

MEETING SUMMARY

Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 05/05/2021 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 | | |
| Celestin Fausino | 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 | No |
| Michael Herron | Valley De Oro Community Planning Group | No |
| 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 | No |
| Carl "Rick" Huenefeld | MCRD | Yes |
| Robert Bates | Airline Pilot (Active) | Yes |
| Kallie Glover | Performance Engineer, Delta Air Lines | Yes |
| Dave Ryan | NBAA | Yes |
| Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members | | |
| Justin Cook | Acoustical Engineer | Yes |
| Jawad Al Baghdadi | Congress, 53rd District for Rep. Sara Jacobs | Yes |
| Joshua Coyne | San Diego City Council, District 2, for Jennifer Campbell | No* |
| Anthony Nguyen | Congress, 52nd District for Rep. Scott Peters | Yes |
| David Flores | S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1 | No |
| John Nelson | FAA Representative | Yes |
| Ivan Gutierrez | FAA Representative | Yes |
| Presenters | | |
| Steve Smith | Ricondo | Yes |
| Kate Andrus | Mead & Hunt | Yes |
| Heidi Gantwerk | Facilitator | Yes |

SDCRAA Staff

Dennis Probst, Brendan Reed, Sjohnna Knack, Roman Lanyak, Jim Payne

13 voting members in attendance

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

Note: This meeting was rescheduled after the April 21st, 2021 had to be postponed due to technical issues.

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. Action Items

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

<https://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC?EntryId=13986>

a. Additional Data Review and Possible Action on Nighttime Departure

Procedures

Steve Smith, Ricondo, presented an update of the two nighttime RNAV departure procedures. The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had asked that ANAC place the two procedures on hold pending results of the Part 150 and any potential procedures that might change the initial departure heading. Steve presented results for final review by ANAC.

Public Comment:

Gary Wonacott, resident of South Mission Beach, read his submitted public comment into the record on agenda item 3.a. His public comment is located on the san.org website.¹

Questions from ANAC:

Deborah Watkins asked for clarification on what the ANAC was voting on and clarification on the two procedures.

Steve Smith explained the proposed nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 6:30 a.m.) RNAV departure procedure to the Northwest (PADRZ) is the same as what was originally proposed in the Flight Procedure Study. He then explained the nighttime RNAV departure procedure to the East (ZZOOO) was modified because during the requested noise assessment they found that it exposed new people to the 65 CNEL when the initial leg followed the PADRZ route. To avoid new noise exposures, a modification to the nighttime RNAV departure to the East

¹ ANAC Public Comment 042121; pg. 2,
https://www.san.org/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/API/Entries/Download?EntryId=14356&Command=Core_Download&language=en-US&PortalId=0&TabId=487

(ZZOOO) was made so that the initial leg mimics the 290 heading, in order to maintain current conditions.

Deborah Watkins recommended that ANAC look at ways to improve the proposed options. She suggested the development of a nighttime RNAV departure procedure over the channel or the 290 utilizing the proposed BROCK waypoint for East and Northwest flights with appropriate noise modeling study assessing effects on Mission Beach to help eliminate constant thunder of airplane noise. She stated that she is not ready to vote for the proposed procedure as it does nothing for Mission Beach.

Matthew Price said he thinks there will be an element of relief to Mission Beach with the proposed modification for the ZZOOO pathway. He asked if the procedure will formalize a turn at AN14-1 with the nighttime ZZOOO design.

Steve Smith said yes, as long as they're assigned, they will turn inside of AN14-1 waypoint, then join the track and continue on. By formalizing the procedure, they expect the right turns over La Jolla to be reduced.

Matthew Price said he believes the proposed option provides some relief at night for all the communities and supports to move forward given the limited flexibility to make any changes.

Sjohnna Knack reminded ANAC that with the implementation of the RNAV procedures ZZOOO and PADRZ in 2016 and 2017, early turns in Mission Beach and Point Loma were reduced.

Robert Bates stated that he believes the proposal is the best solution to maintain the status quo given the limited resources and space. In his opinion, codifying the departures will decrease the early turns. He asked if there's a way to make the vectored RNAV procedure for eastbound traffic simpler for the pilots and if there's been discussion with the FAA on what the best coding for that procedure might be.

Steve Smith said regarding the design it's not necessary based on the criteria to have a fixed point and that the details will get worked out through the procedure development process. He said they have not spoken to the FAA regarding best coding because when it's submitted, the FAA will process it and address concerns that pilots may have. He explained that the term codify is not a requirement or restriction and most likely used because you load coding into the navigation boxes of the aircraft.

Char-Lou Benedict asked if there were any more detailed satellite maps showing how many homes are located under the path.

