

## HMMH

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

January 28, 2020

Mr. Patrick Lammerding  
Deputy Executive Director  
Hollywood Burbank Airport

Subject: Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force – January 15, 2020 Meeting  
Summary  
Reference: HMMH Project Number 310870

Dear Mr. Patrick Lammerding:

The following is a bullet point summary of the second meeting of the Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force (Task Force) that occurred from 6:30 pm to 9:30 pm Wednesday, January 15, 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 December 4, 2019 meeting summary.
- Representative from Council Member Rui's office moved to accept the meeting summary; Ms. Springer seconded the motion.
- Six of presentations were scheduled for this meeting, the facilitator HMMH, the FAA and four community group presentations, Burbank for Quiet Skies, Parents of LAUSD Students, Save Coldwater Canyon, and Valley Village Homeowners Association.
- HMMH gave their presentation.

The following is a bullet point summary of what was included within HMMH's presentation titled, "Joint Stakeholders Taskforce: Fifth Meeting of the Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force"

- Purpose of the Task Force is to address community concerns regarding aircraft noise from aircraft departing BUR and VNY.
- The expected outcome of the task force is to submit recommendation(s) to the FAA aimed at solving the aircraft noise problems.
- HMMH's role:
  - Acquire, process and analyze flight track data to define the problem expressed by communities and to review and assess proposals brought forth by the community groups.
  - Assist the Task Force in determining possible solutions and assist in preparing the submittal to the FAA.
- There have been 77 questions submitted by the task force, HMMH consolidated into 51 questions for submittal.
  - 31 submitted to the FAA-13 responses, 4 partial responses, 10 awaiting response
  - 11 submitted to HMMH-4 responses, 1 partial response, 6 awaiting response
  - 9 submitted to BUR and VNY Airports
- HMMH will provide summaries of the solutions proposed by the community groups during the February 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- HMMH will present the flight track analysis for BUR and VNY from 2007 to 2019 at the February 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

- At the February 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, Task Force Meeting 6, a final set of responses to task force member questions will be provided.
- At the Task Force Meeting 7, HMMH will present recommendations for Task Force consideration and the Task Force will approve/determine recommendations.
- The focus during the meetings thus far has been on education, data and information gathering, going forward the focus should shift to developing recommendations to solve the problems(s).
- The FAA began their discussion.
  - The City of Los Angeles filed a lawsuit against the FAA with regards to departures from BUR airport, because that litigation is in the early stages we are not engaging in public discussions on that matter for now. Unfortunately, five of the Task Force questions relate to those issues and we have not answered those questions.
  - Until the litigation is resolved we intend to work with the Task Force where we can.
  - The FAA did provide a response to the letter from Senator Harris and her colleagues sent in July 2018. The FAA responded in September of 2018 and subsequently responded to her letters for two requests on December 19, 2019 and January 13, 2019.
- The FAA opened the floor for Task Force Members to ask clarifying questions.
- Ms. Springer: In regard to returning to pre-Metroplex procedures the FAA responded they will not return to ground based navigation. For clarity does this mean you cannot return to ground based navigation or you choose not to do so?
  - As GPS technology has been implemented as part of the NextGen and modernization of the national airspace system, it becomes a foundational program for the FAA and the modernization of the airspace. As such, we will not be going backwards.
- Ms. Springer: Follow up to the FAA response in regard to the direction of operations, can BUR and VNY operate in a flow direction independent of the nearby airports? For example, LAX and SMO.
  - For the entire Los Angeles basin all the airports do interact with each other. Southern California Metroplex was such a complicated project is all the procedures have to work in unison. No airport can operate independently from the other airports, they all have an impact on each other. Of course, there are variances within that.
- Representative for Ms. Feinstein: At the last meeting you determined there had been a southernly shift and that you would conduct additional analysis to determine the cause. Have you been able to do that analysis or have any information on that for us tonight?
  - At the last Task Force Meeting we talked about a lot of analysis and also gave a lot of analysis on a thumb drive and much of it is on our webpage now. We have conducted further analysis, but we are not at liberty to discuss that tonight due to the ongoing litigation.
- Representative for Ms. Feinstein: According to the FAA at the last meeting, the southern shift did not occur due to a procedural change, is it possible to go back to pre-metroplex conditions and shift it back north as an interim fix or a long term fix? What are the factors you must consider and is it even possible for you to do?
  - This question is coming right into that litigation again, with that we are not going to respond to that question.
- Representative for Mr. Lieu: Just for clarification, it is my understanding the FAA is in the process of doing an Environmental Assessment as part of the settlement agreement with the communities in Benedict Hills, regarding air traffic that would cover part of the Santa Monica Mountains?
  - That is correct, we are in the beginning stages of an Environmental Assessment with amendments to the SLAAP and OROSZ procedures. We will also consider any other reasonable alternative.
- Representative for Mr. Lieu: Following up on that it is my understanding as well that part of that which was initially suggested by the residents of Benedict Hills was the creation of two waypoints that could potentially create a solution for stemming traffic and keeping it in a certain area, thus mitigating noise. That has not been implemented correctly?



