval to move forward, we want to have new projects lined up to go. And so, we've created two new project groups, group numbers 9.3 and 9.4. We took those homes from the current wait list, and we started the assessment process on those properties. Any questions?

**Conrad Wear**: I just have one question. Has that got **[00:09:51 unintelligible]**?

Mr. Mayer: No, actually, it's not in one central location. It's over multiple properties. It's more multi-family apartment.

**David Swarens:** It's not a question, but after last week, I was approached by a **resident** with an inquiry about **[impasse]** on their own property. **[00:10:26 unintelligible]**, and so if that person whose name I did not get, **[00:10:34 unintelligible]**, it would helpful **[00:10:39 unintelligible]**.

**Fred Kosmo**: I was approached by somebody and they told me that there was a slow-down in the Quieter Home Program, and less houses being done than had been done in the past, and so is there a slow-down? What is that, and what can we do to **get it back on track?**

**[00:11:10]** Mayer: Yes, that is what we are currently dealing with the FAA on, typically a program is completed approximately 300 to 350 units a year, and that is based on the size of the properties that we're working in, so the larger single-family homes are going to cost more money to complete than a smaller apartment. So, 300 to 350 units is our average per year. We haven't been able to move forward with the program on any new construction since August of 2016. That is the last project we completed—the last bit of construction. We've been working with the FAA since August of 2015 to resolve the current policy issues that the FAA wants to see incorporated into our program. And so, we had a timeline of projects that we were able to take through August 2016. The discussions really with the FAA were changing the policies.

**Fred Kosmo**: So, what are the main issues with the FAA?

Mayer: There has been a varied **number** of things. Over the course of these past couple years, we've been ticking those things off. So, back in August 2015, a very broad, complex list that ranged from we are no longer allowed to treat non-habitable spaces, so we can't put windows in **bathrooms** anymore, for example. And so, that was a really low-hanging issue that we were able to resolve and move on from. The more complex issues that we're still dealing with today, mostly are centered around air-conditioning. And the FAA policy book, in their handbook that we use to facilitate the program, is somewhat vague on what they will consider appropriate air-conditioning treatments. So, in the past where we have provided in some instances, a full heating ventilation and air-conditioning system, HVAC, the FAA has come back on different occasions and said, "We won't allow you to heat, so you have to take the H portion out of the HVAC." Then they've come back and said things like, "We might entertain HVAC, if it makes sense on a case-by-case basis." And so, we're still really trying to work through the nuances of what they will consider an allowable and eligible—and the key word is eligible, because our funding comes from the FAA. And if the FAA doesn't consider an eligible treatment, it won't pay for it. And so, that's why we've been unable to move forward with some of the **modifications** up to this point because this 8.12 project that I talked about earlier was bare bones. It was windows and doors, and a decent ventilation system that has taken from August of 2015 to now to finally get the ability to move forward with that project. So, there's a lot more complex issues that we still have to resolve with the FAA.

**Sjohnna Knack**: Said it at our last ANAC meeting, in order to get **QHP** working, as well as Angela has worked diligently on daily, to try everything we can **in these organizations**. We will continue that until the entire program is moving forward, and we're back to our normal status, which is 300 to 350 homes a year. So, we are very hopeful that we will get back to that normal status soon.

**Curfew Violation Review Panel (CVRP) Statistics –** Sjohnna Knack, Program Manager, Airport Planning and Noise Mitigation, gave a review of the curfew violations

Knack: We're looking at the last two months, so that would be February and March of 2017. And thankfully, we saw significant decrease in the overall number. We're going to look at the number for the total year of 2017. We're on par for where we were last year at this time; actually slightly higher. The interesting part is that we're up in assessed penalties for this time last year. And the reason for that, so if you will recall, at the last meeting in February, we reported on the fact that we had so many curfew violations over the holiday period. So, if you remember how we penalize aircraft, we look at six-month compliance periods, from January through July, July through January. And so, in our **Board**, we agreed on our $2000.00 for the first, $6000.00 for the second, $10,000.00 for the third. And then we look at the previous six months, and multiply that times the number of curfew penalties that **carrier w**as assessed. And so, just so you know, Frontier Airlines currently has a multiplier of four, so multiply all those numbers times four. JetBlue has a multiplier of five. Delta has a multiplier of five. And so, those dollar values add up very quickly, especially when you're on your third of more, that's times ten. So, I can tell you JetBlue, I think is on their third now, so $50,000.00 for any penalized curfew violation that JetBlue has between now and July 1st. Now, we do want to remind the panel, because we do have a new member, that the panel that reviews each situation, each violation, is going to look at the circumstances. And typically, a carrier that has a mechanical issue, local in San Diego, or there is weather local in San Diego, the fines are waived. We don't want a carrier to operate unsafely over San Diego. That's not 100 percent of the cases, but that is typically how the panel operates. Three total in the last two months; three February, none in March.

**Missed Approach Statistics** - Ms. Knack explained the definition of missed approaches. She clarified that a missed approach is done for safety reasons and cannot be influenced by the Airport Authority.

Knack: When I look at the numbers, we did see the increase over the last year's numbers, so we have 78 in February and 58 in March. But when you look at kind of total overall arrivals—so, this intended to be arrival. When you look at the number of missed approaches over the overall arrivals, we're still at less than **[1]** percent conducting missed approaches. One of the things that we did this time in an effort to continue to really dig into this data and investigate, is we looked at where these missed approaches are going. And so, a missed approach, I think there's a common misperception that every single missed approach is turning early to the left over Point Loma, or it's turning early to the right over Mission Beach. Those are absolutely sometimes the case, and so what we've identified here is the far right column. We call that non-compliant, if you will. And that's a flight that did a

missed approach, that didn't maintain the corridor. And you can see that out of 65 in February, only 9 were noncompliant. And in March, it was 5. So, that's out of those thousands of arrivals, those were the ones that were not flying a normal divergent path, which is in essence, to the **west straight up**. One thing we added that is not in your member materials, is the fact that when we were looking at these, not all missed approaches occur on the west end of the airport. There are some missed approaches, and we've identified one in this image here, are to the east of the airport. And so, what we're going to do from here on, I'm just going to separate those numbers, so you have an idea of where are the actual impacts because I do understand and acknowledge that missed approach early turns, it's flying over someone's house**.**

**Early Turns** –

Knack: The difference in early turns—so this is not missed approach, this is a divergent procedure. So, any aircraft that turns, before the FAA's noise dots. They are counted as an early turn. And we do not look at altitudes anymore. So, when you look at the overall statistics as compared to last year, obviously, you can see pretty significant decrease. We had an increase in February, slightly—57 versus 34, **both left**, Point Loma, right over Mission Beach. But then in March, we saw a dramatic drop; from 121 last year, to 21 this year. And we'll talk about why that is. So, if you look at just to the left, as you'll recall, most of you on the panel know that with the new Zoo procedure, which is the procedure that flies down to the Zoo waypoint, which is about two miles off the tip of the peninsula, when that procedure was implemented in November, we saw a significant reduction in early turns to the left. And so, you can see the numbers continuing to decrease in the months of February and March, 10 and 8. And you can see the breakdown of in general aviation 7, and then in the various carriers. We also show an altitude chart, although we count them all, and we still think it's important to note that some of the aircraft that are crossing over the peninsula are oftentimes at close to 9000-10,000 feet. If I look at the early turns to the right over Mission Beach, this is what we expected. So, when we saw the Zoo implemented, we saw early turns to the left decrease. And as we expected, when the PADRZ procedure to the right over Mission Beach was implemented, there is a waypoint that keeps aircraft within the noise dot, so we saw early turns to the right significantly decrease. So, last March there were 61, and this March, 13, so significant. And I do want to point out that in the month of February, between the 17th and the 27th, we had significant rain storms. If you recall, in the county, we had anywhere from three to five inches in that just over one-week period. And so, those numbers are very much indicative of that **poor weather**, and the FAA, and frankly the pilots needed to avoid those weather circumstances.

