

# MEETING SUMMARY

## Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 10/16/2019 4:00 p.m.

Meeting called to order by: Heidi Gantwerk

### In Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>In Attendance</u>
<b>Community Planning Groups Within the 65 dB contour</b>		
Anthony Bernal	Downtown Community Planning Council	Yes
Melissa Hernholm-Danzo	Community Resident at Large within 65 dB CNEL	Yes
Judy Holiday	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	Yes
John Kroll	Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee	Yes
Chris Cole	Uptown Planners	Yes
Anthony Ciulla	Ocean Beach Planning Board	Yes
Fred Kosmo	Peninsula Community Planning Board	Yes
<b>Community Planning Groups Outside the 65 dB contour</b>		
Matthew Price	La Jolla Community Planning Association	Yes
Susan Nichols	Grossmont-Mt. Helix Improvement Association	Yes
Jim Morrison	Pacific Beach Planning Group	Yes
Deborah Watkins	Mission Beach Precise Planning Board	Yes
<b>Aviation Stakeholders</b>		
Olivier Brackett	San Diego County Airports	No*
Vacant	City of San Diego Airports	N/A
Carl "Rick" Huenefeld	MCRD	No*
Robert Bates	Airline Pilot (Active)	Yes
<b>Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members</b>		
Justin Cook	Acoustical Engineer	Yes
Zach Bunshaft	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
Marvin Mayorga	S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1, for Sup. Greg Cox	Yes
Keith Lusk	FAA Representatives	Yes
Kallie Glover	Performance Engineer, Delta Airlines	Yes
<b>Speakers</b>		
Craig Mayer	Deputy Program Manager - QHP	Yes
Heidi Gantwerk	Facilitator	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.

Fred Kosmo thanked the Airport staff that attended the Peninsula Community Planning Board and made a presentation regarding the Airport Development Program.

---

## 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>

### Quieter Home Program Update

Craig Mayer, Manager of the Quieter Home Program (QHP), explained that the QHP is the Airport Authority's residential sound installation program, which receives federal grants from the FAA to treat homes located within the 65 dB contour, in an effort to reduce the interior aircraft noise impacts. QHP was recently awarded a \$14.6 million grant from the FAA, the largest grant received to date. The goal of the program is to reduce the interior noise level in properties by a minimum of five dB. There is a two-step process for eligibility to participate; 1) property must be located within the 65 dB contour; 2) the interior noise level average must be higher than 45 dB. If the home tests below a 45 dB average, the FAA allows a treatment package limited to a ventilation system and ancillary treatments like caulking and weather stripping that allows the homeowner to keep the windows and doors closed especially during the hot summer months.

Using the FAA's money to hire contractors to do work in a private residence results in a number of challenges. Participants are informed up front of all policies and procedures to ensure that they have a realistic expectation throughout the process. It's a voluntary program designed specifically to reduce interior noise level; not a home remodeling program.

QHP staff serve as the participant's advocate throughout the process; hiring the contractor through a public bid process. The lowest responsible and responsive contractor is hired to do the work, and QHP manages that process for the duration. Participants must relinquish their authority and decision making to QHP staff.

Homeowners must sign an avigation easement and homeowner participation agreement in order to proceed with the sound attenuation process. Even though there is no monetary cost to the participant, there is a non-financial cost in providing the Airport Authority the avigation easement to participate.

The other high-level issue that participants need to be aware of is the potential for ancillary costs where the FAA grant money cannot be used. For example, when code deficiencies are discovered, the FAA is specific about where their funds may be used and the property owner would be responsible for those costs. Examples might include on the low end, possibly switching plates; on the high end, a remodel done without obtaining a permit.

The QHP team is comprised of approximately 15-16 people. The job of each team is to make sure that a project goes smoothly, interacting with the contractor, the participants and the design team.

QHP properties are sorted into two categories; historic and non-historic. A historic architect reviews all properties to determine if the property is potentially historic and submits the recommendation to the City Historic Resources Board for a final determination. Non-historic properties are offered vinyl windows and sliding glass doors as part of a retrofit program. For historic properties, the only difference is that

windows and doors installed work toward maintaining the historic integrity of the property. Retrofitting the opening means the operable components from existing windows are removed, the frame and the structure are left intact, and a new window or door is installed. The retrofit window has four operable parts; two of them need to be opened to get to the outside. Doors offered for non-historic properties are wooden or aluminum acoustic doors, with several options to choose from.

In most single-family homes or condominium units, air-conditioning and some sort of ventilation are offered. In multi-family properties, only a ventilation system is offered which draws fresh air in, circulates it, and exhausts stale air, so windows and doors can stay closed. For all properties, QHP is not allowed to provide heat or install any system if an existing air condition system is present.