- That is correct, we did two public workshops and based on the amount of community input received at those workshops we decided to do further environmental work and we are just in the beginning stages of the environmental assessment.
- Representative for Mr. Lieu: Are the two waypoints the FAA is proposing are JAYTE and TEAGN, the two waypoint that initially were proposed by the residents of Benedict Hills?
  - If the question is were those two waypoints created for that proposed change then the answer is yes.
- Representative for Mr. Lieu: JAYTE and TEAGN were not the waypoints that were proposed by the residents of the area, those are waypoints the FAA determined or proposed?
  - It was all done under confidential mediation and I do not have that information.
- Representative for Mr. Lieu: Is it correct to say current standing FAA regulation allows for spacing not just of planes just within 3 nm laterally but as well spacing them at least 1000 feet vertically?
  - Yes that is our minimum spacing standard.
- Representative for Mr. Lieu: Will the Environmental Assessment consider alternative waypoints when the FAA does that study aside from the ones being looked at?
  - The current Environmental Assessment will allow for any reasonable alternative.
- Representative for Mr. Lieu: So potentially including the waypoints that were proposed by the residents of the community?
  - Without knowing what was proposed I can't respond to that, but any reasonable alternative will be considered under that environmental assessment.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: Because satellite-based navigation is foundational to modernization of the airspace, the FAA will not return to ground based navigation, I want to clarify, that is unless directed by congress?
  - Everything we do is unless directed by congress.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: Based on conversations with pilots my understanding is they use flight management software that tends to place the aircraft on a minimum climb rate, what can be done to increase the minimum climb rates or encourage airplane operators to increase their level of rate of climb?
  - First let's distinguish the difference between a climb rate and a climb gradient, a climb rate is really up to the pilot to determine, what rate they are going to climb that aircraft as long as they meet the minimum climb gradient which is 200 feet. Which in some procedures it is higher, it depends on the unique circumstances at the airport if we exceed 500 feet/nm it requires a waiver to our procedural criteria, below that requires additional justification. As shown in the responses, you have different climb gradients for each procedure. The way the airplane or pilot in command flies at what climb rate whether they climb at 600 feet, or 500 feet is a determination made by that pilot.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: So the climb gradient is the minimum that is set and the climb rate is what the pilot chooses?
  - Correct, the minimum gradient is set in the procedure.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: For the climb gradients, what can we do to get those waivers, is that something that FAA is able and willing to push for these airports?
  - Typically we do not design procedures to have a climb gradient higher than 500 feet, because it is outside our safety criteria. There are a few airports where that may be an exception, but they are not the norm. It looks we are 340-420 at BUR so which is under the 500 feet.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: What are climb gradients for VNY?
  - The FAA looked up this information and it is the exact same climb gradient as the OROSZ and SLAPP.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: What I request for future meetings, as we move to recommendations, is for the gradients that are between 200-500 what efforts can be made to increase the minimum climb gradient, thus increasing the climb rate that a pilot can choose as high of a level as that is deemed safe.



