HMMH
300 South Harbor Boulevard
Suite 516
Anaheim, California 92805
www.hmmh.com

February 25, 2020

Mr. Patrick Lammerding
Deputy Executive Director
Hollywood Burbank Airport

Subject:	Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force – February 19, 2020 Meeting Summary
Reference:	HMMH Project Number 310870

Dear Mr. Patrick Lammerding:

The following is a bullet point summary of the sixth meeting of the Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force (Task Force) that occurred from 6:30 pm to 9:30 pm Wednesday, February 19, 2020.

- The Chair, Ms. Emily Gabel-Luddy, called the meeting to order.
- The Chair described the rules of order.
- The Facilitator, Mr. Gene Reindel, provided roll call, and determined there was a quorum.
- For Agenda item 3, approving the agenda, there were no task force comments.
- For agenda item 4, consent Calendar, the Facilitator provided the January 15, 2020 meeting summary.
- Mr. Krekorian office moved to accept the meeting summary; Ms. Springer seconded the motion.
- Agenda Item 5 two presentations were scheduled for this meeting, the Federal Representative Noise Mitigation and the facilitator HMMH.
- Representative for Congressman Mr. Adam Schiff gave a presentation.

The following is a bullet point summary of what was included within the Federal Representative Noise Mitigation's presentation titled, "Aviation Noise: Federal Actions"

  - Congress authorizes and funds operations of the FAA, most recent authorization was FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 covers funding through Fiscal Year 2023
  - This bill has specific sections covering airport noise and environmental issues
  - FAA uses DNL, the goal is to reduce noise exposure, compatible land use guidelines under 14 CFR Part 150, environmental impacts under NEPA
  - The FAA has existing regulatory authority to set the noise threshold.
  - FAA was directed to review the DNL metric and the 65 DNL threshold
  - Congress could lower the threshold by legislation, there was a Decrease Noise Level (DNL) Act to lower the threshold to 60 dB immediately and 55 dB within 10 years.
  - Communities and airports can agree to use a separate lower threshold than 65 DNL
  - The community requested noise monitors
  - Expanding noise mitigation acts outside the airport impact zone
  - Government Accountability Office (GAO) is investigating NextGen to determine if FAA adequately measures noise, mitigates impacts and conducts public outreach.
- Task force members then asked questions/comments for the Federal Representative Noise Mitigation
- Representative for Mr. Marteniz
  - Has the Task Force provided a copy of all presentations and documents in Spanish?
    - Ms. Gabel-Luddy: thank you for your question I will look into what we have.
- HMMH gave their presentation.

The following is a bullet point summary of what was included within HMMH's presentation titled, "Technical Consultant Presentation"

