

MEETING SUMMARY

Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 4/17/2019 4:00 p.m.

Meeting called to order by: Heidi Gantwerk

In Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>In Attendance</u>
Community Planning Groups Within the 65 dB contour		
Anthony Bernal	Downtown Community Planning Council	Yes
Melissa Hernholm-Danzo	Community Resident at Large within 65 dB CNEL	No*
Dawn Reilly	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	No*
David Swarens	Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee	Yes
Chris Cole	Uptown Planners	Yes
Tom Gawronski	Ocean Beach Planning Board	No
Fred Kosmo	Peninsula Community Planning Board	Yes
Community Planning Groups Outside the 65 dB contour		
Matthew Price	La Jolla Community Planning Association	Yes
Susan Nichols	Grossmont-Mt. Helix Improvement Association	Yes
Jason Legros	Pacific Beach Planning Group	Yes
Deborah Watkins	Mission Beach Precise Planning Board	Yes
Aviation Stakeholders		
Olivier Brackett	San Diego County Airports	Yes
Wayne Reiter	City of San Diego Airports	Yes
Carl "Rick" Huenefeld	MCRD	No*
Robert Bates	Airline Pilot (Active)	Yes
Carlos Phillips	Airline Flight Operations (Alternate)	Yes
Dave Ryan	NBAA	Yes
Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
Justin Cook	Acoustical Engineer	Yes
Ashley Campbell	Congress, 53rd District, for Rep. Susan Davis	Yes
Joshua Coyne	San Diego City Council, District 2, for Jennifer Campbell	Yes
Kiera Galloway	Congress, 52nd District, for Rep. Scott Peters	Yes
Marshall Anderson	S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1, for Sup. Greg Cox	Yes
Keith Lusk & James Kosanovich	FAA Representatives	Yes
Speakers		
Brendan Reed	SDCRAA Director, Planning & Environmental Affairs	Yes
Angela Shafer-Payne	SDCRAA Vice President & COO, Operations	Yes
Nick Johnson	President, Johnson Aviation	Yes
Mary Ellen Eagan	President, HMMH	Yes
Heidi Gantwerk	Facilitator	Yes
Steve Smith	Director, Ricondo	Yes

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

Heidi Gantwerk, facilitator for the Airport Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC), opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. Introductions were made around the table. Ms. Gantwerk briefly shared the agenda. She announced that the June 19 meeting will include a presentation on the Flight Procedure Analysis and a presentation from the FAA on operations, particularly missed approaches.

2. Presentations

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

<http://www.san.org/Airport-Authority/Meetings-Agendas/ANAC>

Flight Procedure Analysis

Steve Smith, Ricondo & Associates, presented an update on the Flight Procedure Analysis. He discussed the flight procedure modifications intended to address noise in La Jolla, Mission Beach, Ocean Beach, and Point Loma.

The analysis looked at operational feasibility and noise impacts of various designs. A separate working group for East County, which has specific airspace challenges, is reviewing flight procedure modifications that might mitigate air noise for East County Communities.

The analysis also provided an independent review of the Airport Noise Office definition of early turns (ANAC Recommendation #18).

The flight procedure evaluation process included coordination with the Technical Advisory Committee and the Citizen Advisory Committee, over the course of five meetings. All meetings were open to the public and information was shared on the website as it became available. The process reviewed nearly 20 different procedure designs. As of the April ANAC meeting, the consultant team is making three recommendations for further consideration, after examining operational feasibility assessments and designs, what's allowed in FAA design criteria, and the noise screening results. The ANAC Recommendation #17, nighttime noise abatement heading, will be evaluated in the Part 150 because of its potential effects on the 65 dB contour.

Next steps involve presenting the final recommendations to the TAC and CAC, providing an update on results and recommendations based on comments received, and then bringing a more detailed update to ANAC in June.

Ryk Dunkelberg, Mead & Hunt, gave an update on the Part 150 study update. A Part 150 study is an aircraft noise and land use compatibility study that considers both future and existing aircraft noise and the impacts that noise has on population as well as noise-sensitive land uses. It consists of two complementary documents, a set of maps called noise exposure maps and a set of recommendations called a Noise Compatibility Program. It utilizes a five-year planning horizon, starting from the date the document is submitted to the FAA.

The noise exposure maps must be accepted by the FAA. The Noise Compatibility Program recommendations are approved or disapproved by the FAA. The study period is anticipated to take approximately 18 months, which means the five-year planning horizon will begin a year-and-a-half from now. The Part 150 addresses noise effects inside the 65dB contour. Changes at San Diego International Airport requiring the study be updated are 1) aircraft fleet mix change; 2) reduction in noise levels of individual aircraft, 3) a change in activity levels (number of aircraft operating here in a year); 4) the implementation of a new noise model. Parameters guiding the study state that any suggested

modifications: 1) cannot shift noise from one non-compatible use to another; 2) cannot impact safety; 3) cannot impact capacity; 4) cannot modify or change the existing curfew; 5) cannot evaluate alternatives that would trigger a Part 161 study, which is an access restriction to the airport. The overall goal is to reduce the number of people affected by noise. The interactive noise study website is now live (www.sannoisestudy.com), and is designed to gather input from the community with specific questions, and will be an integral part of the study. The next step is to generate an existing and future baseline noise contour, based on forecasts developed and approved by the FAA in the EIR and Part 150 Study.

Question from ANAC: Fred Kosmo asked for clarification on how ANAC recommendations 14 and 15 are being addressed, and asked if a recommendation will be put forward to the FAA and the airport consistent with this?

Mr. Smith said the consultant team is recommending to this body that the design seems to be feasible and meets the intent of the recommendation related to 14 and 15 at night. Ultimately, there is a design that could be submitted to the FAA for consideration, but nothing they're doing replaces the FAA process. It's submitted to the FAA, and they go through their own independent process.

Mr. Kosmo asked if all San Diego departures separations are between JETTI at 275-degrees and the historic red dot #1 at 290-degrees?

Mr. Smith said the intent for recommendation 14 was to try and move northbound departures further south of La Jolla, while not changing the initial headings from the runway. For recommendation 15, at night, they're on the right-turn heading, so the design is intended to work between 10-11:30 pm. There is no current RNAV for that particular procedure, so in essence, it may improve flight tracks because if everything is vectored going south and east, an RNAV would have better predictability in the flight track.

Mr. Kosmo asked if recommendation 15 has eastbound daytime flights going around Point Loma?

Mr. Smith said 15 ANAC suggested to move JETTI two miles further west. The consultant reviewed the ANAC suggestion as originally designed, and found it feasible.

Mr. Kosmo questioned if they are saying it's feasible for eastbound daytime flights to follow the ZZOOO procedure and not fly over Point Loma?

Mr. Smith said if they are on the RNAV procedure and they stay on it, and ATC doesn't vector them off for any reason, yes, but there's nothing about this procedure or anything being recommended that would prevent the FAA from doing whatever they need to do to maintain safe separations. Vectoring still can occur.

Matthew Price said the nighttime abatement heading is supposed to be 290 for all flights, but on the documentation it seems as if the initial heading is PADRZ, which is 295; is there data regarding that?

Mr. Smith said that that issue is included in ANAC recommendation 17, which hasn't been fully assessed yet, and will take place as part of the Part 150 Study. Some change may happen in the 65 and it needs to be evaluated under that process.

Mr. Kosmo asked as for aircraft noise reductions, is anything being studied that might remove cargo planes from mix at the airport, or international flights?

Mr. Dunkelberg said no to both.

3. Action items (taken out of order of agenda)

Ms. Gantwerk asked for approval of meeting summary from the April meeting. With a motion by Fred Kosmo and a second by Deborah Watkins the meeting summary was approved.

Airport Development Program (ADP) – Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Angela Shafer-Payne, SDCRAA VP & COO, Operations, presented an introduction on the ADP EIR.