And then new this month, because we know the panel has been requesting this, we worked with the FAA to see what caused early turns. And so, we were able to determine that—the pending investigation, we're still waiting for feedback. ATC means it was something to do with Air Traffic Control. Pilot deviation, that's pretty intuitive; that was a pilot that did not follow the path—and then weather. And so, on the general aviation operations, we're actually calling them, so we can get the pilot command's contact information. We're talking to them. It's a very small effort because you never know if they're going to be operating out of San Diego. It's a very small GA portion. But it's a pretty good number, and so we feel it's important. We have monthly meetings with the FAA continuing to track this information, as well as reaching out to the carriers. You'll see when I talked with you about Fly Quiet, we reached out to the two that scored the lowest, if you will, to continually see that we work with that to include those numbers. But to be very blunt with you, if they fly the satellite-based **RNAV** procedures, it will **decrease. W**e're really going to be boiling down to where we were back in August of 2015, which is a very low number, which is reflected by an anomaly for traffic separation or weather.

**Metroplex Update –**

**[00:27:14]** Knack: I don't have an update on Metroplex, unless my colleagues from the FAA would like to give an update. I do want to mention to the panel though, that the last implementation doesn't have any San Diego procedures.

**Fred Kosmo**: Obviously, it looks like there's a significant improvement of **early turns** so that's good. I'm happy to see that. But it still looks like we had 224 early turns.

**[00:28:27]** Knack: No, that statistic is not reflected right now—not in Point Loma certainly, and frankly, not over Mission Beach either.

**Fred Kosmo**: Okay, because when I look at 2012, there were only 538 early turns all altitudes. And after that, 800, 1000, 1200, 700. As far as I can tell, we're on track for 900. Shouldn't' we be trying to get a number that's closer to the 538 number, than the **907**?

Knack: Well, as I explained, that's exactly what's happening. So, the number that you are referencing is the total number. And so, the first number that you mentioned, you're including the 146, which includes Mission Beach. And in January, that procedure, the new procedure to keep early turns from happening had not been implemented yet. So, if we look at the slide for just Point Loma, you can see that the numbers are significantly lower than last year.

**Fred Kosmo**: But, and then I wondered, on the early turns there's a decline. It seems like pilots think they get **away with it** and they can turn early to save money.

Knack: So, we have a presentation for that. And Jack, do you want to talk about pilots early turning and cutting corners to save money? As a pilot, I wondered if you wanted to answer the question about—he's indicating that pilots cut the corners to save money. So, what Fred had suggested is that some pilots are turning early because it saves in fuel costs, that they're making those decisions.

**Jack Bewely**: No, absolutely not.

**Fred Kosmo**: Okay, well, if the pilots aren't making early turns, does the FAA , or does radar and control.

Knack: So, let's look at the eight just from March. So, in 2016, there are **60**, and last month we had 8. And so, that is wholly reflected of the implementation of the ZZOOO procedure. So, again, I really believe that with these new satellite-based procedures, you're going to see numbers decrease down to where we're going to find the only things left are weather, an anomaly. The FAA, maybe you could talk about the anomalies with traffic separation? But frankly, we're down to those levels. And we're not going to get the higher levels that we've seen in the past year.

**Jack Bewely**: I would like to add a few things to my abrupt comment. First of all, pilots do not have the discretionary authority to make turns based upon their own, unless there is an emergency, such as avoiding a collision with another airborne object, or a lot of times if you have an engine failure, you deviate off course a little bit while you're managing that. But as far as taking a voluntary quick turn to save fuel, that may at one time have been an issue. It's not an issue today because **of** violation with the pilot and also with the airline, and that's unacceptable to the pilot. They're not going to take an arbitrary turn to save fuel. What really happened was we're constrained by the FAA, and by Air Traffic Control shortly after takeoff, around **300** feet. And normal procedure is turn on the flight control management system, which is now known as the autopilot. And the autopilot has a programmed departure on it. And so the autopilot flies the airplane. We won't deviate from that, unless Air Traffic Control instructs us to make a turn. So, we fly that pattern, and it's a **defined** pattern because it's done through a satellite now, so you can't get too far off.

Rick: That is accurate. None of the turns are arbitrary or capricious. They're all done for a good purpose, and it's all to preserve safety. And as you said, Jack, it's the flight management system that's flying the airplane.

**Knack**: I did agree with you, Jack. For those of you who have the luxury of attending an earlier session some months back, **Grady Boyce** gave a great presentation about just how he flies his airplane, how the airplane virtually flies itself. Once it does get slightly airborne, about 300 feet, as Jack said, the flight management system takes over. If there are early turns, they are not done arbitrarily or capriciously. It's all done with a purpose. It's all done for the preservation of safety.

**Rick**: And I might add that all of the air traffic controllers are—they're instructed also not to deviate unless there is an emergency.

David: I was just wondering, I know Sjohnna, you indicated that you were reaching out to the pilots. There are 11 flight deviations listed on this sheet, so **why** does occur for some reason?

Knack: From a general aviation perspective, what we were finding is that the general aviation pilots will either have put faulty information into this flight management system that Jack talked about, Roman actually talked to all of them, and we make sure that they understand the sensitivity of not meeting those noise dots. Additionally, we're going to put more materials over at Signature Flight Support, so that when they're briefing and when they're doing their flight planning efforts, they'll see where noise dots**.**

**Conrad:** I want to see what the **office** extrapolate's from a year's worth because if you have let's say, 10, on a single day, and you extrapolate that, that's 120 early turns for the entire year, if you base that off of **March**. So, I think **we have to wait until we have more data**.

**Noise Complaints Statistics** – Ms. Caroline Becker, Noise Mitigation Specialist, explained her presentation of noise complaints by month.