- Federal Regulations
    - Airport Noise and Capacity Act 1990 (ANCA)
    - Airport Noise and Access Restrictions (Part 161)
    - FAA Noise Abatement Policy Act
- Response to Task Force Member Questions
    - HMMH presented a document containing responses to all questions prior to last month's meeting dated January 31, 2020.
- Data Analysis
    - Aircraft operations by year
    - Annual runway use
    - Prevailing wind analysis
    - Annual number of complaints and complainants
    - Historical flight track data analysis
- Representative for Mr. Marteniz: Where does Whiteman Airport fit into the effect on San Fernando Valley?
    - Mr. Reindel: There is a large number of airports that contribute to the San Fernando Valley airspace. LAX is the major operator in the area we wanted to include it to show a reginal aspect. We did not look at all of the 20+ airports.
- Mr. Krekorian: Did you do any analysis on what departure procedure the aircraft departing BUR Runway 15 are using? To determine what percentage went to the east and what percentage went to the west.
    - Mr. Reindel: We did not specifically do that analysis but we have the data and you will be seeing that data coming up. We show both arrival and departures for each of the years shown here. We depict the data but did not do an actual count of how many went each direction.
- Mr. Krekorian: Is that an analysis you can do and bring the results to the Task Force?
    - Mr. Reindel: Yes that is probably an analysis we can do. We can do a gate analysis to show which aircraft go each direction. We would have to get this analysis done quickly so we can provide it before the next meeting.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: For clarification, in all wind conditions 60% of the time the wind was coming from the south, meaning for safety aircraft should depart to the south and 40% of the time the wind was to the north, meaning for safety aircraft should depart to the north?
    - Mr. Scholten: Yes that is correct just based on the winds.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: For clarification, in calm wind conditions 60% of the time the wind was coming from the north, meaning for safety aircraft should depart to the north and 36% of the time the wind was to the south, meaning for safety aircraft should depart to the south?
    - Mr. Scholton: correct based on just the winds.
- Mr. Krekorian: Wind Analysis indicated 58.8% of the time Runway 8 and 15 would be favored based on overall wind conditions. Every year over 90% of departures are coming of runway 15.
    - Mr. Scholten: During the calm wind conditions, FAA rules dictate a runway different than most aligned with the prevailing wind direction may be used if an operational benefit exists. Operational benefits of using Runways 8 and 15 during calm wind conditions include: availability of published instrument approaches only for Runway 8, deconfliction with LAX arrivals on northern downwind, and terrain and obstructions south and east of BUR that would interfere with the final approach courses for Runways 26 and 33.
- Ms. Springer: Favored is synonymous with used?
    - Mr. Scholten: Correct. Those would be the preferred runways to be used if you were only looking at the wind.
- Mr. Krekorian: The southern line is to arrive on Runway 8?
    - Mr. Reindel: Yes it is called a downwind arrival. The arrivals are coming from the east and then coming around the airport to land to the west.

- Representative for Mr. Ryu: So the very south those are at fairly high altitude? At the very south at the big loop on average what altitude are the aircraft at?
    - Mr. Reindel: Yes they are at a higher altitude.
    - Mr. Reindel: We do not know the altitude at this point, we can certainly do an analysis. We looked at altitudes on departures, but not for arrivals.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: Looking at the line above the southern line that looks like a U that is arriving Runway 33, in 2015 you barely see that concentration compared to 2019, do we a number of operations? Is this a narrowing due to Metroplex or an increase in the number of flights?
    - Mr. Reindel: I believe it is a combination of both. I believe in 2019 there were little more conditions contribution to arrivals on Runway 33 then maybe happened in 2015. We have not looked at those exact numbers. It is also the implementation of procedures to arrival on that runway.
    - Mr. Reindel: The path, not the furthest to the south but the second furthest south that are arriving Runway 33 would be lower as they are closer to the runway at that point and are on descent to arrive. They are lower in altitude than those in the southern most path.
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: Does this represent all jet departures? Corporate jets? Commercial Carriers?
    - Mr. Reindel: Yes it is all jets, small medium and large. It includes corporate jets and commercial carriers.
- Mr. Krekorian: I think it would be important to see the change in fleet mix over time. To see if larger jets are flying lower than smaller jets which impacts the noise level.
    - Mr. Reindel: It likely has changed some, we can look at fleet mix to see how it compares. We could also possible look at a couple predominate aircraft at different weights to see if those altitudes have changed.
- Representative for Ms. Harris: Could you lay out that altitude analysis side by side in terms of altitudes., weights and aircraft type in the same time period?
    - Mr. Reindel: We could do the analysis for the year and categorize them as you said. Now we do not know their exact take-off weights, that is proprietary information that the operators don't share, but we know the max take-off weight so we can compare that. We can also look at overall fleet mix. We might have time to look at a few predominate aircraft that have different max take-off weights to see if there are any differences in altitude.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: For Gate 4, in 2007, 2010,m 2015 it shows mid 1000s for flight tracks and in 2019 it is now 20,000, would that be because the majority of planes prior to 2019 were turning before then got to gate 4?
    - Mr. Reindel: I cannot say specifically for sure, if I were to take a guess that is where my thought would go as well. Obviously there are more going through gate 4 now then used to be and if you look at the number of total operations it has not increased that much over the time period. Especially if you look at 2007 tracks when there were more operations than in 2019.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: Under 2019 gate 3 is that 19,000 or 30,000?
    - Mr. Reindel: The total number of tracks at Gate 3 is 39,492
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: So under Gate 3 you also have 2 times as many tracks and that is further north.
    - Mr. Reindel: Not quite that there was 26,766 total tracks in 2007. There is an increase at Gate 3 as well.
- Representative for Ms. Harris: Is there any reason why you picked January and March?
    - Mr. Reindel: I do not believe there was a particular reason. It was looking at the same week every year to get rid of seasonable variabilities. Looking at a week was already a large amount to listen to.
- Mr. Krekorian: Under what circumstances are sectors combined? Is it available employees, workload, time of week?