Sjohnna Knack said impacts inside the 65 CNEL contour will be discussed in the Part 150 presentation.

Fred Kosmo said he supports the proposal and asked if there would be more impacts to Ocean Beach with the magnetic shift. He suggested that if they move the proposal forward, it should be revised periodically so that the 290 vector does not move farther South and further impact Ocean Beach.

Sjohnna Knack stated the proposal is to maintain the existing nighttime flight paths over Ocean Beach. She reassured that if the procedure was approved and implemented by the FAA, the Authority's Noise staff monitors those regular updates on a daily basis through their airport noise and operations monitoring system (ANOMS).

John Nelson, with the FAA, said the FAA does adjust procedures in accordance with magnetic variation reviews.

Jim Payne stated once you have a flight procedure, it will receive the magnetic variation updates as the other procedures do, and we won't have to worry about the drift anymore.

Judy Holiday asked if the FAA moves forward with the proposed nighttime departure procedures, is it possible to do some noise modeling outside of the 65. She believes it's a good idea to have an established procedure and asked if there can be ongoing conversations on ways to mitigate the noise in the Mission Beach area outside the 65.

Sjohnna Knack stated that there was noise analysis done outside the 65 dB CNEL and based on that modeling, they were unable to find a specific flight path change that did not shift noise. She explained that it would be an ongoing effort of Noise staff to look at new and emerging technologies and what other airports are doing to reduce noise.

Tania Fragomeno asked, as it relates to the shading on the eastbound departures slide, if it alleviates the concern expressed in the public comments and Deborah's comments earlier.

Sjohnna Knack said the shading was done specifically to address those concerns and that they are keeping it as is today instead of having all aircraft fly on the same route as the PADRZ.

Justin Cook echoed and supports Matthew Price's comments that no further insight could be gained from doing additional noise modeling given all the different alternatives the Part 150 team looked at.

Dave Ryan said operationally he sees no issues with either of the proposals.

Heidi Gantwerk proposed a motion to request that the Airport Authority staff submit the two nighttime RNAV departure procedures to the FAA for their review in the IFP gateway.

Matthew Price put forward the motion, it was seconded by Anthony Ciulla.

Fred Kosmo proposed an amendment that the FAA conduct magnetic variation testing now and in the future to make sure that the path stays in the same spot. He requested that ANAC give a specific directive to the FAA to ask them to take magnetic variation into consideration.

John Nelson stated that's something that would not be submitted through the IFP gateway.

Steve Smith concurred with John Nelson, that it's not something that gets submitted through the IFP gateway, it's not a part of PBN design process. He stated that the proposed procedures all have fixed waypoints and don't rely on a magnetic heading, even though they're put in as reference. The eastbound proposal includes a heading that is issued by air traffic control and the heading is based on a magnetic heading. Mr. Smith also stated this is

something that the Airport Authority has always monitored and when they see trends, they communicate this with the FAA.

Matthew Price proposed to leave the current motion and to take up consideration at the next meeting, a letter to the FAA for them to review procedures that may have been impacted by magnetic drift.

John Nelson said that would be a request that the FAA would be happy to consider.

Deborah Watkins said she appreciates the fact that they do need an established nighttime noise procedure. She supports the eastbound departure procedure for this particular procedure, but she cannot support the Northwest procedure for the PADRZ.

ACTION: Moved by Matthew Price and seconded by Anthony Ciulla to request that the Airport Authority staff submit the two nighttime RNAV departure procedures to the FAA for their review in the IFP gateway. Motion carried by the following votes: YES – Kosmo, Ciulla, Holiday, Fragomeno, Cole, Benedict, Price, Brackett, Huenefeld, Bates, Glover, Ryan; NO – Watkins. The motion was approved.

b. Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Update – Review and Recommendation to Send to Airport Authority Board

Kate Andrus from Mead & Hunt presented on the Part 150 study draft recommendations, as well as the process they have been through the last couple months, review of the public comments, the last meeting with the CAC/TAC, and what they're hearing from everybody about the study and the recommendations.

Public Comment:

Nancy Palmtag, resident of Loma Portal and member of the Citizens Advisory Committee, read her submitted public comment into the record on agenda item 3.b. Her public comment is located on the san.org website.²

Questions from ANAC:

Anthony Ciulla thanked Nancy for her comments and thought her perspective was valuable. He said living just outside the 65 decibel (dB) contour at the moment, he can appreciate the headaches that people have living in it. He stated he has the information he needs to make a vote.

Fred Kosmo said he thinks that they should form a new ANAC subcommittee for highly technical issues so that ANAC can continue to follow these recommendations as they go to the FAA. He believed having a group of concerned citizens to help the process move forward and inform ANAC is something they should consider.