Becker: You can see we have a big increase from our last ANAC meeting. Over the past two months, almost **6300** complaints. So, while we are on track for the same number of complaints that we had for 2016, we have seen a greater number of complaints in the last two months. Out of those 6288 complaints, the largest number of complaints we had on a singular event is **7**. And I'm going to go through those top five complaints with you. So, two of them are from the same time period. They're from the 22nd. They happened during the nighttime procedures. The last two those did not have any noise dot violations. You can see that they just head straight out. This is our noise complaint breakdown, so there are percentages on what people are most complaining about. You can see **most** complaints were low or loud aircraft complaints, over the ocean, and then off-course and low and loud. We have a couple new categories that we hadn't seen before, continuous prolonged noise, or frequency of flights. That's a new one that we are now seeing these last two months, as well as people that are unhappy with the nighttime procedures. Previously we have presented on number of noise complaints per neighborhood, and this here, we're presenting the number of households **per neighborhood**. So, the reason for this change is so that whether a person sends us one complaint or 1000 complaints, we're looking at that the same way. They're both just as valid. And we want to treat them the same way. This is a new way to look at **tracks**—56 percent of those complaints came from La Jolla; 27 percent came from Point Loma. We're going to be investigating these in a different way. **Sjohnna** is going to talk about that a little bit more later.

**Victoria**: What is the nighttime procedure that was referred to?

Becker: They fly out on a **290** heading.

**Chris Cole**: I find **this breakdown** very impressive. I wonder whether have these—the complaints that are coming, that are categorized, are they helping you to talk to the airlines? I confess that I don't know that I can make anything out of this. I wonder if you're able to make anything out of it, and if you are, how is that happening then possibly represented here, classified here.

**Knack**: So, if I understand your question, you're asking if the categories that we created based on complaints are helping us in our conversations with our stakeholders. And the answer is not really. And so, I have a presentation later that's going to talk about how we can rectify that and get categories that will help us, and switch us from data entry into a case management role. So, if I don't answer it in my presentation, at the end, please follow up.

**Fly Quiet Report** –

**Sjohnna:** For the newer folks on the panel, this is our second Fly Quiet Report. What I'm reporting is 4th Quarter 2016. And so, the first slide is an executive summary, if you will, on the changes between 4th Quarter 2016, and 3rd Quarter. And so very briefly, and I'm going to talk in more detail about each element, and maybe I'll step back one second and say—and remind everyone that Fly Quiet Program is a system that allows us to grade or score an operator on how quietly they operate out of our airport. Right now, we look at three elements. We look at curfew violations, early turns, and the fleet, or the type of aircraft that they're flying. This type of program is used at other airports to allow us, the airport staff, an opportunity really engage with the operators in a dialogue, and get really specific. So, with that, looking at some trends, obviously, as we talked about, at our last meeting in February, we did have a high number of early turns, and we saw in 4th Quarter that United and Southwest had a pretty significant number of early turns. As I mentioned earlier, we did reach out to them, and we're hopeful that with the new procedures, I will say that both Southwest and United utilize I would say almost all the time—I think all of their aircraft— can be corrected—are satellite-based or satellite-equipped. And so, we hope that they'll be flying with the satellite procedures, which will inherently make them compliant with early turns. Curfew violations, again, we're looking at 4th Quarter. I hope at the next meeting we can get caught up, so I'm not going so far back. But curfew violations were high during the holiday period, as we discussed at our last meeting. And this brought several new carrier scores down. And then we'll talk about it later, we also had some operators that

cancelled flights. And when you cancel a flight, you get bonus points, so we'll talk about that. And then in general, as we look at fleet quality, this is an extremely generalized statement, that when an operator switches out their aircraft, they typically are replacing it with newer and oftentimes quieter—not always the case, but generally speaking. So, let me dig a little bit deeper into the scores, and by the three elements. And the first is curfew. United had the quietest, the best scores. So, they had a score of 11, which is the best, because a high score is 10. So, why did they get 11? Because they cancelled a flight. So, if an operator violates curfew and they are not penalized, we still subtract a point, because while they're not getting fined money, they're still making an impact on the community, a noise impact. If an operator violates curfew and they're penalized, we take away two points. Some trends that we saw here is Southwest—we hadn't seen curfew violations from Southwest since 2014. And this past year, they did have—I think they had a total of five or six, I want to say. So, they did slide on down on the lower end. I'm happy to report that we haven't seen them violate since January. And actually, we've only had two, and have less than a week left. JetBlue, unfortunately, with their two **red-eye** departures, they continue to have quite a few violations on those two red-eyes. And then Frontier—Frontier has a late-night—I believe it's a 10:30 or 11:00—close to 11:00 departure, and frankly, when you have a departure that late, it doesn't leave you a lot of wiggle room when you have weather elsewhere. And I mentioned to you earlier what doesn't get penalized, so if a carrier is late coming in—so if Frontier has weather in Denver that makes them late into San Diego, that doesn't waive the penalty. So, if they bring the problem in, that's up to them. That's a business decision. So, if they have crew delay, if there's weather, if they had a mechanical—JetBlue has a mechanical in Boston, in New York, and they get here late. So, these are the curfew scores. Now we're going to early turns. We do a slight adjustment based on how close to the noise dot. Again, I mentioned earlier we do look at an early turn that is more than 1500 feet, has more egregious it can go, and so you can see the ranking. We have quite a few operators that have zero. We do not—we keep the score very simple. We don't calibrate, if you will, or create a formula for the percentage of operation, because the feeling is that they're making a departure, and so there really shouldn't be **an equalizing** if you will. But I do think it's important, and the reason departures is on here is because it's a lot—they have a lot more chances, Southwest does, with 8522 departures, than say Spirit at **453**. So, I just wanted to point that out. So, these are early turns. And again, 10 is the quietest, the best. And then finally, we look at fleet. And this is probably the score we spend the most amount of time on. It took a lot of time to set up because we worked very hard with the carriers. We went to every single operator to show them how we calculated the score for them. We checked back with them to make sure that we're continuing to calculate it correctly because it looks at everything down to the engine type, maximum gross take-off weight, as well as an FAA certified aircraft. And so, we ranked those numbers. We do calibrate this score for percentage of operations. It's quite a bit easier, and you can appreciate has one departure a day, in a Dreamliner Boeing 787, which is the quietest airplane I think out there. It is their commercial aircraft. Then it is, although I'm hoping everybody is enjoying the temporary use of right now, **British 777**. But certainly, at this point, they were still utilizing the 747, so that's why they had a lower score.

Chris: On the **RNAV** from last quarter, is that reflected in **score**?

**Knack:** They do reflect the ZZOOO procedure, so this is from 4th Quarter 2016. So, it does have some of the ZZOOO. The ZZOOO was implemented in November, on November 2nd.

Chris: Does that translate to the age of the fleet, or not necessarily?

**Gene**: Well, If it's in a certain series, let's say, it could be a smaller number, so the series will be—basically the type that you see will determine really kind of the basis for the age.

**Knack**: 747s, where they have series, with three digits at the end of that 747, and it can range anywhere from—I don't think they fly anymore, so 300 all the way up to a 900. So, the 900 is one of the more newer, so you could intuitively say, but it's based on the engine type, and the engine configuration.

**Kosmo**: I'm trying to make some sense of **curfews** United, Delta, British, American, actually canceled flights. And yet, they do that because they want **to avoid** violation, or they just didn't have enough people on the flight to make it worth it.

**Knack**: Well, I can assure you that the latter is not accurate because as far as I'm aware, based on the statistics I've seen from out of our Development Department, our load factor, where a percentage of the plane is full, is often in the 80s or 90s, which is a full flight.