    - Mr. Scholten: It is a combination of factors it can be based on staff availability, workload, the traffic level at the time. In general when traffic levels are lower sectors will be combined as there is less of a need to have each sector staffed by an air traffic controller as there is not much traffic. Overall staffing plays into that and also the complexity of the traffic and operations. It is not just one thing that causes sectors to be combined.
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: Is this more insight as to what was discussed two meetings ago where the first heading was given to 210 but the second heading being delayed by as much as 15 seconds, causing planes to turn later?
    - Mr. Scholten: These are some of the challenges that are faced by the controllers working this area that could contribute to things such as the aircraft turning later. The combining of sectors is one thing that could contribute to that and the aircraft getting a delayed turn from the 210 heading because the controller is working a bigger airspace
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: Can you explain what a system service review is?
    - Mr. Scholten: I cannot.
- Mr. Tomek: Are these potential recommendations we can be making to the FAA?
    - Mr. Reindel: Yes so these are recommendations that came from DVAC's analysis looking into the southern shift and what potential remedies could be made to remedy that. Knowing things that the FAA can do if you are interested in returning to how it use to be you could ask the FAA to look at these procedures and get it back to what it use to be. It is also not to say they can do that, because we don't know if they actually can.
- Mr. Tomek: All of the things you just detailed are consistent going back to earlier presentations on how busy the San Fernando Valley airspace is and all those overlays in the first workshop it sounds like this is a function of the very busy airspace and the FAA maybe not staffing this adequately? Is it a function of a specific change in their procedures? Is it not consistent with existing SOP's which suggest people are busy and not achieving the hand-off as fast as they should or use to, it is not so much a structural problem as it is a staffing problem?
    - Mr. Reindel: Unfortunately, we cannot answer that. We can see some of symptoms that are occurring that we have pointed out like the delay in SCT to what they could potentially do, but as to the why's that is from the FAA. The FAA would have to look into whys. We are providing information on SOPs and what they could potentially get benefit from if they looked at it. The FAA has also said there has not been a change in procedures and that is true there has not been a change in a procedure but there is a shift. Cleary something has changed from 2007 and today.
- Mr. Koretz: Is there anything that would stand in the way of the FAA doing some of the proper training and getting it started now.
    - Mr. Reindel: I would say not likely anything in the way. They FAA is currently doing it but what your recommendation would be to update that training in order to reduce those delays in turning aircraft to the north.
- Mr. Koretz: What is the FAA not including within their current training?
    - Mr. Reindel: What it shows is there is a southern drift and one of the things the FAA could focus on in training is how to eliminate that southern drift.
- Mr. Najarian: To what level of certainty does Kevin feel these recommendations will solve the southern drift? If his recommendations were adopted by the FAA would it solve the southern drift?
    - Mr. Reindel: I am not sure if we can say that at this point. We are not inside the tower, we are not inside SCT all we can do being on the outside and just listening and looking at the data is to say we think it can be improved at put back to how it was.
- Mr. Najarian: Do you feel DVAC is the best expert outside of the FAA that can make recommendations to the Task Force?
    - Mr. Reindel: The best entity to make a recommendation is the FAA. I do think his credentials show he has that expertise and experience, he know the talk and processes.
- Community Group Proposals: Preliminary Assessment