The QHP effort is an eight-step process, step one being the homeowner meeting, and through to the post-construction meeting. The important thing for property owners to know is that it is about an 18-month process to go through those eight steps. That does not include any time spent on the wait list. Precedence on the wait list is based on location (noisiest first) and length of ownership.

The treatments provided will not increase the assessed value of the home, and will not result in additional property taxes. The work has to be permitted through the City, so the County Assessor's Office will be notified that the work is being done. They'll send the property owner a notice that the property has gone through some renovation and they're reevaluating the assessed value. We provide a form for the property owner to fill out and send back, so that there are no additional taxes assessed.

At the end of the process, the property owner is asked to provide a survey about their experience from beginning to end. There are some things that owners are typically concerned about or unhappy with that there isn't much opportunity to change. One of the first is tenant coordination; that's a big challenge for the program. All property owners that rent their space out, must include or involve their tenants as much and as often as possible, so that once construction has started, there are no surprises, and it is a seamless process working with those tenants.

Many people find the provided treatments unsightly. It must be stressed that what is being worked towards is reducing the interior noise, not remodeling the home. Modifications may have to be made to the home to accommodate, for instance, a new cooling system, because there is no attic or crawl space. Closet space might need to be used for ductwork for a system.

Another concern is the lack of a daily project schedule. QHP staff provide every property owner a construction schedule that covers starting date and finish date, but nothing in between. This is because contractors are working in multiple homes at any given time, so they need flexibility to go from one to another, with as much flexible access as possible. In most cases, this allows them to finish the work ahead of schedule. Each construction group has a Homeowner Coordinator, who may have three or four projects to juggle at one time. To expect that coordinator to call every single homeowner that they are working with every morning with a schedule is not feasible.

Looking ahead, the goal is to expand the program boundary. Today, the QHP is working on homes in the 66 dB program boundary. A request was recently submitted to the FAA to expand; their verbal agreement and approval was received, but we are waiting for an official response.

Another goal is to expand the program to address non-residential properties, which is in the preliminary planning phase. The subject has been approached on a cursory level with the FAA. Considerable work remains to establish whether there is available additional funding to support this, and to establish the types of facilities that the FAA would allow to treat. (Places of worship, schools, daycares, medical facilities, etc.)

## Questions from ANAC:

Anthony Bernal asked if future expansions would include government or municipally-owned buildings?

Mr. Mayer said that is still unknown and part of what still needs to be discussed with the FAA. The current FAA program guidance book has language that allows for a non-residential program, but it's not yet descriptive enough to know what it might look like.

Sjohnna Knack provided some history. In this program, before the residential treatments started, six schools were treated first. If there are new schools within the expanded boundary, then they would be potentially eligible for treatment, but they would follow similar policies that Craig outlined.

Mr. Mayer said that homes built after October 1, 1998 are currently not allowed to be treated, and it would need to be determined if that would apply to those non-residential facilities as well.

Melissa Hernholm-Danzo asked, how many more homes might be included in the boundary expansion? She also asked about the budget increase, and what does each home cost to retrofit, to understand how the budget could accommodate that many new homes.

Mr. Mayer said it's a rough estimate, but approximately another 2,500 to 3,000 units will be in the expanded boundary. There was a new grant of \$14.6 million for this year. The current annual operating budget for the QHP is around \$14.7 million. A new grant is requested from the FAA every year. The retrofit cost of a single-family, non-historic home averages around \$35,000 to treat. The cost for a historic single-family home averages \$70,000.

Ms. Gantwerk clarified that the expansion would make 2,500-3,000 homes eligible, but only a percentage of those homes apply.

Justin Cook noted that this is "potentially eligible." You have to also test to meet the interior standards. The number potentially eligible doesn't mean they will meet the noise criteria for eligibility.

Matthew Price asked, as the Airport Authority embarks on airport expansion and the development plan, have they modeled a budget that would be required to retrofit the homes that are expected to be impacted by the expansion of the 65 CNEL? Have they discussed with the FAA any projections before moving forward?

Sjohnna Knack said the Part 150 is not at the stage yet where the mitigation measure has been identified with a quantity of homes. Craig is focusing on those homes in the contour until the Part 150 is approved by the FAA.

Mr. Mayer said the maps in the current presentation address only the current 65 dB contour. It does not take into account the Part 150.

Ms. Knack said when the FAA gives their approval in writing on these expansions, they will be put on the website.

Fred Kosmo asked if the pace will stay at about 300 homes per year. He also asked how the noise measuring works inside the units.

Mr. Mayer said about 400 units are anticipated this year. Units are tested with the windows closed, which is why the treatment package includes ventilation. Only habitable rooms are tested, so no treatment will be done to bathrooms, laundry rooms, closets, etc., all according to FAA policy guidelines.