- Representative for Mr. Ryu: Is there any ability to create additional GPS waypoints in order to create dispersion in a RNAV world? If it is possible how would it be done?
  - I think what you are asking for is dispersal or the section 175 of the reauthorization. That is something the FAA is looking at from a headquarters standpoint of how do we do that. The FAA has scientists looking at that, as it is not something that is built into our criteria yet as far as using GPS to find ways to have dispersal headings. It is something we are required to respond to as part of the reauthorization and we are currently working on that.
- Representative for Mr. Ryu: At VNY the PPPRY waypoint was added, this caused tracks to move about 2/3 of mile south from where they were initially occurring. What was the after-action assessment of the PPPRY waypoint?
  - When it was initially brought to our attention, we established the PPPRY waypoint. By creating the PPPRY waypoint we were able to put aircraft back in the basic turn area they were on prior to the metroplex. It is in the responses; it is very clear on how the PPPRY was built.
  - We have been working with LAWA on looking at PPPRY and why we are seeing a shift south of PPPRY. The attempt there was to get aircraft to turn a little tighter to PPPRY waypoint and make it mirror what it was prior to the metroplex.
- Mr. Koretz: Was any additional wildlife studied beyond just birds and bats and is there any data you can provide to illustrate that that was studied and what the results were?
  - Yes the Environmental Assessment that was done during the Metroplex timeframe will have addressed all the wildlife as well as terrain. It does take into consideration elevations in the noise modeling.
- Mr. Koretz: How do you deal with the fact that there is a real impact that you at least didn't anticipate in your study?
  - The only way I can answer that is I think we are seeing changes in wildlife patterns all over the globe.
- Mr. Koretz: Are you going to use the fact the lawsuit was filed as an excuse not to provide valuable data that would help us to solve this issue as I understand has happened in other places in the country where similar situations have occurred or are you going to provide the data and help us work together towards a solution?
  - As we already stated we cannot engage in public discussions on those matters that are specifically addressed in the litigation, but as we also stated we are here committed to work with the Southern San Fernando Valley Noise Task Force. We have to put a box around where there is litigation, it is what we do everywhere and we have very specific instructions from our chief council's office and we are following those instructions.
- Burbank for Quiet Skies gave their presentation.

The following is a bullet point summary of what was included within Burbank for Quiet Skies presentation titled, "Burbank for Quiet Skies."

- From the FAA's website on NextGen:
  - More on time arrivals and departures
  - Quieter and more environmentally friendly
  - Safer air travel
- Research outside the FAA, in reality they mean:
  - Aircraft can take off minutes or even seconds apart.
  - Flights taking off at lower altitudes and traveling in more precise paths in areas they have never been before
  - Noise complaints increase
  - Lawsuits filed across the US
- FAA held Q&A for NextGen
  - Signs that showed the procedures.



- Had stations where you could pull up your address and look at how the changes would affect you.
- FAA representative stated “people only think it is getting louder”
- Noise readings from February 2017 using Webtrak
  - 83 dB was the noisy benchmark pre-Metroplex
  - Below 1800 feet altitude benchmark pre-Metroplex
  - Showed data flight data from 12/18/2016, 1/22/2017, and 2/26/2017
- Used BUR quarterly noise reports to pull data
  - Showed Q2 2017 and compared data to Q2 2012, Q2 2013, Q2 2014, Q2 2015 and Q2 2016.
- Comparing track data from a day pre-NextGen and post-NextGen there were more noiser and lower flights post-NextGen
  - There were 39 flights below 1600 feet
- Showed BUR Airport infographic comparing departure altitudes from same week in August 2016 and 2017
  - They are using 1000-2000 feet altitude bands. Where we show you changes in a couple hundred feet.
- A new community-Magnolia Park
  - There is now noise over Magnolia Park
- Nighttime Noise Violations
  - Many health effects from lack of sleep.
- BUR Airport complaints have increase
  - There were nighttime resident complaints
  - No fines imposed from BUR Airport
- John Wayne Airport (SNA) has strict aircraft access and noise monitoring program
- Comparison of BUR and SNA
  - BUR and SNA are both surrounded by communities
  - Both operate 24 hours a day
  - Voluntary Curfew Hours
    - SNA Mon-Sat 10pm-7pm, Sun 10pm-8am
    - BUR Mon-Sun 10pm-7am
  - Latest scheduled departure time
    - SNA 9:45pm
    - BUR 10:00pm
  - If a commercial airline needs to depart after 10pm
    - SNA: written request to depart and must depart before 10:30pm
    - BUR: nothing
  - If an airline violates the after-hours rule
    - SNA: Air carriers will be fined and ultimately disqualified from operating at the airport if violations continue.
    - BUR: nothing
  - Currently no protection at BUR for late night flights
  - Noise guidelines in place for commercial airlines
    - SNA: each commercial airline must meet or be below a quarterly noise average
    - BUR: nothing
  - Noise guidelines in pace from General Aviation (GA) after-hours flight
    - SNA: aircraft have to be below SNEL values at NMS 1-10
    - BUR: fines by weight, only if overweight.
  - Underweight GA aircraft have departed in the middle of the night and no fines issues as it was not overweight
  - GA flight violating rules
    - SNA: citation with a fine
    - BUR: pilots contacted, and weight logs checked