**Kirk Hansen**: I think that's good. I'm impressed to see that they actually care about **curfew.** On the next page, it looks like JetBlue has not been doing well on **curfew** violations and they have a very high score. So, is there a correlation they're so quiet, they think they're going to sneak through curfew?

**Knack**: No, I think they're well aware; they're not sneaking out, no.

**Subcommittee Update – Letter to FAA** –

Watkins: I'm Debbie Watkins, Chair of the ANAC Subcommittee. I'm going to give you an update. The Subcommittee met on Wednesday, March 15th. The topic of the meeting was an assessment of historical versus current arrival and departure procedures for 2009, 2014, and 2016, from communities of Point Loma to La Jolla Shores. The Subcommittee also welcomed a new member from La Jolla, Chris McCann. Mr. Sandy **Purdon** from Point Loma, gave up his seat so that La Jolla could be represented on the panel.

Watkins: Mr. **Rob Cook**, the FAA TRACON Supervisor, presented on the assessment of historical data for a one-month period in December 2009, 2014, and 2016. The subcommittee discussed various aspects of the presentation, including the weather impacts and aircraft sequencing impacting early turns. The reduction in early turns over the RNAV, ZOO, and PADRZ procedure implementation, nighttime departure routes on the 293 heading for noise, the number of aircraft, vector, and **in all proposed** procedures, the number of aircraft following the RNAV procedures, and there was a question about during the Torrey Pines Golf Tournament, it was perceived that aircraft avoided the area, and so that answer was never presented. And also, having aircraft altitudes decrease or the paths moved during the past three years. The Subcommittee meets again on May 17th, to review potential for procedure modification to limit or prevent early turns and missed approaches, and review FAA noise dot and. Also, FAA representation at our ANAC Subcommittee Meeting was discussed. The Subcommittee was concerned about the FAA attendee not being able to address questions, or make management decisions. As an attempt to request the FAA to send the appropriate personnel, I suggested a letter be written requesting the FAA sends someone to the Subcommittee Meetings, who could answer questions and provide the necessary support for the Subcommittee **work plan**. The proposed final draft to the FAA from the Subcommittee is in your packet for your consideration, along with the work plan. I will point out that I did not unilaterally write the letter, and it came from perspectives and intent of many of the Subcommittee members.

**[01:05:19]** Gantwerk: Hopefully, you've all had a chance to look at that, and I have spoken with the staff regarding board policy, and we all know, ANAC is not a board that can take action, and that can make recommendations to the Airport Authority Board. So, the question now will be does ANAC recommend that staff forward this letter to the Airport Authority Board for their consideration as to whether or not to send that?

**Victoria**: **Motion**

**David**: I second that.

Gantwerk: We have a motion, we have a second. Now we'd like to have some discussion on that. Yes, Brian?

Brian: I think our relationship with the FAA has been very good so far. I was able to with Barry or with Rob, and to have. And I read through the letter, it has a lot of possible alternatives to sending the letter to the FAA, just in order to maintain the relationship that we have, and the open conversations we've been able to have with them, and get responses. And though I have reservations about asking for information So, I know that we're willing to forward with the letter, with the FAA to make sure that we're still getting the information that we need on a basis, and the answers—and also some technical expertise.

**Victoria:** I would ask Debra if there's a specific frustration that you have that that you're needing from the FAA, because I read your letter, and answer your questions, but were you able to get answers at a later date from the FAA staff, or did you just feel like you didn't get answers at all?

Watkins: We didn't have any answers at all, so that's why there's a frustration. And the Subcommittee recommendation, we do need to have someone there who can make decisions and get the answers to our questions.

**Heidi:** And just to point out, we did have the follow-up to answers to quite a few of the questions that came up in that meeting, right?

Watkins: Yes, Sjohnna did send out some questions to the Subcommittee members. We **want someone** who has decision-making authority.

**Victoria**: So, I was just wondering if Barry was actually able to make decisions for you, or just give you guidance, and then take some things back to the FAA.

Watkins: Yes, **we** seemed to be getting things across, we need to know before we even spend our energy to figure out whether we have viable decisions.

David: One of the things that ANAC does well is provide quality the resources. I don't think we're ever compromising, and what I'm hearing seems to be occurring in the Subcommittee—we have such a quality of information and professionalism here. And if there's a question that's very specific, we made a commitment to very prompt response. I don't think it should compromise the relationship **of** active partnership and participation. It enhances the efficiency and effectiveness of the endeavor and makes it worthwhile**.**

**Conrad:** So, a couple thoughts on that. First, the FAA doesn't necessarily **need to be at these meetings?**

**Knack:** If they attend ANAC meetings or Subcommittee meetings, it's all voluntary. The board policy identifies they did make a commitment in front of the board, and they have met that commitment of supporting. But it is not a requirement.

**Watkins:** I think my last sentence, and that was that without the standing FAA representation, our communities' recourse is severely **lost an** opportunity. So, if they decide that Barry is not the right person, at least somebody needs to be here with decision making power.

Gantwerk: We're talking about whether we send this to the board for approval. Any other thoughts on that?

**Victoria:** So, are you suggesting that we not send the letter and have **the Airport** contact Barry?

**Knack:** I certainly think we can make the request of the FAA. I just want to be clear on the commitment on behalf the Airport Authority**.**

**Gantwerk:** So, requesting not to send the letter is what I'm hearing, and just have someone contact the FAA? Is that what I'm hearing from the motion? So, what we have on the table is **the Airport contact the FAA**.

Melissa: Can we put a timeframe on the request to Barry, and if he doesn't not respond positive, then on May 1st, we can send the letter? I appreciate time is of the essence, and that's a waste.

**Gantwerk**: And I just want to come back, so I hear that. I understand it's a sentence we're talking about. Were there other comments in terms of tabling? Is there anyone who supported that, or does anyone want to speak?

**Melissa**: I support tabling it. I'd like to hear what Sjohnna is going to present.

**Sjohnna** I think the sentiment is well-received and well-heard, and that heeding to some of our official's concerns, it impacts the relationship, it might be and only suggesting that it may be worthwhile to reach out and see if he will; similar to how we handled, frankly, the 16th. We didn't need a 16th member. We got La Jolla represented. I fully understand concern. It's heard loud and clear, but I think that we can—that the Airport Authority can at least make the request, and then report back to ANAC with how that request went.

**Gantwerk**: **Sjohnna** is going to reach out directly to the FAA, to ensure that someone appropriate is at the meeting on May 17th. I think we'll do that in short order, and report back to the ANAC Committee before our next meeting.

**Victoria**: I just want to say we have a motion on the floor, and we need to remove the motion—

Gantwerk: Yeah, that's the question. So are you still willing to put the motion—to table it after what we discussed? David you are you going to second that. So, we are tabling it, which means we'll take it up in the future, depending on what happens with this discussion. If we table a motion, does it not come back at the next—yes. But you will get information in the meantime from any discussions that Sjohnna has.