- The ADP planning looked at the aging facility in the Terminal 1 complex, built in 1967, which was built to handle 2.5 million annual passengers. Last year, the airport exceeded 24 million annual passengers.
- Fifty percent of last year's operations were run through Terminal 1. What is being accommodated in Terminal 1 is not providing customers with an adequate level of service, from restrooms to gate hold rooms.
- It's important to note that in this planning process, the single runway is the limiting factor. The replacement for Terminal 1 accommodates customer service at a greater level. It does not provide additional capacity, which is defined as the number of operations that can operate on the runway.
- The other factor is the curfew, which defines the operating window. The Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 limits the Airport's ability to place any restrictions on the types of aircraft that can operate at the airport.
- Airlines have proven that if there is capacity on the runway, they will find ways to operate out of your facility. Customer demand will continue, and airlines will respond to it, despite the fact that terminal facilities are not adequate.

Airport Development Plan - Overview

Brandon Reed, SDCRAA Director, Planning & Environmental Affairs, gave an overview of the ADP project components.

- We are considered a Top 30 or Core 30 airport, playing an important role in overall national air system.
- Last year's Economic Impact Study found that through direct and induced economic impact, we contributed about \$12 billion annually. There's been exceptional growth in demand over the last five years. The economy is good, air fares are low, and specifically in San Diego, carriers like Alaska and Southwest are competing for market share.
- Should the Authority Board approve it, the ADP is seeking to create a more comfortable, modern and efficient terminal. Major components may include:
 - An on-airport entry roadway, taking traffic off of Harbor Drive as far east as Laurel, and putting it on airport property.
 - A dual-level roadway, which would reduce congestion, comparable to Terminal 2. This would connect to a new 30-gate terminal, replacing Terminal 1.
 - A parking plaza to accommodate the removal of the east terminal parking.
 - New Taxiway Alpha to provide efficiency on the airside, by getting aircraft from gates to the end of the runway efficiently.
 - Although not part of the project, space is being preserved to eventually connect to an intermodal transit center, which has been in SANDAG's regional transportation plan for years, it may include high-speed rail, trolleys, Amtrak Coaster, and some level of pedestrian bridge, and north side passenger processing.
- Over the last 5-6 months, there have been some physical refinements made based on the comments received on the draft EIR. The parking plaza has been reduced from 7,500 stalls to 5,500, which is about a 650 net-positive parking increase.

- The structure size and footprint of the parking plaza were reduced to designate a transit station area. The physical layout of ADP has been changed in order to accept whatever technology SANDAG and the region decides is appropriate.
- Another physical change that was made was to reserve the right-of-way for on-airport exit lanes, to support future broader roadway improvements.
- The consultants are in the process of developing a new forecast for aviation growth, working with the FAA to update the numbers from the last forecast which was done in 2012. There are no final results; data is still being analyzed. This updated forecast will be used to run new noise contours in the EIR.
- When complete, the Airport Authority will recirculate a draft EIR, with a public comment period. The final EIR will go to the board for possible certification.

Forecast and Capacity

Nick Johnson, President, Johnson Aviation presented on forecast and capacity.

- He reiterated that the single runway limits operational capacity.
- He defined “an operation” as one arrival or one departure.
- The summer of 2018 showed that capacity is already fast approaching the limit of 50 operations per hour.
- Annual operational capacity since 1990 has seen ebbs and flows. Looking at the last five years, there has been incredible growth in terms of the numbers of operations. The underlying driver of the forecast is the economy of San Diego.
- The FAA’s forecast is unconstrained and doesn’t reflect issues like single runway, specific facilities, and policy limits. Our forecast has been submitted to the FAA for review. Response is expected within the next 30-45 days.
- Looking at a constrained forecast, there are things the airlines will consider like adjusting their schedule, working on filling flights to capacity, and responding to supply and demand.
- From a big-picture perspective, constrained airports may be slot controlled by the FAA.
- Simulation modeling is being done, looking at various demand levels, so that the noise analysis can be run. That information will then be used to model the future noise as part of the analysis.

Noise Analysis and Modeling

Mary Ellen Eagan, President HMMH, presented on noise analysis and modeling, covering 1) overview of critical noise metrics used in the documentation; 2) the difference between NEPA and CEQA Noise impact thresholds; 3) process of the analysis.