- Uproar LA
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: Can the rate of climb or the ascent be optimized even though it might burn more fuel, is it possible to rebalance the instruction to FMS to secure a more rapid ascent at the expense of fuel savings?
    - Mr. Scholten: There is the capability to do that, normally it has to be something done as part of a procedure. It has to be proceduralized so that would be more difficult for in the case when an aircraft is on a heading or on a vector which is something that is issued by an air traffic control. There is no procedural guidance that says what the defined climb rate would be other then a minimum climb rate established, but the issue then you can increase the climb rate, but there is a point where an aircraft cannot maintain that. The FMS generally optimize the aircraft climb to fuel climb, there are some ways you can trade that fuel efficiency with climbing quicker but only goes to a certain point where that can be done.
    - Mr. Reindel: Increasing altitude quicker may not result in the quietest operation on the ground. There are noise abatement departure procedures that have a thrust cutback that can reduce the noise on the ground. There are two aspects to increasing the rate of climb of an aircraft, one is noise reasons to get up and be quieter but that be offset by a noise abatement procedure, the second is to get up high enough so that you can make that turn off the 210 heading. The request may be more for the latter than the former is to get up sooner so you can turn sooner. Our analysis has shown that they are high enough from Runway 8 arrivals to make the turn off the 210 heading.
- Mr. Koretz: You said they might not due it because it is not part of the procedure, is there anything from stopping us from mandating a different procedure?
    - Mr. Scholten: It could be included as part of a procedure as a minimum climb rate, but depending on what that rate is you may get some aircraft that aren't able to do that climb rate due to fuel loading, aircraft performance, atmospheric conditions or specific aircraft type.
- Studio City for Quiet Skies
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: If northerly departure was done outside of the Santa Ana wind conditions, would the other airports have to also change their procedures in order to avoid conflicts with BUR?
    - Mr. Scholten: Yes to some extent they would. For example if BUR was to depart to the north but VNY was to remain landing to the south the air traffic controllers would have to work the airspace different and use different procedures. It would be a lot more workload for controllers and could have a negative impact on the airport capacity because of those complexities. LAX would also have to be considered. You would also have to look at if from a safety perspective, there would be a larger margin of error.
- Advocates for Viable Airport Solutions
- Sherman Oaks & Encino for Quiet Skies
- Burbank for Quiet Skies
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: You talked about the traffic management reviews and working with controllers at SCT to issue the second vector sooner, would that not address the second point on the Burbank for Quiet Skies request that aircraft turn sooner?
    - Mr. Reindel: Indeed it would, but the main word in the proposal was to require, you couldn't put something in place that would require aircraft to turn sooner. We have discussed how we might be able to get them to turn sooner. It was more of a semantics' thing that they want to require they turn sooner which is going to be the difficult part.
- Ms. Springer: What was the altitude at the Jefferies Gate HMMH created (Gate 1)?
    - Mr. Scholten: it was around1800 feet. We are not saying it wasn't possible, you would have to specify a certain climb gradient that all aircraft would have to fly at least that climb gradient.
- Save Coldwater Canyon