## 2. Public Comment

Ms. Gantwerk opened the public comment period. She reminded the public that each speaker would have three (3) minutes to speak and would not be able to go over the allotted time, to ensure all speakers get an opportunity.

**Allen Harris:** First, I thank you for asking some questions on this Fly Quiet data. It's very interesting that on April 5th, we had ten flights that are turning north over La Jolla. We wonder are these flights turning north to clear a path to avoid curfew violations? It's real interesting that United has the highest score, but they have three flights that typically turn north most evenings, including on American Airlines and Japan Airlines. And so, we would like to have more data on that. And also, kind of I sit on the Subcommittee, and kind of disappointing that you tabled this motion tonight because we only meet every other month, and the next meeting is our last meeting before we make recommendations to this committee. What was missing from the letter is the FAA sent a presentation that wasn't even the right data. Representative from the FAA did not answer any of our questions, and basically just said, " I do not know" to get back to the Subcommittee, so that's very disappointing that we don't have that support. Thank you.

**Urs Baumann:** My name is **Urs Baumann**, village of La Jolla. And until about last October, we didn't have any noise, and now we do have noise, and lots of noise, and they fly close to the shore, and whatever the statistics say, fine, but we feel this is **very different**. I was a **flight attendant** for 25 years. I know a little bit about airplanes, a little bit about airplane noise, but I can tell flights are close to the shore. They're low going **north** especially. So, this is a direct question of course, to the FAA. Why are you not going further out before turning right? In Europe, dense populations, flights are probably a lot faster going up to the higher level, and cruising.Thank you.

**Gary Wonacott Mission Beach** Town Council: I have come to talk about for the ANAC consideration. One of them is what we call an education pilots that fly over Mission Beach using PADRZ. We've had a chance now to see how the new PADRZ is shaking up. What we're seeing is a lot of planes coming over Mission Beach, so I just wanted to talk about that. The other is talking about **stage four** operations. So, I got a copy of **the** Fly Quiet database, and I used that to identify all the **stage four** aircraft that they were looking at in their quality noise scores for all the airlines. What I found out is that there is a strong correlation between the airlines that had predominantly, or maybe even all stage four aircraft, and ones that had the quietest scores. So, for me, it tells me that that's the direction we need to be going. Another thing I came across in this, Southwest Airlines in their—online, talks about their fleet, claiming that they have about 80 percent stage four compliant aircraft, and yet we see Southwest Airlines having one of the lowest—actually the second lowest scores of all the airlines in the flight score analysis. So, I don't quite understand how that is. I mean if maybe Southwest is flying their stage four somewhere else, because maybe this is a rationale for wanting to put pressure on them to fly here. So, getting a consultant, to come in, do an analysis, to determine what's the best case scenario for 100 percent operation of stage four aircraft. And then we had something to shoot for, using this metric, that would track this even better than the Fly Quiet score. So, that was one thing I wanted to present to the ANAC. The second thing is again, we have a pretty good idea of how things are shaping out as far as the PADRZ. And one of the things we're seeing, this is a Google map that shows a picture—shows Mission Beach. That plane is this plane here, which is shown in green. The is the aircraft heading versus time. And you can see that it's coming up, and it comes to about 300 degrees heading, so that—once you've got a plane with a 300-degree heading, sure it's going to fly over Mission Beach. Compare that with a plane that is flying the nighttime heading, and that's over here, it comes up to about 290 degrees. That plane flies south of this. I think this is really an educational issue. When you take off and then fly a 300, and you fly a 290, there is no requirement of—and there is a big difference in Mission Beach if they're flying 300 or 290. So, I think it's a matter of letting the airlines know, letting the pilots know that if they fly, they takeoff, they take over the heading of 290 degrees, that they're going to fly south of Mission Beach Peninsula. So, that's the other thing we propose for consideration by ANAC.

**Lee Miller:** I've lived in La Jolla for about—almost 30 years, within a block of the beach. And in the last few months, the amount of noise from aircraft has risen exponentially. I was home trying to work yesterday, and the aircraft were nonstop. Historically, we have a lot of aircraft noise from military—Marine helicopters, and private helicopters and private planes. The sound of water is amplified exponentially, so it's very noisy. It's like a little aircraft highway along the beach there. And now, seemingly, all of a sudden in the last maybe six months, we have noise from commercial aircraft has increased. I took time yesterday, instead of working, and noting these 60 aircraft noise issues that I dealt with, and 40 of those commercial aircraft, several of them I could see were Southwest. They were that close. It looks to me, just visually, from experience, is that they're much closer to the

coast and much lower. That's just what it looks like because I've lived there a very long time, and I've never seen anything like this. So, out of 60 noise issues, 40 were commercial. And at times, everything went 3:34, 3:35, 3:38, 3:41, 3:47, 3:53, 3:58. It goes on and on. It was like a parade. I just couldn't believe it. And the noise, I don't know like that normally, but over the ocean, it lasts a very long time, so the noise may start, but then takes a minute to four minutes to dissipate. So, it's constant, constant, constant. That came to, with both the noise issues, every seven minutes if you averaged it out over a seven-hour period. That's kind of stressful—very stressful. Thank you.

**Beatrice Pardo:** I have attended many of your ANAC meetings and Subcommittee meetings, and thank you Debra, for asking to get a member of the FAA that is a decision maker. We think time is of the essence on this. We want the problem solved in La Jolla like now, not 20 years from now. So, for us, time is of the essence. It shouldn't be that difficult to get a decision maker. We really want this problem to be resolved. We can't wait for the red tape. My goodness, we have a problem. This is affecting our lives. And if I seem like I'm freaking out right now, it's because I am. I was up until 11:30 last night, even though I had a very early meeting this morning. At 11:30 was the last flight. It was very noisy. So, we want this problem solved. And we want it done now. Please.

**Chris McCann:** I live in La Jolla, and I **sit on** the Subcommittee for La Jolla. I appreciate all the work you guys are doing. Certainly, this a contentious issue. People are having their quality of life impacted, and we appreciate your guys' efforts. I want to read you a letter I received today from La Jolla. My name is Russell **Moll**, and I live on in La Jolla. My home is located on the southeast side, unhappily, directly under the current approach patterns of aircraft arriving from the west and the north from San Diego. My wife and I were away on a series of trips from mid-November 2016 until early January 2017. When we returned home, we immediately noticed aircraft flying over our home that hadn't ever been present before. I think this has been a **contentious** change, the aircraft leaving and arriving at San Diego Airport. Furthermore, it appears that they are extremely unreceptive to acknowledging that these changes have adversely affected thousands of people. In our specific case, many arriving flights over our home. Furthermore, while the WebTrak site lists the aircraft at about 8500 feet altitude at the time they fly over our home, common sense indicates otherwise. Many planes appear much lower in altitude, and hence, create **noise.** When I read the FAA has tinkered with flight patterns in March, there has been no **change.** But I'd like to also go on the record as saying I'm disappointed about the situation with the letter. That letter was crafted over many, many, many, many exchanges, and it simply an expression that we need someone at least with Barry Davis' managerial capability, and ability to understand the FAA management process at the meeting. Justice delayed is justice denied. He needs to be there, or someone like him needs to be there, so we can work **rapidly** with him. We **reply** on the FAA to find a solution. If the FAA doesn't show up with someone who helps us make solutions, they are part of the problem. Also, I thought it was interesting that Southwest has some of the lowest Fly Quiet scores, when as **Gary** said, they claim 80 percent of their fleet is stage four. But you also have to realize that Southwest, based on the numbers and the documentation presented today, has four times as many operations as any other airline. So, we have the worst noise offender operating the most often. Lastly, I notice that you mentioned there are 8229 complaints so far this year. I'm curious how many of those were received by email. And I ask that question because I notice that was not covered in this presentation, that you're going to see email complaints on May 27th. So, if even a large percentage of those complaints that you're receiving already are by email, I would expect your charts at the next meeting to show a significant decrease in complaints if you guys are cutting off an avenue to receive them. Thank you for the work you guys are doing.

**Matthew Price:** Good afternoon. I'd like to focus on what's happening after 10 p.m. because it's particularly egregious. It's after 10:00 and 11:30, the noise is nonstop. And if you look at the flight patterns, part of it, or a major part of it is the fact that flights that are headed east that normally would go south, go north, but continue to fly north as far as all along **the** coast, and then fly south. So, from here, as the plane comes at us, turning and going all the way down, as they increase in altitude. And now we have also seen is that the top four airplanes that are complained about were all turns over **La Jolla** itself, eastbound flights, turning over. That's a that's part and parcel what's happening after 10:00 flights. So, I think that noise abatement for the entire area of our community, including La Jolla, not just the **southern** communities. I think that really needs to be addressed. Number two is you guys are doing hard work. I know that in the last session, there was a motion to add a member to this ANAC Committee from La Jolla. I'd like to just step back and look at the complaints this session, and you will see that a number of household—not the number of complaints—the number of households from La Jolla, if you add all communities, the sum is greater than the sum of all the other communities in San Diego; more than Point Loma, more than Ocean Beach. All of those put together doesn't equal La Jolla. The rationale for not adding a member

to this community was the bylaw or the rationale that committees should **be** to sit on this committee. I will say to you that there are communities on this committee, where in that community, there are plenty of areas that don't reach that target. So, I would submit again, even the fact that now, that most people here are from La Jolla, and the overwhelming majority of people affected by the aircraft noise in San Diego are from La Jolla. I ask that we have a **seat**. Thank you very much.

**Patty Davidson** I live in La Jolla. And I've noticed increased commercial air traffic outbound from near the coastline. The flights appear to be lower and closer to the coast. My family is disturbed by the most, while. And peaceful and quiet after 9:00 p.m. in our neighborhood, with few cars and not much noise. The number of flights was considerably less, and not a big problem. There are now routine outbound flights, which take off every 30 minutes, while flights approach from the east. This is double whammy of noise, and bombardment which can last five minutes. We get visual jet engines, audible noise, with associated pollution from the. So, we're really getting tired physically, and mentally.

**Cameron Volker:** I live in La Jolla Shores. I'm here to discuss the loud jet airplane noise from jets over my home in La Jolla Shores. I have lived there for over 30 years, and it was always exceptionally quiet and peaceful. Until approximately last November—it started with a few late-night jets blasting over our neighborhood around 10:30 or later at night. We didn't know what they were. I thought they were military jets; couldn't understand why they were there. But I now understand that these jets are departures which have turned sharply over La Jolla to fly east at night. Since these initial noisy jets started waking us up at night, we have additionally experienced a severe change in La Jolla Shores. The continuous arrivals flying directly over our homes in La Jolla Shores, we hear all day long, the blasting noise of jets flying continuously all day and night over our homes in La Jolla Shores. Jet noises are truly impacting our quality of life, and highly agitating, likening it to living with a giant kitchen blender or low, medium and high over our homes. This is truly hard to bear. In the recent past, we had no noise in La Jolla Shores from jet airplanes; it was always quiet, with the exception of some small planes and helicopters. We would like it if fight patterns, paths and altitudes could be examined and adjusted, so that La Jolla Shores can revert back to our previously peaceful neighborhood, not one which is because of the frequency of flights, which never used to fly over us, and have a large where no one is impacted by turns to eliminate the noise. We also know that there is another historical over major freeways and industrial areas where flights could be directed for arrival, away from La Jolla Shores. Thank you.

**Krishna Ratnam:** Good evening. I didn't really prepare a speech, so I'll just speak off the cuff, but rather than saying something else. And this issue is quite important to all of us. If you'd asked me a few years ago, where is the greatest place to live in the entire country, I would say the name of it, so much so that small house was perfect for us. We had two kids. And as of last year, we decided to remodel, so we submitted the permit to the city, and, and now I'm revisiting whether that was a good idea to do. The airplane situation. Some are dated. I'm very. I have a four-year-old, and a 21-month-old. One of my four-year-old's first words was **airplane**, because we would go to the coffee shop, and watch these silver objects fly over the ocean. And he would say, "Airpane." And we couldn't tell what airline it was, but it was some jet flying over the ocean. Fast forward to my then two-year-old, who is now four years old, and now I have a 21-month-old. And she also says, "airpane." Except now when I'm sitting in that same coffee shop, but when we're staring out over the water, and she says "airpane," I can now see a Southwest Airline. I can see United Airline. And I spend a lot of time with my four-year-old looking at airplanes, so. Now, there's three options here. Either are moving into the ocean, and thus I can see the airplanes. If that was the case, that's a huge problem. And then you probably. Option number two, I'm, and as I get older, my hearing and vision are getting better also. Option number three is that these airplanes are coming closer. I think there's other people out here that think the same thing that I do. So, while I'm hopeful for number two, I'm really dreading number one, even the fact that I have for reconstruction of a house in hopes of living there the rest of my life, number three kind of sucks. Thanks.

**Kasia Navarro:** I'm an attorney. I'm a mother of a five-year-old little boy. I've lived in La Jolla for 17 years, and we've enjoyed utter peace and tranquility, never considered leaving my home, or leaving La Jolla, even when our family expanded, and busting at the seams in terms of space, until now. And that's because we literally feel like we're under **siege**. Our peace and tranquility has been utterly robbed from us, without any notice, and without any consent. Where I live we are now privy to the constant jet noise of planes arriving and directly flying over my

home. I can see the airlines, I can see the colors, I can tell you exactly who is flying over. I don't have to go on the flight tracker to figure it out. The noise starts, I'm sure as you know, 6:30 in the morning, continues every couple of minutes, like a blender, perfect analogy. It's incredibly unsettling. It's disturbing. That's with our doors and windows closed. And we're not even in the summer months yet. I guess we were fortunate that we had all this rain because it actually masked to some degree, the noise of the jets. And I think that's why, to a great extent, it went unaddressed by our neighbors. But we're all noticing it now. We're going to notice it more as soon as the windows and doors begin to open because we live this indoor-outdoor beautiful lifestyle in Southern California. And I want to add one more thing. When we decided to first start, there was a reason why we purchased it in La Jolla, and not in Point Loma—because we knew that there were certain areas of San Diego County that are inherently going to be subject to some form of airplane noise. The loudest noise that I ever heard in all these years, what started in November, was the sound of Air Force One flying overhead when—after President Obama was here once. We've never heard anything like this. It's incredibly distressing. We are demanding changes immediately. We will not wait. I am extremely disappointed with this committee, with this demonstration of silly bureaucracy, and not empowering the Subcommittee to make recommendations, and make decisions, and to act on behalf of its constituents. Shame on you all. I'm going to go home tonight and explain to my kids again why they have to close their windows, because they're disturbed by the airplane noise. And I'll explain that it was because of inaction by your committee. Thank you.