- Number of GA files issues in 2019
  - SNA: 65 first time violations, 7 second time violations, and 3 third time violations
  - BUR: None
- Steps after a third violation
  - SNA: Aircraft is banned from the airport after the third violation for 3 years.
  - BUR: nothing
- Number of commercial aviation fined issued in 2019
  - SNA: 21 fines Jan-Oct
  - BUR: None
- Passenger counts increase at BUR. 2018 highest passenger count since the recession.
- Marketing campaigns are paying off, BUR is the number three alternative airport in the nation
- We need action to be taken
  - Aircraft to take off at higher altitudes
    - FAA institute an altitude gate at Jeffries of 1800 feet.
  - Aircraft to turn sooner after take-off
    - Getting airplanes out of Magnolia Park and surrounding communities.
  - We need stronger after-hour noise rules.
    - BUR should be a leader in this flight.
- Task force members then asked questions/comments for the Burbank for Quiet Skies.
- Chair Ms.Gabel-Luddy: We are consistent with wanting higher assents, a more rapid ascent, at a higher gradient. That the second turn be sooner. Looking at after hour rules and Part 161 study. When you looked at noise and altitudes were you looking at all air traffic or certain kinds of carriers?
  - I was looking at anything, that's why I picked a time I looked at whatever was going out at that time, whether it was a private airlines, southwest, UPS. Whatever was going out during those hours we looked at. The residents were logging all sorts of flight private and air carriers.
  - Study done between FedEx and UPS, UPS is the lowest sometimes it switches and FedEx is lower.
- Parents of LAUSD Students gave their presentation.

The following is a bullet point summary of what was included within Burbank for Parents of LAUSD Students presentation:

- In April 2018, LAUSD wrote a letter to the FAA and got no response.
- At the first Task Force meeting LAUSD asked to be a part of the Task Force. No response.
- Yesterday jet fuel was dumped on LAUSD students, there was an investigation but not response directly.
- Parents, relatives and children have reached out to each one of you on this board numerous times. Have you been fair, do you really care?
- According to local pharmacies and over the counter drug stores to purchase medicines there have been a 12% spike from 2017 to 2019. The average growth of the nation of Studio City, Valley Village, Sherman Oaks and Toluca Lakes.
- The CAASPP Test on average scores have dropped 4.1% in the affected USLAD schools this includes: Colfax Elementary, Carpenter Community Charter, Wonderland and North Hollywood High. Other LAUSD schools have inched up. The aforementioned and other schools have had increases in prior years.
- Children from the LAUSD school district spoke to the Task Force.
- F is for fair and fan out.
- A is for ascend and always be fair.
- I is for involve, please involve us kids.
- R is for revert and return.
- LAUSD should be on the Task Force.
- The FAA does not answer questions directly.



