

MEETING SUMMARY

Airport Noise Advisory Committee

Date | Time 10/21/2020 4:00 p.m.

Meeting called to order by: Heidi Gantwerk

In Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>In Attendance</u>
Community Planning Groups Within the 65 dB contour		
Erika Espinosa Araiza	Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee	Yes
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	Yes
Carl "Rick" Huenefeld	MCRD	Yes
Robert Bates	Airline Pilot (Active)	Yes
Kallie Glover	Performance Engineer, Delta Airlines	No*
Dave Ryan	NBAA	No
Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
Justin Cook	Acoustical Engineer	Yes
Maria Bojorquez-Gomez	Congress, 53rd District, for Rep. Susan Davis	Yes
Joshua Coyne	San Diego City Council, District 2, for Jennifer Campbell	Yes
Anthony Nguyen	Congress, 52nd District for Rep. Scott Peters	No
Genevieve Fong	S.D. County Board of Supervisors, District 1, for Sup. Greg Cox	Yes
Keith Lusk	FAA Representative	Yes
Ivan Gutierrez	FAA Representative	Yes
Presenters		
Heidi Gantwerk	Facilitator	Yes
Ryk Dunkelberg	Mead & Hunt	Yes
Jim Payne	SDCRAA	Yes
Sjohnna Knack	SDCRAA	Yes

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

13 voting members in attendance

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

Heidi Gantwerk, facilitator for the Airport Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC), opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. with introductions. Ms. Gantwerk briefly shared the agenda and read the Executive Order N-29-20.

2. Roll Call

Heidi Gantwerk called a committee member roll call for attendance.

3. 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>

a. Part 150 Update

Ryk Dunkelberg from Mead & Hunt shared where they are in the overall study process and their next steps with the FAR Part 150 study. The Noise Exposure Maps (NEMs), one of the two components of a Part 150 study, were recertified in November of 2016. The current updated Part 150 study was initiated in 2018 (toward the end of the Flight Procedures Study). The Part 150 study addresses aircraft noise issues within the 65 or greater Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour. The Airport Authority completed the Flight Procedure Evaluation study in 2019 to address concerns from residents outside the 65 CNEL contour¹.

Mr. Dunkelberg then explained the three categories of alternatives, Operational (under control of the FAA), Land Use (under the control of the state and local governments), and Administrative (under control of the Airport proprietor). At prior meetings, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed aviation activity forecasts, aircraft operations and fleet mix, existing and future base case noise contours, land use and population analysis within the 65 CNEL contour along with identified preliminary alternatives (including several resulting from ANAC alternatives). In May 2020, the draft operational alternatives were presented to the TAC and CAC, and the refined and new alternatives were presented² in October. At the next TAC/CAC and public workshop, the preliminary study recommendations will be presented, followed by the draft report in February 2021 and then the public hearing in March 2021.

Questions from ANAC:

Chris Cole asked if the City or developers with the new Midway development have been in contact with the Airport Authority.

Sjohnna Knack said that the City is a member of the TAC and the Airport Authority staff is aware and involved in the airport land use compatibility planning.

Judy Holiday asked if the public workshop date in December has been finalized and voiced her concern about low attendance if held virtually.

¹ SDIA Air Traffic Flight Procedure Evaluation (Ricondo & Associates, Published August 2019) <https://www.san.org/Airport-Noise/FAR-Part-150?EntryId=13636>

² Part 150 and TAC/CAC meeting October 15, 2020.

Ryk Dunkelberg said those dates have not been finalized and could be pushed back given the holidays. He mentioned they're having discussions on the best way to hold the workshop, with public safety being their number one priority.

Heidi Gantwerk said there's been an increase in participation since they've been holding meetings virtually.

Rob Bates asked about the timeframe and next steps for Mead & Hunt to do the modeling.

Note: Rob Bates' question is referring to the NADP vertical profile modeling.

Ryk Dunkelberg explained they first have to get FAA agreement on each particular and significant aircraft to model, then they will evaluate from a single event level with the most common aircraft at the airport. Afterwards, they will probably make a recommendation that each of the airlines use that particular departure procedure for each of their aircraft flying at SDIA.

Matthew Price asked Mr. Dunkelberg four questions:

- If the NADP modeling will include looking at the effects outside the 65 CNEL
Answer: They looked at the effects of both inside and beyond the 65 CNEL.
(Note: since the NADP has no impact on the 65 CNEL, consultants used Lmax to show any subtle changes that could be expected with the NADP.)
- Asked for clarification on the new dispersion alternative
Answer: The new dispersion alternative is to address different percentage allocation of aircraft on certain departure routes.
- If the nighttime noise abatement procedure is under Federal control
Answer: Yes, there is under Federal control of where and how they fly.
- What will be the criteria for the consultants to recommend or deny moving a proposal forward?
Answer: Criteria for recommendations or denial are based on the Program Standards (Section B150.7) of the Part 150 regulations that every alternative must meet, along with other federal laws and regulations.

Fred Kosmo asked what the modeling is showing and where the noise is being shifted.

Ryk Dunkelberg explained that each of the procedures they modeled resulted in a cumulative noise contour, the 65 CNEL contour. If the modeling of that particular recommended procedure results in the shifting of noise, which results in new non-compatible land uses within that contour compared to the future base-case contour where there were no operational changes, that is a shift of noise. Shifting noise from one non-compatible use and/or neighborhood to another is in violation of the Part 150 regulation goal.

b. GAO Report – Stage 3 Phase Out & Operational Trends

Justin Cook from HMMH gave an update on the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) report on the potential mandate of a Stage 3 aircraft phase out.³ He gave an overview of the federal regulation of the Part 36⁴, and its purpose of constantly looking at ways to reduce noise through aircraft design. He explained Stage 5 is the latest noise standard and that all aircraft flying today are certified at a minimum of Stage 3 or higher.

The report found that 96 percent of Stage 3 aircraft could meet Stage 4/5 noise standards but don't because the recertification cost and offer little to no noise reduction benefit. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there's an acceleration of some older Stage 3 aircraft being retired (e.g. British Airways B744

³ Aircraft Noise: Information on a Potential Mandated Transition to Quieter Airports ([GAO-20-661: Published August 20, 2020](#))

⁴ FAA, [Advisory Circular 36-4D](#), Noise Standards: Aircraft Type and Airworthiness Certification (Washington, D.C.: Oct. 12, 2017).

at SDIA), and a change in fleet mix, potentially leaving behind those Stage 3 aircraft, which, if recertified, would be considered Stage 4.

Questions from ANAC:

Chris Cole asked if the Authority has ever denied any general or regular airline usage of the airport due to standards.

Ms. Knack mentioned there are noise limits in the Airport Use Regulation. To her knowledge, there's been one airline denied usage since her 15 years at the airport.

Judy Holiday asked how they determined that most Stage 3 aircraft could meet more stringent noise standards, and what were the "other benefits" of a mandatory phase-out of certified Stage 3 aircraft.

Justin Cook said they looked at the raw measurements and compared it to Stage 4 standards.

Ms. Knack mentioned with newer technology in aircraft, some of the other benefits, along with noise, are in environmental, air quality, and fuel consumption.

Deborah Watkins asked what could be done to make it mandatory to remove Stage 3 aircraft at the airport.

Justin Cook explained that an airport can't require certain types of aircraft at an airport, but they can have a program like the Fly Quiet Program that encourages airlines to fly the newer generation aircraft.

Ms. Knack said the louder fleet being retired due to the pandemic. It doesn't mean they won't have noise concerns when operation levels resume. She explained how the Fly Quiet Program gives them an opportunity to engage with the airlines. Staff will present a Fly Quiet overview and update at the next ANAC meeting⁵.

Jorge Rubio said from an airport operator standpoint, he believes this is a positive change in the industry and that he saw the difference it made in the communities during the phase-out of Stage 2.

Tania Fragomeno asked if the cost for the recertification was for the modifications to the aircraft or for testing.

Justin Cook said it's the cost of the testing process (taking aircraft out of service to be tested) that cost the airlines money.

c. Current Noise Concerns – Departures over La Jolla, Early Turns over Point Loma, and FedEx Arrival from Tijuana

Jim Payne discussed noise concerns that the noise office asked the FAA to review in September. The specific concerns included an egregious early turn over Point Loma and a particular FedEx flight from Tijuana with a high rate of Missed Approaches (essentially a visual flight that takes off in Mexico and is vectored into SDIA). The Noise office is looking into working with Tijuana Air Traffic Control to improve the handoff from domestic to international airspace to reduce missed approaches for this flight.

Questions from ANAC:

Matthew Price asked if ANAC can get a noise dot off the coast of La Jolla.

⁵ ANAC meeting December 16, 2020.

Keith Lusk said for that process to happen, it would first have to be agreed upon by the ANAC, then presented to the FAA as a formal recommendation, and then the FAA would be in a position to evaluate the recommendation.

Ms. Knack asked the FAA why these aircraft, that are compliant with the noise dot, are being taken off and not rejoining the published route, both at night and during the day, without evidence due to traffic separation or weather.

Keith Lusk said John Nelson did conduct a review of the submitted procedures specific to this, but did not indicate the reasoning before he left. Mr. Lusk said he will get the answers to the noise office.

Ms. Knack mentioned the intent of Jim's presentation was to bring to the Committee's attention that her team is not just taking noise complaints, they're watching for unique operations with commonality between concerns and the most egregious flights within their own system before reaching out to the FAA for possible resolutions. This will be ongoing and a standing topic at ANAC meetings.

Heidi Gantwerk mentioned there is a public comment on this agenda item that is in the member materials.

d. Airport Authority Updates

Sjohnna Knack reminded everyone that the monthly stats are on Tableau, published the second Friday of the month. She gave an update on QHP and how staff and contractors continue to work through COVID-19 while maintaining safe procedures in the field. The Program has completed to date around 4,400 homes. In August 2020 they received their largest FAA AIP grant in a single year from the FAA for \$18 million dollars. This grant allows them to maintain the current spending on the residential component of the Quieter Home Program, and start the non-residential program.

To date, they've established the policies and procedures and identified Dewey Elementary as the first non-residential facility to treat, hopefully starting in December 2020. Currently there are 28 non-residential properties on their list, made up of public and private schools, preschools, places of worship, and some other ancillary properties. They will rank schools as first priority, working from the loudest to quietest areas.

She reported SDIA has been running at about 50 percent of their operation levels from this time last year, while passenger levels are around 30 to 35 percent and have been leveling out the last few weeks. She mentioned she is currently working with the Airports Council International noise working group, looking at ways they can work with their communities, within the Federal restriction parameters, before aircraft come back to normal operating levels.

Questions from ANAC:

Chris Cole asked about low participation rate from Bankers Hill, and if there's a way to reach out to homeowners to apply for the Quieter Home Program.

Ms. Knack explained that they reach out to all owners, and tenants if unable to reach the owner. The main reasons for the low participation rate in Bankers Hill area are the owners have significant amount of code violation work they must complete before their property can be treated and so they chose not to participate. Or, they are commercially zoned properties therefore not eligible.

Erika Espinosa-Araiza asked if the non-residential properties are able to apply or are they selected specifically by the Authority.

Ms. Knack said any non-compatible use would be eligible to apply, but they've done an extensive research and identified pretty much all properties. She encouraged the Committee to send her any eligible non-residential properties they believe should be considered.

Fred Kosmo asked for the reasoning that caused the Early Turns presented.

Heidi Gantwerk said the audio connection with Keith Lusk, FAA, was dropped. Once she receives the FAA's response she will send it to the Committee. Note: the following information was emailed to ANAC members:

ANAC Members,

During our last ANAC meeting, several questions were posed regarding the current noise concerns presented by Jim Payne. We have reached out to the FAA for additional information regarding these flights and the answer is below.

Per the FAA:

Point Loma Early Turns– While this type of event is never planned, and rarely occurs, sometimes it is simply unavoidable. Controllers often rely on the expeditious compliance of their instructions by pilots. When for reasons beyond our control that is not possible, controllers need to take quick and decisive action to ensure the safety of the aircraft under their control.

La Jolla – All of the flights you shared were NAP compliant. (In other words, they adhered to the FAA noise dots). However, our initial review does indicate that there may be some additional aircraft overflying La Jolla. Due to the reduction in competing arrivals, and in an effort to expedite an aircraft's turn on course, it appears that we may be vectoring aircraft off the ZZOOO departure (using right turns over La Jolla). We are working diligently to complete an internal review of our procedures and we will address any issues of noncompliance.

If you need clarification, or have any other questions, please let me know.

Have a good weekend all,

Heidi

4. Action Items

a. Approval of August 19, 2020 Meeting Summary

Anthony Ciulla made a motion to approve the meeting summary from the August 2020 meeting, it was seconded by Olivier Brackett. The motion was approved.

5. Public Comment

Tony Russell (SDCRAA staff) reported there was one Public Comment that was emailed to the Authority Clerk by the deadline posted on the agenda. The Public Comment was distributed to staff and Committee members and posted online.

6. Next Meeting/Adjourn

Next meeting is December 16, 2020.

Meeting was adjourned.


Sjohnna Knack (Dec 17, 2020 10:47 PST)

Revised 10/15/2020

October 21, 2020 ANAC Meeting

Communications Received from the Public

Item 3.c

-----Original Message-----

From: Lance Murphy

Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 9:42 AM

To: Heick Dustin

Subject: Re: Distribution: October 21, 2020 Airport Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC) Meeting

Hi, I'm unable to attend the ANAC meeting but would like to make the following comment regarding Missed Approaches:

If possible, I would like the comments in their entirety included in the minutes of this meeting.

=====

The missed-approach statistics should be of great concern, they are a leading indicator of possible operational risks or crowding of the airport's capacity.

This is particularly risky when they occur in fog or anytime there are under head-to-head operations.

I'm also concerned when they occur during the time that people are sleeping - it is as loud as a curfew violation.

I suggest the following additions and changes to the Missed Approach reporting:

1. There should be a pie chart or similar graphic to display the conditions that affect a missed approach - wind, fog, other external cause, or none (pilot may have been too hot on approach?)
2. There should be a breakdown for number of missed approach based on time of day. The noise data (peak dB?) should also be reported for the overflowed area as well as the complaints generated by that event. This data should be presented to the airline so that they can better manage their impact on the community.
3. If there are ANY missed approaches during head-to-head operations, they have an extremely high risk of potential collision over populated area. Each event should be individually reported with all comments and data required if it had resulted in a near-miss or possible collision. I would recommend that these be forwarded by Airport management to the FAA region for fault analysis and reporting back to Airport Safety Officer.

=====

Best regards,
Lance Murphy
San Diego