Gantwerk: Thanks again for all of you who took the time to be here. What's your name sir?

Christopher Roberts.

Gantwerk: I called you. I said your name. No, I called you to be next, and so go ahead, sorry.

Chris Roberts: I guess the first time I guess is when by planes that are approaching from the north. This again, started in November. And recently, the National Transportation Noise Map came out. It was published in the newspaper. And you can see that there's a Nike Swoosh out in the east. That Nike Swoosh has been moved forward and what is being heard now in La Jolla Shores is all because the altitudes have lowered. This is bringing quite—the one thing that's left out, I think is the actual topographical map. So, all of these planes are coming in. They might be showing at 8000 feet, but when they fly over terrain that's 1000 feet. Where I live at 1300 feet, the planes are coming in at **4800** feet. This is quite a disturbance. The other thing that happened is with moving of the Swoosh, is with the turn, approach. But this is **[not as positive]**. Planes that are arriving from **Montgomery** Field use Mt. Helix as a visual sight. They're flying to the left at 2500, 3000 feet. The planes coming from La Jolla Shores are flying at about 4500 feet. Three instances on April 1st, from 8:00 till 10:00 in the morning, if we go back to WebTrack's history, you can see direct intersection of the plane within 15-1600 feet of each other, literally on top of each other. I envision Harrison Ford at those controls. Sure, maybe the FAA just feels that 15-1600 feet is within an acceptable range, but the only that I'm aware of in San Diego has been a small plane interfering with. So, I probably think that this was to those historical altitudes, because the flight path right now is coming through different airports. You have Montgomery Field, Gillespie Field, and the lower approach is commercial air path with the small planes. And a lot of these are flown by student pilots; student pilots that don't speak English. So, the control tower may be giving instructions they might not understand. They're making loops around San Diego using Mr. Helix as they're visualizing their approach to Montgomery.

Karen Marshall: All I want to know is why is there not a representative from the FAA here today?

Gantwerk: There is; there are two. There are two. You really need to keep it very brief.

Karen Marshall: I will keep it brief. One thing I want to know is, I feel that you have lied to residents in La Jolla, Pacific Beach. I have lived here for 14 years. I live in Point Loma, and there's a letter here that's written by one of your supervisors, **Craig Cox**. And it talks about the accommodation of people that live under and around an airport. Well, we don't live around an airport, so what you've basically done, is there have been letters that have been signed and have gone to Washington, D.C., stating that these people that live around the airport should have some type of relief. Well, I don't live by the airport, okay. I live in La Jolla Shores. My husband works very hard. We are not like the hoity-toity—what's the word—the stigma—doesn't matter where you live. The matter of fact is this started in 1998, when and supervisor, and no one, as far as I know, in the community of La Jolla and

Pacific Beach, Mission Beach were ever notified about this information, even back in 1998. So, this has already been in progress. So, I think it's unfair. I think that you are corrupt. I think there I a reason that as a kickback from the airlines. But it is so disgusting, I can't tell you. And how you've affected my life—every day I hear planes going over and over and over and over and over. I'm an avid gardener. I spend most of my time outside, not behind walls. And I can't even enjoy my peace and quiet and serenity in my own home. So, shame on you again, FAA, you are corrupt and you're liars. That's how I feel.

## 3. Approval of February 17, 2016 Minutes

Ms. Gantwerk called to motion of approval of the February 27, 2016 meeting minutes. **David Swarens** approved the motion and **Chris Cole** seconded the motion.

Fred Kosmo: I just officially abstain.

Gantwerk: You can officially abstain. Thank you. And Victoria has abstained. We are running late and we have two major presentations. Thank you all for sticking with it.

## 4. Information Items

**Eugene Riendel** – **HMMH –** presented noise regulations for airports, specifically looking at the noise stages of aircrafts, and noise and access restrictions to airports from US airports. Since the dawn of the Jet Age, back in the late '60s, we've had regulation that Congress has put into action, starting with the Aircraft Noise Abatement Act, followed then in the '70s with the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act, or also known as ASNA. And then in 1990, the Airport Noise and Capacity Act, or also known as ANCA, which really talked about the phase-out of the older stage type aircraft, or the noisier stage aircrafts, particularly stage two; and then limits on restrictions was also put in there on stage two and stage three aircraft. But also, most recently, the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, then restricted or phased out the lighter jets, the general aviation type jets that were stage two. So, based on the regulations, then the FAA has put into—based on the Congress action, the FAA has then put in some Federal Aviation regulations, starting with Part 36, which talks about how you certify and measure aircraft noise levels, know as Part 36 Noise Standards, which begins to set how you measure the aircraft noise levels, so then the operating noise limits under Part 91, then starts to define the stages, such as stage two. The Airport Noise Compatibility Planning, also known as part 150, is how airports are to go about determining land use compatibility, and resolving incompatible uses around the airport. And then lastly, is the Notice of Approval of Noise and Access Restrictions, which is known as Part 161, which discusses the restrictions on stage two and stage three aircraft. So, having said all that, basically begin to think about it as what Congress has done are the relevant statutes, and then how FAA has responded to those. Part 36, mainly what it's about is it's about noise certification of aircraft to ensure that aircraft that are built today are using technology to provide the quietest aircraft that we can, based on the technology that's available during the time of their manufacturing. That's really what Part 36 is about, to noise-certify those aircraft, and to try to help those aircraft manufacturers get new technology to quiet **aircraft**. Part 36 provides stages. We're up to now stage five. Stage one are those aircraft that have never been certified, or failed certification. Stage two is the loudest aircraft that do meet stage certification, and three, four, and five, set the limits. We have phased out all stage two aircraft, or essentially all stage two aircraft. And there is no plan in place for Congress action to phase out any other aircraft in the fleet. Now moving on to Part 161, it really restricts access to airports from aircraft based on noise. And it lays out Part 161 of the Federal Aviation Regulation that lays out how to go about restricting aircraft, whether stage two, or stage three type aircraft. It's really a comprehensive analysis. You have to first of all, come up with what is the noise problem you're trying to solve, what are the impacts based on your analysis, and cost analysis. And it really does encourage voluntary agreement throughout the country on page two. In fact, San Diego is one of the ones that did come up with a voluntary measures, going back into the late '90s, to actually retire stage two aircraft sooner at San Diego. There are six statutory conditions that must be met. It has to be reasonable, non-arbitrary, non-discriminatory; no undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, maintain safe and efficient use of the airspace, no conflict with existing law, adequate opportunity for public comment, no undue burden on national aviation system. There are many roadblocks, or potential roadblocks in conducting a Part 161. First of all, there's no guidance on how to determine the cost analysis. Also, Aviation Interests, which is a key data source, it's really unlikely to get that type