- There are two critical noise metrics used in both NEPA and CEQA analysis;
 1. Single Event Noise Equivalent Level, SENEL, referring to graphic in presentation showing the sound exposure over one minute.
 2. Community Noise Equivalent Level, CNEL, a 24-hour measure of noise exposure. In California, using the CNEL, a penalty assessed for operations that takes place in the evening (7-10 pm) or nighttime (10 pm – 7 am).
- NEPA is the FAA process from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, requiring that any time there is a federal action at an airport, the FAA must undertake this process; in many cases, they have the airport undertake the process on their behalf.
- Federal action would involve a change to the airport layout plan. FAA provides a number of guidance documents for this process.

- The threshold of significance was determined by the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise, stating that in an area where aircraft noise is 65 dB, areas that have a change in noise of 1.5 dB or more are considered to have significant impact.
- CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act is modeled after NEPA, but the significance effects are determined more locally, and are more general regarding protecting the environment and minimizing impact.
- A critical distinction between NEPA and CEQA is the FAA requires that you compare project impacts to a no-action impact; what would happen in five years, whether or not any changes were made.
- CEQA impacts are compared against the baseline or existing condition. The interpretation taken from previous projects identified a number of significant impact criteria; not only is it a 1.5 dB change baseline to future, but anything within the 65 CNEL contour; areas that have a 3 dB increase between 60 and 65 contour; substantial increase in noise exposure or the amount of time the aircraft is exposed; and a substantial increase in the number of nighttime flights.
- The process used is to define noise modeling scenarios, the baseline and the future years; collect and refine the data; run the contours using a model called The Aviation Environmental Design Tool, the FAA required model; analyze the impacts and document the results.
- Much of the data exists from prior analyses. Aircraft operations will be the main change. The baseline and forecast years will be updated from 2012. Aircraft noise and performance characteristics will reflect newer fleet, runway and flight track utilizations will be re-determined based on a more current sampling of data.
- The main focus will be developing representative flight tracks. An average annual day on what's required for the model input, reflecting the fleet mix, percent use of each runway, and percent use of each flight track on each runway. That will be adjusted to the official FAA tower count or approved forecast.

Question from ANAC:

Davis Swarens asked for clarification on difference between no project and no action, with regards to CEQA analysis.

Brandon Reed said under CEQA, everything in the initial and recirculated draft EIR will compare the project at different points in the future to 2018 conditions.

Ms. Eagan said no action and no project are the same, except that with the FAA comparison, you look at 2025 no action versus 2025 with the project. Under CEQA, you look at 2018 baseline against 2025 with project.

Robert Bates asked if the curfew is factored into the CNEL metric measuring noise over 24-hour periods. He also asked regarding slot control, do airlines migrate to larger equipment with more capacity?

Curfew answer: Ms. Eagan said because there's less noise at night, there's less contribution during that portion, but still averaged over 24 hours.

Slot control answer: Nick Johnson said in some cases, yes. Getting to a slot program is a progression, moving closer and closer to that line of capacity. In Chicago, rather than have a slot regulation imposed, airlines self-regulated by shifting to larger aircraft. At La Guardia in New York where there is a slot program, aircraft size and seat capacity has gone down. By bringing the slot level down, the FAA brought delays down. The outcome of a slot program is about improving schedule reliability and reducing delays, and how it is implemented and the results will depend upon the market the airport is serving.

Mr. Kosmo asked if anything is being done in the revised EIR to address significant unavoidable impacts on surrounding communities? And when will CEQA studies be complete? Will the noise impact be recirculated data and conclusions to ANAC for comment before issuing the EIR?

Mr. Reed said the first task to complete is to update the forecast, which will inform the analysis, and as part of the CEQA process, there are mitigation measures that can be offered. It will probably take several months to get through those processes. The draft EIR will not be circulated to ANAC before, but circulated to the entire region when they go out for the comment period.

Chris Cole asked if the analysis takes into account the anticipated changes in flight patterns.

Mr. Reed said this project entails building a new terminal, not changing flight patterns, but using 2018 data as our baseline, the EIR and forecasts will have incorporated all of the post-Metroplex changes.

Matthew Price asked if there's a defined threshold for what awakens people at night?