- Task force members then asked questions/comments for the Parents of LAUSD Students.
- Mr. Koretz: Question for the committee, was adding a LAUSD board member ever considered, could we not ask LAUSD to select a board member to represent them and join us on this Task Force?
  - Chair Ms. Gabel-Luddy: we discussed this at our very beginning of the entire Task Force meeting and the position of the Task Force is that it should have elected officials on it.
  - Parents of LAUSD Students: The LAUSD Board members are elected officials.
  - Chair Ms. Gabel-Luddy: With the representatives such as Mr. Koretz, Mr. Krekorian and Mr. Ryu and Ms. Marteniz that there was good representation from the affected schools in the area. Just as we agreed that we would organize with the groups we knew in our communities to make presentations that we would afford the same opportunity to other groups.
  - Mr. Koretz: I missed the first meeting, I think we should reconsider to add a member of the LAUSD elected board. I think we would hear a little bit of a different perspective.
  - Parents of LAUSD Students: Carlos Torres spoke at the first meeting and asked about adding a LAUSD Board Member on the Task Force and did not hear back.
  - Chair Ms. Gabel-Luddy: We discussed this and let LAUSD know how we were going to structure the Task Force. We would never turn down an LAUSD member who wanted to present or discuss. If we add LAUSD we would need to do Pasadena, Glendale and Burbank as well. In fairness to all affected parties.
  - Parents of LAUSD Students: They are not affected. The children themselves are not being represented and the LAUSD Board Members are political appointees to represent our children.
  - Chair Ms. Gabel-Luddy: We all support our kids, we discussed representation a few months ago and reached an agreement as a Task Force to move forward in this matter. We would not turn down a representative from LAUSD coming to meet with us. I am glad you came tonight and made the presentation. I want to thank you for that.
  - Parents of LAUSD Students: It is a shame once again our children's voices are being snuffed.
- Save Coldwater Canyon gave their presentation.

The following is a bullet point summary of what was included within Save Coldwater Canyon presentation titled, "Jet Issues Related to the Santa Monica Mountains and Foothills."

- Neighborhood group focusing on the health, safety and welfare of Coldwater Canyon.
- SCC is a voting member of The Hillside Federation.
- Hundreds of jets per day fly in the wrong direction, make a U-turn and fly back over more people. This impacts and harms more people than necessary.
- Jets must get up and out of the valley.
- The Santa Monica Mountains are one of LA's most precious assets
- The Santa Monica Mountains are part of the South Coast Ecoregion.
- The Santa Monica Mountains consist of parks, recreation areas, and wildlife refuges that are noise sensitive areas according to the FAA.
- Under Section 4(f), the FAA must avoid potential impacts to publicly owned parks and recreation areas.
- The Santa Monica Mountain trails are one of the most frequented natural areas in California.
- In 2017 that changed, the mountains are assaulted by over 200 low flying jets per day.
- It is comprised of city, county state and federal parkland and open space that provides quite and refuge, health benefits and recreation.
- The foothills and mountains should be avoided because the elevated terrain worsens impacts.
- Aircraft should stay at least 1 nm away from mountains, foothills and rising terrain.
- Aircraft flying at low altitudes over mountainous terrain have an increased crash risk.
- There are narrow hillside roads that make it difficult for emergency vehicles to pass and almost impossible for residents to evacuate safely.



