

HMMH

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

June 3, 2020

Mr. Patrick Lammerding
Deputy Executive Director
Hollywood Burbank Airport

Subject: Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force – May 6, 2020 and May 7, 2020
Meeting Summary
Reference: HMMH Project Number 310870

Dear Mr. Patrick Lammerding:

The following is a bullet point summary of the seventh meeting of the Southern San Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force (Task Force) that occurred from 6:00 pm to 10:00 pm on Wednesday, May 6, 2020 and from 6:00 pm to 10:00 pm on Thursday, May 7, 2020.



Summary of the Wednesday, May 6, 2020 meeting:

- The Chair, Ms. Emily Gabel-Luddy, called the meeting to order.
- The Chair explained the meeting's online format.
- The Chair explained how public comments will be accepted for the meeting.
- The Facilitator, Mr. Gene Reindel (HMMH), provided roll call, and determined there was a quorum.
- Agenda item 3 - approving the agenda: there were no Task Force comments.
- Agenda item 4 - consent calendar: the Facilitator provided the February 19, 2020 meeting summary.
- Mr. Greif moved to accept the meeting summary; Ms. Springer seconded the motion.
- Agenda item 5 – presentation by HMMH titled:
 - “Final 7th Meeting of the South Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force”:
- The purpose of this Task Force was to address community concerns regarding aircraft noise from aircraft departing from BUR and VNY.
- The expected outcome of the Task Force is to submit recommendations to the FAA and other entities.
- Recap of previous six meetings:
 - Meeting 1: Purpose, protocol, meeting process
 - Meeting 2: One community group presentation
 - Meeting 3: FAA, HMMH and four community group presentations
 - Meeting 4: FAA, Southwest Airlines and HMMH presentations
 - Meeting 5: FAA, HMMH and four community group presentations
 - Meeting 6: Task Force Member and HMMH presentations
- Agenda item 6 – community group comment(s): Nine (9) groups submitted comments:
 - Benedict Hills Estates/Benedict Hills HOA
 - Advocates for Viable Airport Solutions
 - Encino Neighborhood Council
 - San Fernando Valley Coalition for Clean Air
 - Save Coldwater Canyon
 - Sherman Oaks and Encino for Quiet Skies
 - Studio City for Quiet Skies
 - UproarLA
 - Valley Village HOA.
- Agenda item 7 – public comment:
 - The first 200 words of each submitted written comment were read aloud.

- The first minute of the received oral comment were transcribed and read aloud.
- Public comment concluded.
- The Chair stated the meeting will continue Thursday, May 7, 2020.



Summary of the Thursday, May 7, 2020 meeting:

- The Chair reconvened the meeting.
- Mr. Gene Reindel (HMMH) provided roll call and determined there was a quorum.
- Agenda item 8 - amendment to the Task Force by-laws: there were ten public comment submitted and three were read aloud.
- Mr. Reindel stated the current by-laws require a majority vote to approve a recommendation. A change to the by-laws would require four votes to approve a recommendation.
- Mr. Najarian commented: "I believe a 4-4 vote should have a note or asterisk showing that it was a tie vote when submitted."
- Mr. Martinez asked: "Will the vote totals be published in all recommendations? I think it is important the FAA knows the vote totals."
 - Mr. Reindel responded: "The vote totals will be known; I did not intended them to go in with the recommendations, but we can add that as an attachment."
- The Chair moved to vote on the by-law amendment; Mr. Krekorian seconded the motion.
- The by-laws amendment was approved with a majority vote of 6-1.
- For agenda item 9 - four non-voting members of the Task Force submitted comments. Two written comments from Congressman Ted Lieu and Congressman Tony Cardenas were read aloud. