

FAA Interim Response to Noise Forum's NextGen Noise Mitigation Proposals


NEXTGEN SUBCOMMITTEE FOR THE
OAKLAND AIRPORT/COMMUNITY NOISE FORUM
APRIL 18, 2018



Brief Timeline

- In response to complaints throughout 2016 and at the request of the former FAA Regional Administrator, Mr. Glen Martin, the Forum accepted the role as the FAA link on behalf of NextGen noise affected communities.
- Noise mitigation proposals were sent to the FAA on March 27, 2017.
- After 8 months with no word, Congresswoman Barbara Lee contacted the FAA to request a response in November 2017.
- Continued efforts by Representative Lee resulted in the FAA providing an undated report titled *Interim Response to Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum's Recommendations* in February 2018.

The Forums's Proposals Identified Six Issues

- **HUSSH** - Night time noise abatement for OAK departures
 - **WNDSR** - A concentrated 24-hour arrival route into OAK
 - **OAKLAND** - OAK departure
 - **CNDEL** - OAK departure
 - **NIITE** – Nighttime noise abatement for SFO departures
 - **TRUKN** – Concentrated SFO departures over the East Bay
-
- **Multiple recommendations and alternatives were made for each** ●
- 

The FAA's Interim Response

- The Proposal's 6 issues were separated into their 34 individual recommendations by the FAA.
- The questions the Forum had regarding the 1) anticipated process, 2) how the proposals would be evaluated, and 3) a specific timeline were considered as 3 additional requests by the FAA.

Grand total: 37 items the FAA responded to.




The FAA's Response to the Six Issues

- **HUSSH** – 8 Under Evaluation and one recommendation for a 24-hour use for certain OAK departures as “not endorsed” for undefined safety issues.
- **WNDSR** – All 6 recommendations Under Evaluation.
- **OAKLAND**– All 5 recommendations Under Evaluation.
- **CNDEL** – All 2 recommendations Under Evaluation.
- **NIITE** – All 5 recommendations Under Evaluation.
- **TRUKN** – 4 Under Evaluation and 3 of the recommendations identified as “Feasible and Could Be Undertaken in the Short Term (Less than 2 years)”

The Three TRUKN “Feasible” Responses

“Feasible and Could Be Undertaken in the Short Term (Less than 2 years)”

1. Analyze if a procedural decrease in altitude over TRUKN exists and whether higher altitudes can be restored.
 2. Model how proposed changes will result in noise reduction.
 3. If the FAA develops the ability to assign RNAV tracks automatically to echo legacy dispersed traffic and noise conditions, modify the TRUKN procedure to test this capability.
-


- The FAA’s response is on these is vague and seems to infer only studies could be initiated within two years.
 - No information on “where” in this 2 year timeline these proposals are.
- 

The FAA's Response to the Process Questions

The Forum's Questions:

- How the process is anticipated to move forward
- How will flight tracks and procedures be evaluated

The FAA's Response:

- Finalize the preliminary feasibility studies.
 - Conduct formal environmental and safety reviews.
 - Coordinate and seek feedback from communities and stakeholders
 - Undertake additional negotiated actions as needed
 - Implement new procedures as required.
- 

The FAA's Response to Timeline Question

The Forum's Question:

- What is the estimated timeline for the process?

The FAA's Response:

- The FAA gave no specific timelines or information on “where” within the FAA's process any of the recommendations under evaluation are.
- The FAA gave no estimate of how long “Under Evaluation” might last.
- The FAA did provide generalized time estimates for the typical series of steps once the evaluation portion is complete.
- Several steps on the list have only open-ended time estimates.

The FAA's Generalized Timeline

These are the estimated time estimates the FAA provided once a “procedure” has been evaluated and if considered feasible:


- Changes to Air Traffic Facility actions – a few weeks to more than 1 year
- Amending or creating a new instrument flight rule procedure – more than 1 year
- Various reviews, preparation, inspections, and distribution of published charted procedures – more than 200 days

Grand Total > 1.5 years

NextGen Subcommittee Responses

- “Under Evaluation” is vague. Request “where” along the evaluation process each of the 6 submitted issues for consideration are.
- Request information on the FAA’s deliberations for the feasibility of each of the 6 submitted issues in the proposal.
- Clarify we seek expeditious timelines for each of the 6 submitted issues in the proposal.
- The NextGen subcommittee is not convinced that the recommendation to use HUSSH 24-hours a day for certain OAK departures is a “safety” issue that prevents it being endorsed by the FAA. Ask this remain under consideration.

NextGen Subcommittee Responses Continued

- Clarify that initiating studies within 2 years for 3 of the TRUKN recommendations is a vague and unsatisfactory response.
 - Strongly urge the FAA to more closely and collaboratively include the Forum in the FAA's procedure design process going forward.
 - Request that the FAA commit the necessary resources to actively move forward with the proposed recommendations in a more expeditious manner. The subcommittee understands the FAA has proposed certain changes on the Peninsula by August 2018. Why is the East Bay so much further behind if the Metroplex is so interdependent as the FAA states?
- 

Conclusion

- The NextGen Subcommittee has prepared a formal response to the FAA that includes the concerns, clarifications and requests outlined in this presentation titled *Response to the FAA's Interim Response Report For the Supplemental Proposals to Revising the Northern California Metroplex for Alameda and Contra Costa Counties*.
- The NextGen Subcommittee requests the Noise Forum vote to adopt this report together with the cover letter provided and send to the FAA as the next step in addressing adverse NextGen noise concerns.