Sjohnna Knack stated the Authority Noise staff will include the Part 150 recommendations as a standing agenda item and discuss progress at all ANAC meetings.

² ANAC Public Comment 042121; pg. 5, https://www.san.org/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/API/Entries/Download?EntryId=14356&Command=Core_Download&language=en-US&PortalId=0&TabId=487

Matthew Price thanked CAC/TAC and consultants for their work, supports the NADP, GBAS and a Subcommittee. He does not agree with the FAA's noise shifting position and feels that many of the rejected alternatives should be moved forward.

Chris Cole thanked the consultants, committee, and CAC/TAC for their work. He requested that in the future, especially when the ANAC has to vote on items with noise impacts, anticipated noise impacts on particular areas are included in the presentations.

Deborah Watkins thanked everyone that participated in the Part 150. She said that she agrees that the noise abatement departure procedure is something good and will push it forward.

Robert Bates stated that he has been a big supporter of looking at working with the airlines to modify the vertical portion of the departure and NADP. He asked Kallie Glover if she could speak to Delta as far as the performance factor and how the airlines choose which runways, aircraft, and airports to switch from a distant NADP to a closer in NADP. From his experience, he believes it's something that will have a lot of benefits to the 65 CNEL area, as well as other areas.

Rick Huenefeld agrees with the consultants that SAN is located in a mature environment and that this is not the first time these things have been discussed, He made one strong supportive argument for one of the administrative recommendations, that it's absolutely critical that there be a deployable mobile noise monitoring system, and that the community should direct where that system goes.

Olivier Brackett expressed his appreciation to the staff, consultants, and committee and is impressed with the hard work put into the study.

Dave Ryan on behalf of the business aviation community thanked everyone for all the hard work that went into the study. They appreciate being able to participate.

Kallie Glover commented to Robert Bates about how Delta chooses an NADP 1 versus 2, that they review each regular airport, usually twice a year, and whatever is in the AIP determines where they get NADP 1 or 2.

Heidi Gantwerk proposed a motion to request that the Part 150 Noise Exposure Map and Noise Compatibility Program be sent to the Airport Authority Board to accept and submit to the FAA for their assessment.

ACTION: Moved by Fred Kosmo and seconded by Rick Huenefeld to request that the Part 150 Noise Exposure Map and Noise Compatibility Program be sent to the Airport Authority Board to accept and submit to the FAA for their assessment.

Motion carried by the following votes: YES – Kosmo, Ciulla, Watkins, Fragomeno, Cole, Benedict, Brackett, Huenefeld, Bates, Glover, Ryan; ABSTAIN: Price; ABSENT: Holiday. The motion was approved.

4. Action Items

a. Approval of February 17, 2021 Meeting Summary

Chris Cole made a motion to approve the meeting summary from the February 17, 2021 meeting. It was seconded by Char-Lou Benedict. Motion carried by the following votes: YES - Kosmo, Ciulla, Watkins, Fragomeno, Cole, Benedict, Price, Brackett, Huenefeld, Bates, Glover, Ryan. The motion was approved.

5. Public Comment

There were six public comments that were emailed to the Authority Clerk by the deadline posted on the agenda. The public comments were distributed to the ANAC members and posted online³.

6. Next Meeting/Adjourn

Next meeting is June 16, 2021.

Meeting was adjourned.


Sjohnna Knack (Oct 25, 2021 11:00 PDT)

Oct 25, 2021

sknack@san.org

³ ANAC May 5, 2021 Public Comment, <https://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC?EntryId=13986>







ANAC Approved Meeting Summary 050521

Final Audit Report

2021-10-25

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Created: | 2021-10-21 |
| By: | Emily Kuhn (ekuhn@san.org) |
| Status: | Signed |
| Transaction ID: | CBJCHBCAABAATptmXveaiYuVRH7zGqhD04tlQfQ3z6GI |

"ANAC Approved Meeting Summary 050521" History

-  Document created by Emily Kuhn (ekuhn@san.org)
2021-10-21 - 7:22:49 PM GMT- IP address: 12.69.234.16
-  Document emailed to Sjohnna Knack (sknack@san.org) for signature
2021-10-21 - 7:23:20 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Sjohnna Knack (sknack@san.org)
2021-10-21 - 8:16:59 PM GMT- IP address: 54.183.176.12
-  Email viewed by Sjohnna Knack (sknack@san.org)
2021-10-25 - 6:00:34 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.56.254
-  Document e-signed by Sjohnna Knack (sknack@san.org)
Signature Date: 2021-10-25 - 6:00:55 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 70.95.53.42
-  Agreement completed.
2021-10-25 - 6:00:55 PM GMT