of data that you need in order to successfully complete a 161. FAA has made its opposition clear. They've opposed any—or not approved any Part 161. One has been approved, but it had to go through a court system at Naples, Florida. So, the FAA disapproved it, and then the courts overturned that, going through a pretty lengthy process to do that. But that's the only one that's been totally successful. It is thought to be also—and this is a key important piece, is that it is expected to be the place yet to go, and that is Part 161 is the last resort. And that's part of what Part 150 is supposed to do, is try to use Part 150, which is the Noise and Compatibility Land Use, is to rectify the problem using other means than Part 161 for use restrictions. And San Diego has a number of noise and access restrictions already in place, known as their Airport Use Regulations. And Part 161 also provides grandfathering, which says that San Diego can continue to have those use restrictions because they were enacted prior to ANCA, the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990. However, those regulations, if you were to make them more restrictive than they are today, would result in them being actually thrown out completely by the FAA because you can't make them more restrictive. You can make them less restrictive , if you change them, but any change you make to your Airport Use Regulations, have to maintain the restrictions you have or make them less restrictive.

Victoria White: Did you say that San Diego has a restriction on stage three aircraft already?

Sjohnna: It's basically specific to that decibel level. And it's really the louder aircraft.

Conrad Wear: What is the typical lifecycle of a stage aircraft?

**Gene**: Aircraft are lasting a lot longer than they were originally designed for. Stage two aircraft would still be flying today, if they were not phased out. There are some stage three aircraft, such as an MD-80, that are on their last leg, so to speak, and they were built back in the early '70s. So, a fleet is around quite a while after stages. So, I would guess 30 to 40 years before a total stage.

**New Flight Tracker and Noise Complaint Entry** – Sjohnna: we are switching our web-based flight tracking program over to a new vendor. We as a government agency, have to go through competitive processes. So, we did go through a process, several years ago, but we did select a new vendor. And so, what we've been doing the last couple of years is working with this vendor to maintain the same usability, the same functions as our current—we'll call it our old WebTrak system, but make it better, so provide things that we can customize to our own community, such as the noise dots. And then secondly, and hand in hand with that, is looking at a way making sure that the information we receive from the public, is in a way that we can actually do something. Right now, we're spending a lot of time just doing data entry, and so if I can drill into this a little bit more, first I want to do a side-by-side comparison, just to be clear about what the WebTrack system was, versus Flight Tracker. And so, I've done this side-by-side comparison, and I've looked at five different features, which were the most common features, if you will, of the systems. So, WebTrack is a near real-time feed, and just so you know, the FAA source of data is available to a multitude of vendors. Airlines buy it, airports buy it, it's open to a multitude of vendors. So, you're all buying the same data source. And there are limitations on when they can release that data. We are not allowed to release it in real time. There is also limitations on the type of flights that are filtered. There's actually rules on what must be filtered for security purposes. So the near real-time feed with WebTrak is about 30 minutes. With the Flight Tracker, that's our new system, it is 15 minutes. when we get a string of data, we're finding more complete information. Historic data currently in WebTrack, you can go back and do historic flights up to three months. And with Flight Tracker, you'll ultimately be able to do six months. We started it on April 1st, the data feed, and so it's going to take us a few months to build up, but ultimately, we'll be able to look back over six months. The noise monitors is different between WebTrack and Flight Tracker, and the difference is that because this is different vendor. Every night **Casper** is uploading that noise monitoring data, so that when the community wants to go back, the next day, they can see the noise levels. And what we're getting in those complaints is typically just not enough information for us to make any good investigation. And so, what we're going to do in doing this, and this is very common—in fact, we studied—most of the major airports are moving into this system. LAX did it about six months ago. And that is going from email to a web-based form. And yes, there is going to be an initial period where it's going to be more challenging for the public because instead of just—we do find that there's apps out there where they can click once. What we need is we're going to have drop-down menus that will ask is this an arrival, is it a departure, is it a helicopter, is it a jet? And that way, when we get that information, we can actually do some investigation. We can do some case management. And Caroline alluded to that. Whereas, right now, all we're doing is inputting data. And so, what this new procedure and process allows us to do, it automatically goes into this system, so we aren't doing data entry anymore. It instantaneously provides the

statistics, and we can analyze the data any way that we want, so that we can move into the case management. a lot of resources that we could be working that we could be doing analysis and queries and charts. And this is going to afford us that opportunity to do that

Melissa: Are you going to have a bounce-back  for the people that are used to emailing?

Sjohnna: Just to be clear, the bounce-back it will only do the first time. The bounce-back starts tomorrow.

Melissa: Dropdowns—I know some of the people **have trouble** deciphering between perhaps a navy jet, a commercial airliner and a helicopter is not an easy thing for them. So, if they answer incorrectly, then they put helicopter when it's an airplane, what does that do to your data?

Sjohnna: I think that we have option if you don't know, to pick "other" category. We would be interested to hearing some of the feedback. We don't have the ability to make big sweeping changes, but if there are small things like items on the dropdown, that's pretty easy to modify if we hear from members of the public that it's not really suiting the concern.

Melissa: So it won't be thrown out as inaccurate?

Sjohnna: No, we don't throw away complaints, but I understand what you're saying. We wouldn't throw it away. What I hope is that we can start following up with more people. We'll have more time. We can call and say, "Hey, we see you filed a complaint about a helicopter, I don't see any helicopters around. Did you mean a different type of aircraft?" if you are submitting a complaint around a certain **time**, it's going to tie those aircraft, so that will also help us and the system will try to help us.

**Watkins**: I just want to thank you for putting this new Flight Tracker in place. I have to let everybody know that thanks to the Subcommittee's recommendation, we're moving to something that is more accurate and so I commend you for looking into that, and help our recommendation. Thank you.

Victoria: I was taking to heart that concern from a community member about email, that maybe I'm wondering if it would be possible to send out an email blast to the people who have emailed you in the past, letting them know that this new functionality will be available, and that they won't be able to email in the future? And then another couple thoughts on, let them know can be more helpful, because there are a couple of community newspapers, that maybe you could write an announcement to those local papers to let them know about this service that would help the changeover.

Knack: We can send out a blast email to everyone that has complained via email in 2017.

**Fred**: I just want to say I appreciate all the effort. I personally thought that WebTrack was very difficult to use, and frustrating, so I think anything we could do to get more accurate reporting and more accurate data.

**Sjohnna**: If people are amenable, we are going to email you an Airport Authority Update, as opposed to going into detail on that. Any other new business?

## 5. New Business

***[There was some new business mentioned at the end of the previous discussion]**

## 6. Next Meeting/Adjourn

The next meeting is scheduled for June 21st, at 4:00 p.m. location to be determined, as the current conference room will be closed for construction. The meeting was adjourned at **7:20** p.m.

Sjohnna Knack
2019.12.06 10:48:29
-08'00'