Mr. Cook said the measurement is done by placing a loudspeaker (through a testing guideline, ASDM standard), outside with white noise that simulates the same level of noise in every frequency. Then the current reduction is measured from outdoor to indoor. That is done for every habitable room. Actual individual aircraft noise is not measured, but instead the noise from the loudspeaker. To qualify you need

to be 45 or above in the interior, and it's an average over all habitable rooms. This is a more consistent approach because an individual aircraft flies over different areas of the home. The loudspeaker subjects the surface of the room to a very loud level, 110 dB, at every frequency. When measuring inside the house, you measure what frequencies are going through the windows, looking at the different weakest points or elements in the room, so those elements can be treated.

Melissa Hernholm-Danzo asked if the entire budget is used every year, and how many homes are under construction currently? Why the increase of 100 over last year?

Mr. Mayer confirmed that the budget is used up every year, and that the number is on the status update provided to the committee, but approximately 90-100 units are currently in construction. The increase is due to more multi-family projects scheduled for this year; they are smaller, and can be completed faster.

Judy Holiday asked for clarification: the outdoor white noise is 110 dB? Would it ever be less than 100? How often are the indoor measurement systems calibrated?

Mr. Cook said it does vary, depending on where the speaker is placed, but they try to find an optimal speaker placement to get the noise level spread over the entire façade, but it will be in that 100-110 range. What you're really looking at is the delta between outside to inside. The systems are calibrated every time the noise crew goes out.

### **Part 150 Study Update**

Sjohnna Knack provided an update on the Part 150 Study.

- Six viable procedures have been identified from the Subcommittee and ANAC recommendations. Four will be reviewed in the Part 150 Study, two of which have been submitted to and are being reviewed by the FAA - a request to move the noise dots (submitted to the FAA TRACON Manager) and a procedure amendment that was submitted on the FAA's website (the IFP Gateway.)
- November 20: the next Citizen Advisory and Technical Advisory meetings will be held; TAC is 10:00-12:00; CAC is from 2:00 to 4:00. SanNoiseStudy.com is where you can find all meeting information.
- Nov. 21<sup>st</sup>: the public workshop on the Part 150 noise study will be held at the Liberty Station offices, covering a variety of Part 150 topics, including existing conditions, noise contours, forecasting. The consultant team will also be seeking public input on alternatives to consider.

**Online Noise Statistics:** Ms. Knack showed where to find the monthly noise statistics online. The intention is to update the statistics monthly, on the 2nd Friday of the following month, i.e., on November 8, the stats will be up for all of October. Historic stats are posted on the site in a .PDF file.

She explained the new statistics program. For the Quieter Home dashboard, she demonstrated how use the hover feature to see stats, and how to download PDFs. The remaining four dashboards come directly from the Airport Noise and Operations Monitoring System (ANOMS). This replaces the previous method which required having to extract data, put it into an Excel file and create a Word doc. and a PDF. The updated methodology is refreshed monthly and reduces human error, allowing for more timely updates.

Noise staff added some data trends and pulled out specific percentages for Missed Approaches. On Early Turns, it is possible to scroll down to find total departures as well as percentage of departures that have early turns, plus some statistics requested by ANAC members. Reasons for early turns have been broken into three categories. There's a breakdown of Point Loma versus Mission Beach, as well as all early turns by operator.

The most interactive dashboard is Noise Complaints, showing total complaints and number of households in the blue line. In the mapping feature, you can click on a specific neighborhood and highlight those complaints from that neighborhood. They're working to get some more detail on the map, but it will never be very detailed because they want to give anonymity to the people filing complaints.

#### **Questions from ANAC:**

Deborah Watkins asked how to see other neighborhoods, and if each dot represents one household.

Ms. Knack said you have to make sure you clear the neighborhood from the search before going on to another, and that the dots do each represent one household.

Chris Cole said he found the underlying map practically useless, and has a feeling that a lot of the complaints are about arrivals, but there have never been statistics on arrivals. He asked if there is a percentage of complaints associated with specific flights?

Ms. Knack said not at this time.

Fred Kosmo suggested that year-over-year stats be provided to identify increases or decreases.

Ms. Knack noted that as part of the subcommittee recommendations, they asked that the definition of missed approaches be modified, so the number will be a little bigger because if a single arrival made multiple misses, they are all being counted, rather than just counting it as one arrival. She showed how to find the comparison stats that are available.

Matthew Price asked about documenting northbound departures over La Jolla at night, and requested year-over-year stats. Stylistically, he suggested more consistency for the breakdowns shown for La Jolla. Also, throughout the various sheets, there are interpretations of the statistics in boxes, which he thinks range from debatable interpretations to some that people may think are not the correct interpretation. He asked that the data be presented without interpretation.

Ms. Knack asked for an example.

Mr. Price pointed out that the number of missed approaches have not increased year over year, while the overall operations have gone up, so the number of early turns has gone up. There are ways with statistics you can describe things in ways that are favorable toward one way or another. For example, month to month, you can't say one is more or less than the last month because it's all about sample size and trends. With large amounts of data, you really can't comment on it.