Ms. Eagan says the analysis typically looks at a threshold level of sound exposure, SNEL computation, and looks at the number of people exposed to noise levels above that. Based on a recommendation by FICAN, that is 85 dB, which is about the level that awakens 15% of people indoors.

Mr. Price asked if the airport will be able to increase its capacity to the same degree and speed without the new terminal?

Angela Shafer-Payne said yes; it's more about how that increase is accommodated.

Mr. Price asked what increase in percent operations will we reach a significant level of impact?

Ms. Shafer-Payne said there could be an increase in passengers because of an increase in the size of aircraft coming in. The largest carrier today flies one type of aircraft. So, generally they consider 260,000 annual operations to be a point at which there will start to be consistent delay. At 280,000 operations, that delay is likely to be 15 minutes per operation. At actual capacity, 290,000 operations, there will be an unsustainable level of delay.

Mr. Price asked are those considerations put in the forecast?

Ms. Shafer-Payne said a constrained forecast takes into consideration limitations at the facility; an unconstrained forecast does not consider local conditions.

Anthony Bernal asked if changes in the parking structure will affect the EIR.

Mr. Reed said it could, but that won't be known until the results are seen. The intermodal transit center and designated transit station area are not actual components of the proposed project, but things that have been programmed in for when SANDAG decides to build them. As part of that process, those physical components would be analyzed in a separate environmental review.

David Swarens said that the media reported that the recirculation of the EIR was based on concerns relative to transit access. Other than updates of data to 2018, will there be other differences seen?

Mr. Reed said other things like being consistent with City's Climate Action Plan are being pursued.

Mr. Price said from ANAC perspective, seeing that the ADP will influence the increase in operations, there should be in the draft EIR some commentary on approaches in noise mitigation because of that expansion.

Mr. Reed said the proposed project will be compared to existing conditions. At no point are they comparing for significant threshold purposes the no project to the proposed project.

4. Public Comment

Kathy Austin, Mission Beach expressed her concerns over the increase in noise over South Mission Beach, especially over the last year. She wanted to know who to talk to for that flight path to be changed. She requested that they look at ways to modify the departure headings to reduce the impacts in her community.

Kelly Borsberry, Encanto lives right under the arrival path into San Diego Airport. He's noticed the increase in noise and he thinks it's due to the planes flying lower, and the increase of traffic coming into our city. He asked to have a sound meter at his home and wanted to know if planes can be moved to other airports.

Russell Moll, Mt. Soledad, expressed concerns about metroplex and the change in flight patterns, stating there needed to be better communication to let the public know what was happening. He felt that the flights should be dispersed so that everyone shared the noise. He also expressed concerns about his health and the impact the aircraft noise has on it.

Casey Schnoor, Ocean Beach/Point Loma, has been involved with this process since August 2015. He applauds the fact that ANAC has now been engaged with the EIR process because the first draft, ANAC was not considered. He felt that ANAC should be able to review and discuss the analysis. He feels that the ANAC Subcommittee efforts were not considered in the draft EIR. He said that the new terminal will increase capacity which will bring larger aircraft which are louder. He pointed out the number of future operations saying that in the next several years the new terminal would reach capacity.

Patty Davidson, Windansea Beach, continues to be concerned with the flight path changes. She is told that nothing has changed but based on her observations they have. She is hopeful for the efforts by the Flight Procedure Analysis there might be some relief. She is concerned there were no recommendations to help reduce arrival noise. She saw something about Kearny Mesa and there could be like 4.9 reduction in dB. She doesn't see a lot of people living in Kearny Mesa; maybe there are plans for later to take into consideration.

5. Next Meeting/Adjourn

Ms. Gantwerk announced that CAC and TAC will be tentatively meeting on May 23, to discuss the Flight Procedure Analysis and Part 150 pending FAA approval the forecasts. Public is welcome.

Next meeting is June 19, 2019. Missed approaches and flight procedures analysis and recommendations will be discussed at length. She asked if there are any concerns about the process of sending out member materials, opportunity for written questions, and no staff presentations all of the data.

Members agreed, so that process will continue.

Meeting was adjourned.