- FAA alleged that the very high fire hazard severity zone was considered in the SoCal Metroplex and was subjected to rigorous safety analysis.
- The FAA emitted there was a shift in 2017 and therefore impossible for the FAA to have considered the fire risk.
- The FAA did not provide any documentation.
- Accidents happen.
- Unpublished procedure created in collaboration with airlines with no community outreach or environmental study was implemented in Oct 13, 2016.
- These jets are in close proximity to mountain terrain at low altitudes.
- SWA said this was a quiet approach, but it is not.
- Many in the new community leave at elevations of 800 to over 1000 feet making aircraft effective AGL lower than if overflying land.
- Noise amplifies in bowl like canyons.
- Noise bounces off a canyon wall and returns so you can hear it again.
- Noise increases and does multiply through echo, reflection and reverberation effects.
- FAA does not measure noise they model it which is very different and less effective.
- Ambient is never measured.
- The method is DNL a 24 hour sound level. The noise level must reach 65 dB DNL to reach a threshold of significance.
- Freytag & Associates in a report stated that the FAA was biased towards the aircraft manufactures and airlines over resident concerns.
- Freytag & Associates in a report stated the EA should have looked at a 2013 baseline and their new fleet mix for 2016 and 2021 was highly speculative.
- Freytag & Associates in a report stated that the SoCal Metroplex EA failed to meet the FAA noise assessment criteria.
- Supplemental metrics that should be used are Time Above (TA) and Number of Events Above (NA).
- Noise intrusion into quieter areas creates a greater impact.
- Ventura Boulevard and Valley Vista Flight path is not the solution.
- Residential homes in the hills are connective tissue allowing wildlife to move.
- National Park Services has been monitoring sounds at hundreds of sites in the past two decades.
- Noise from jets is a threat to wildlife and habitat.
- Wildlife species are more sensitive to noise than humans.
- 43 species of wildlife that are found in these areas that are most impact by the increased noise, these species include sensitive and watch list species.
- 2020 begins year four of the low focused flight path.
- FAA states the turn is .33 nm further south, HMMH states 1 nm further south, the community believe 1.5-2 nm further south.
- Complaints have increase in the new community after flight path changes with SoCal Metroplex.
- Ample evidence flight paths have shifted into mountains, canyons, foothills and surrounding base.
- The FAA must follow their own policy and restore and return to pre-Metroplex flight paths.
- FAA separation standard 3nm or 1000 feet.
- Noise pollution is the third most dangerous pollutant after air and water pollution-WHO
- Jets must get up and out of the valley as quickly as possible.
- Task force members then asked questions/comments for Save Coldwater Canyon.
- Chair Ms. Gabel-Luddy: You talked in the beginning about 1 nm away from the mountains and rising terrain, can you confirm that would reflect the flight pattern was in the past, the pattern that you would like to return to? Also increase the rate of climb?
  - It would be quite a bit more, we believe it is more like 1.5-2nm, that would be the retired pilot said they use to turn north of the 101. They didn't make a U-turn over the Santa Monica Mountains. It was defiantly north, they mad an immediate turn the pilot said.
  - Yes, increase the rate of climb.



- Save Valley Village Homeowners Association gave their presentation.

The following is a bullet point summary of what was included within Save Coldwater Canyon presentation titled, "San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force."

- Population of approximately 32,000 residents in an areas of 2.08 miles.
- BUR spares residents and guests the hassles of LAX, but it comes with a price of noise annoyance and air pollution.
- Valley Village has been on the front line of flight aircraft noise for years. Valley village pushed for the existing voluntary noise curfews.
- Operations at BUR have increased by 38% in just 5 years.
- We are here to ask the Task Force to consider three recommendations: engage with the communities to the north, request strategic environmental assessment of all impacted communities and request technical analysis from pilots/ACT to guarantee safety.
- Engaging the Communities to the north
  - Requirement of Task Force bylaws-reach out to all communities that could potentially be affected. You cannot ignore the communities to the north.
  - Communities affected by the proposed changes are very densely populated
  - Equitability and equality matter
  - Heather hazards affect everyone
  - Future air travel will only make these problems worse
  - Complaint statistics on which so much has been made we believe are skewed
- The communities north of the 101 are more dense and a lot more people are living north of the 101.
- There is no data that indicates a level of change proportional to the outcry.
- What is really happening? Increase in volume? Planes flying lower? No one seems to know.
- We are in the direct path of 100s of daily departures and at an average altitude of 2000 feet, it is very loud.
- Over the years we have asked for increase into additional flight options to spread the path in the safest possible manner.
- What can be done? How can we work together to find solutions that might mitigate these problems.
- It starts with focusing on solutions that focus on equitability.
- At the past meetings heard recommendations from community groups that are not based on the idea of sharing the noise but rather the opposite, moving the noise.
- Most recommendations we have heard advocate moving the flight path to the north of the 101, that is not equitable.
- We must share the noise and environmental pollution is too dangerous to heap onto one or two communities.
- The dangers and risk of airplane pollution is not limited to one area, we are all potentially exposed to danger.
- The future projections of daily flights need to be taken into consideration. The US is one of the fastest growing aviation markets.
- BUR is set to reach its passenger capacity by 2032.
- The decisions don't just impact today they hold the weight of tomorrow as well.
- FAA blames the southern shift on increases in BUR operations, but 2007 was the all time peak.
- Complaint data is skewed, the air noise app allows people to sit on their couch and hit a button whenever they hear a bird, plane or superman.
- Using or comparing complaint data since the air noise app is misleading and can't be relied on.
- A small portion of the population is accounting for all the of the complaints.
- Air noise system should be audited.
- Conduct an independent strategic Environmental Assessment, the Task Force should invest in an noise analysis of the proposed changes.
- The strategic environmental assessment should investigate all aircraft noise mitigation.