Ms. Knack mentioned that for locations, they used to do neighborhoods, but the way the database is set up, it's working entirely off of zip codes. That will be consistent going forward.

Robert Bates asked for clarification that the definition of missed approaches recently changed, is that reflected and can you go back and check prior months/years of data?

Ms. Knack said yes, they went backwards, too, and all data is accurate.

Ms. Gantwerk said numbers may look different than data presented before on missed approaches because those have now been counted and earlier reports updated.

Melissa Hernholm-Danzo seconded Mr. Price's suggestion to leave off the blue boxes of interpretation. She asked runway closure dates could be noted for curfew violations.

Ms. Knack said the runway is closed every night, with some exceptions for seasonal operations.

Judy Holiday pointed out that on the pie charts for violations, two of the colors are very similar; she suggested more contrast.

Deborah Watkins asked if this is all active for public use.

Ms. Gantwerk confirmed that it is.

Judy Holiday agreed with Ms. Hernolm-Danzo and Mr. Price regarding the interpretations being misleading.

---

### 3. Approval of Meeting Summary

---

Anthony Ciulla moved to approve the meeting summary. Deborah Watkins seconded, and motion passed.

---

### 4. Public Comment

---

**Kelly Powell, South Ocean Beach**, said she looked over the draft Environmental Impact Report and saw from the draft guidelines that the World Health Organization does call out that aircraft noise above levels of 40 to 45 dB are associated with adverse health effects. That stood out knowing that most of the peninsula already experiences noise well above that level. She thinks if we're going to continue to see increased air traffic, she'd like to see the airport be a good neighbor and try to help mitigate some of the impacts of that noise. Perhaps there are ways that San Diego could require aircraft to use state-of-the-art technology to reduce noise in the aircraft, and also commit to fund development of improved technology as time goes on, so that we can continue to make quieter aircraft. As long as there's only one runway, she'd like to request that they stop expanding the flight path perimeter and really try to stick to the more narrow originally used flight path. Perhaps there are ways that aircrafts can reach higher elevation sooner, which may also mitigate some of the noise. It seems that in a nutshell, there are a number of things that probably could be done, so the question is really is San Diego willing to do those things even though it's going to take time, money, resources, political clout, or are we just unwilling to do something about it? She'd like to see the airport be a good neighbor, and in return for that, she thinks you get a lot better support from your neighbors in the community if there is an obvious effort from the airport to try to mitigate noise.

**Cathy Ives, South Mission Beach** played a recording of airplane noise, reporting that that was what it sounds like over her house, and that it is definitely over the 65 dB. She said that at busy times of day flights come every 90 seconds, and there is no quiet time. After 10:00 pm, in South Mission Beach, it is similarly loud. You don't want to go to bed before 11:00 because you don't want to get that 11:23 flight that zooms right over your house. She requests that flights after 9:00 go right back over the channel instead of directly over South Mission Beach. She knows that she "will be dead" before they could ever be part of the Quiet Neighborhood Program, or Mission Beach will be under water. Mission Beach doesn't seem to be in any of these contours, even though it is over the 65 dB limit, and the 45 is definitely inside many, many houses, especially some of the old cottages in Mission Beach, like her home built in 1925 without insulation. Please consider sending flights over that channel as much as possible instead of directly over South Mission Beach.

**Carol Knott, South Mission Beach** said the noise is horrible and has gotten much worse since she purchased her home. She expressed concern that noise is measured over the channel in spite of the fact that airplanes don't fly over the channel very often anymore because they're over her house. She thinks the decibels should be measured closer to her house. The other problem is how the noise is starting to affect relationships, including her relationship with a man who does not wear his hearing aids due to noise, impacting their ability to communicate.

### Question from ANAC

Matthew Price said at the last meeting there was a gentleman who gave a wonderful presentation on the Part 150 and how they'll look at ways to mitigate noise. For the record, how can they contact that person?

Ms. Gantwerk said that the November 21st meeting is one way, but also at SanNoiseStudy.com. You can send ideas and thoughts directly to the consultant team working on the Part 150 Study. They don't have to respond and engage in dialogue, but they are reading every single comment that comes in. She recommends looking back at ANAC Subcommittee minutes, where there are a lot of ideas discussed. There will be notes from ANAC Subcommittee meetings with their ideas as well.

---

## 5. Next Meeting/Adjourn

---

Next meeting is December 18, 2019. Plan for that meeting is to put together a panel that brings both an airline perspective and a pilot perspective, from those that regularly fly through San Diego.

Melissa Hernholm-Danzo asked what happened to the idea of having a Southwest representative come to give their perspective. Ms. Knack said she would reach out to Southwest to participate in the panel.

Meeting was adjourned.