- Valley Village
- Changes to Aircraft Procedures
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: What do the purple flight tracks show on slide 95?
    - Mr. Reindel: The purple tracks show if the RNAV procedure shown in the October 2018 CatEx that the FAA is undertaking was implemented.
- Mr. Tomek: The budge of flight tracks south of the JAYTE and TEGAN those existing tracks would no longer exist? The concentration at the new procedure would be incredibly intense?
    - Mr. Reindel: Correct.
    - Mr. Reindel: Yes it would likely be concentrated as shown in the graphic until they are vectored off the procedure.
- Mr. Tomek: Are JAYTE and TEGAN as currently planned are south of the 101 Freeway?
    - Mr. Reindel: Correct.
- Ms. Springer: Can you explain this graphic more?
    - Mr. Reindel: What you are looking at here the red is existing today, but all those existing flight tracks would be concentrated into that band at JAYTE until they approach TEGAN to where they would be vectored to the north. It is the same number of tracks you would culminate them going south of the JAYTE/TEGAMN line.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: If this was the proposed procedure from the FAA's October 2018 CatEx, is this potentially in our future anyways?
    - Mr. Reindel: My understanding is they are proceeding with an EA which is about a 1-2 year process, they are doing the environmental review whether or not they will be moving forward with that procedure.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: so one of the recommendations we can make is for the FAA not to move forward with this procedure?
    - Mr. Reindel: you could, yes.
- Mr. Koretz: Is there a way to make the turn back in same location but to disperse flight tracks?
    - Mr. Reindel: That is why I mentioned in the beginning these RNAV departure procedures tend to be concentrated but the FAA is looking at other technologies that could disperse them but currently that technology does not exist. Within the US in terms of NextGen departure procedures have concentrated tracks as a result.
- Questions for Task Force Members to consider before the next meeting.
- Process for Preparing Recommendations
- Mr. Krekorian: There maybe recommendations we make that might require further analysis and consideration by HMMH, and we would want HMMH to come back and help with recommendations, how would we handle that?
    - Mr. Reindel: My recommendation, I am not sure if you want to rely so much on HMMH's first look at feasibility and get it to the FAA to look at feasibility. That is why I have asked for you to explain the problem you are trying to solve with that recommendation. If we get hundreds of recommendations we will not be able to look into all of them, we may be able to take a high level approach to them and state potential barriers to implementation.
- Mr. Krekorian: As we provide recommendations to you, HMMH will be consolidating them by subject matter trying to reduce the duplication?
    - Mr. Reindel: that is correct but we will try to keep all the nuances of slightly different recommendations.
- Mr. Tomek: I have a question regarding your response number 18 on page 21 of the question memo, detailing where the turn off the 210 heading can happen, FAA's response is not entirely consistent with the data shown.
    - Mr. Reindel: I think what is being responded to, was if they were to put in an RNAV procedure to solve the problem, the RNAV procedure must work in all cases meaning it would have to be deconflicted with Runway 8 arrivals. What we have today is more or less of an open SID, they can vector them as soon as they reach the MVA and there is no

conflict. There is many times there is no conflict and the FAA can turn aircraft north of the 101, they can do this because it is not a defined procedure.

- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: I would like to confirm we will get copies of your presentation from this evening.
    - Mr. Reindel: We will send out an email describing what we just talked about and how to download our presentation.

- Public Comments on Agenda Item 5.

  The following is a bullet point summary of the general ideas of the public comment on Agenda Item 5 of the Task Force meeting.

- The southern drift is an assault
- It is not just the southern drift, but it's concentration of paths
- Our proposal for Sherman Oaks & Encino for Quiet Skies was to use two northerly RNAV procedures called VVERA and HAYES which were implemented prior to metroplex which go over industrial non-residential, can this be addressed?
- Do not forget about the densely populated areas around the 101 Freeway.
- Noise abatement does nothing to protect outdoor spaces
- We are asking for a FAIR solution, we want dispersion
- Do not like the aircraft noise
- Agenda Item 6.
- Mr. Krekorian: I would like to thank HMMH for their presentation. In addition to ensuring your presentation is available to the Task Force Members, that it is also available to the community groups.
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: Not immediately in the preview of the Task Force but one of the Recommendations will be asking for legislative action to ensure a permanent nighttime noise curfew at BUR and VNY.
- Task Force reaches a consensus to add a seventh and final Task Force Meeting on April. 1, 2020
- Agenda item 7, the next meeting will be held on Wednesday April 1, 2020 at 6:30 pm at the Burbank Marriott Hotel.
- Chair Ms. Gabel-Luddy proposed an amendment to the bylaws in the event of a tie that the recommendation go to the FAA for consideration.
- Mr. Reindel: For meeting 7, we recommended that the meeting start with public comment.
- Mr. Krekorian, I agree public comment go first, but set a specific amount of time for public comment.
- Mr. Reindel, I believe we should wait to see how many recommendations we get before we set the time.
- Mr. Koretz, could we consider beginning a little earlier or go later?
- Chair Ms. Gable-Luddy, we will take an inventory for the April 1 meeting to determine Task Force Member availability and availability of the meeting space.
- For any public comments please send them to taskforce@bur.org.

Sincerely yours,

Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc.

Justin W. Cook

Justin W. Cook - INCE, LEED GA
Principal Consultant

cc: Gene Reindel, HMMH Vice President and Task Force Facilitator