- Create a technical task force comprised of pilots and ATC to analyze the departures.
- We ask the Task Force to pursue our three recommendations before putting forth final recommendations that will pose serious harm to communities.
- How do you want to be remembered? As politicians for fought for a select few or guardians of the rights and privileges of all stakeholders?
- Task force members then asked questions/comments for Valley Village Homeowner Association.
- Representative for Ms. Harris: There was no formal technical recommendation within your presentation, from the Valley Village HOA perspective where in general would you like the flight path?
  - The community groups should not be making decisions or recommendations on where the flight paths should go. There are specific noise mitigation recommendations in our presentation we are asking the Task Force to investigate. We do not consider ourselves experts what we would like is for our representatives Mr.Krekorian and the others to keep everyone in the conversation.
- Mr.Koretz: Before your presentation I have not heard that while we had a massive increase in the number of complaints, there was a relatively small number of complainants, where did you get that data from?
  - The Daily News and the New York Times. The Daily News gives you a better summary.
- Mr.Koretz: Where did the Daily News get their data?
  - You would have to ask them
- Mr.Koretz: We don't know if this is factual, we are just assuming what the daily news put out is accurate.
  - How do we know what any of the data heard from these Community Groups is factual?
- Mr.Koretz: I think it would be valuable to know if the number of complainers only went up 5 times or if they went up 10,000 times. We probably need to get to the bottom of how factual this is.
- Mr.Krekorian: I expect your presentations will be distributed to the Task Force Members.
  - Yes we have those here tonight.
- Chair Ms. Gabel-Luddy: Will HMMH's assessment of alternatives show flight track density plots?
  - The facilitator: Yes our analysis will include looking at potential changes to flight paths and corridors.
- 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.

- Find an equitable solution for all communities, share the noise.
- The airplanes now flying are much larger and a more complex problem.
- Homeowners in Studio City are going to have to disclose airplane noise to potential buyers.
- Impact on mountain communities is much worse.
- The FAA is not being a good participant in this Task Force.
- There should be more focus on VNY.
- Agenda Item 6.
- Mr. Krekorian: I have a request for data from the FAA and our consultants.
  - Can the FAA please provide any post-implementation study they have completed?
  - Can the FAA provide any records it has reviewed or generated regarding the safety risk management panel?
  - Can the FAA provide any documents it generated or review in conducting noise models?
  - Can the FAA and our consultants comment on the feasibility of east bound take-offs on Runway 15?
  - Can the FAA and our consultants you please explain the ELMOO procedure for eastbound take-off from Runway 15 and state if it is a RNAV procedure and if not why?
  - Can the FAA state every reason that northbound take-offs from Runway 33 cannot happen? Does runway or taxiway length or configuration is barrier to such take-offs?



- Under what wind conditions are there eastbound and northbound take-offs? If wind is calm can aircraft depart in any direction from either runway?
- Can the FAA please clarify if their separation safety standards are either 3 nm or 1000 feet in elevation? Are both required or one or the other?
  - FAA: That is correct, it is one or the other.
- All other questions will be submitted in writing.
- Representative for Ms. Feinstein
  - Was the data presented in Burbank for Quiet Skies presentation regarding the fines or fees that you do or do not assess?
    - BUR Airport: The Airport Capacity Act of 1990 prohibits airports from enacting mandatory restrictions as well as sets noise standards aircraft must meet. Restrictions that were in place prior to 1990 were often grandfathered in, that is what you see at BUR and SNA. They differ as they were enacted locally. We are currently in Stage 3, meaning State 1 and 2 aircraft are not allowed to operate in the US. Grandfathered restrictions at BUR states stage 2 aircraft are prohibited from operating during our curfew hours and that is where we carry the ability to fine these aircraft. So few aircraft are fined because those fines were on stage 2 aircraft and now only stage 3 aircraft should be operating. The Gulfstream 2, 2b and 3 which are GA aircraft, are still applicable to noise restrictions and a fine if they operate over 5,500 pounds. Those aircraft below 5,500 pounds meet Stage 3 requirements above that they don't.
  - If this body determines specific mandatory requirements that should be applied at BUR and VNY could those be implemented?
    - BUR Airport: In order to instate mandatory requirements, you must go through a Part 161 Study Title 14 of Code of Federal Regulations. BUR was the first US airport to have a completed application. They requested a curfew be instated which was denied by the FAA.
  - At SNA they have a fine if an aircraft files under a certain altitude at a specified gate, could we implement that, or does it fall under the 1990 Act?
    - BUR Airport: That falls under the 1990 Airport Capacity Act. Those would be grandfather restrictions carried by that particular airport prior to 1990.
- Representative for Ms. Harris:
  - Submitted on her requested timeline regarding the reauthorization act
  - On December 20, 2019 the senator sent a request for information on the efficacy of the NextGen Program, are you aware of this letter?
    - FAA: We received this letter and will be responding.
  - Can you commit to providing a response to the December 20, 2019 letter by January 31, 2020?
    - FAA: Yes are working on that and we should be able to send it by then.
  - Section 176 of the reauthorization timeline the FAA submitted, what is the status of review and when will the report be available?
    - FAA: I cannot respond to those questions, I will take them down and provide responses. I do not have the specifics that work is done at Head Quarters and we have to get the answers from them.
  - Section 177 of the reauthorization timeline the FAA submitted, can you please provide a scope and does the NAS have an abstract describing what they will review?
    - FAA: Our responses regarding the Reauthorization Provisions will have to wait. We will take them down and provided response later.
  - How often does the FAA seek public feed-back on the navigation of their website? Can the FAA conduct additional feed-back?
    - FAA: We will take all the comments we have on the website and are looking for ways to improve on that.



- Representative for Mr. Martinez
  - Facilitator and FAA, can you look at the number of BUR arrivals going westbound (parallel to Sherman Way and Van Owen) and southbound (down Sunland Boulevard)? What is the frequency?
  - Facilitator and FAA, can you compare the operations at WHP to BUR?
  - Facilitator and FAA can you look into the effectiveness of the curfew and restrictions implemented at SNA?
- Representative for Mr. Schiff
  - Can BUR provide a written explanation on fines and why you don't fine planes?
  - From Save Coldwater Canyon's presentation slide 3, they state that 100s of jets per day fly in the wrong direction and make U-turns and fly back, can BUR and VNY please explain this?
  - BUR can you please provide the Aircraft Noise and Technical Report from Freytag and Associates quoted in the Save Coldwater Canyon Presentation?
- Ms. Springer
  - What would it take to change the fines at BUR?
  - Can the discrepancy in noise that the community groups presented vs what is stated by the FAA and Airport be explained?
- Mr. Koretz
  - What stops VNY and BUR from implementing all the requirements at SNA?
  - Can BUR and VNY provide data on the number of complaints and the number of complaints for 2018 and 2019?
  - Can BUR and VNY provide statistics on the increase of complainants from Pre-Metroplex to now?
- The Chair Ms. Gabel-Luddy proposed to add an agenda item to the next meeting on February 19, 2020.
  - Noise Mitigation such as sound insulation should be on the table.
  - Federal representatives sitting on the Task Force to present or summarize what might be available through a federal action to see about extending noise mitigation measures beyond the 65 CNEL or other policies at the federal level.
- Task Force reaches a consensus to add noise mitigation to the agenda for Meeting 6 on February 19, 2020
- Agenda item 7, the next meeting will be held on Wednesday February 19, 2020 at 6:30 pm at the Burbank Marriott Hotel.
- A date and time have been reserved for a seventh meeting on Wednesday April 1, 2020 6:30 pm and the Burbank Marriott Hotel.
- For any public comments please send them to [taskforce@bur.org](mailto:taskforce@bur.org).



Sincerely yours,

**Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc.**

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Justin W. Cook'.

Justin W. Cook - INCE, LEED GA  
Principal Consultant

cc: Sarah Paulson Sheehy, Senior Director, Government & Public Affairs, Hollywood Burbank Airport  
Gene Reindel, HMMH Vice President and Task Force Facilitator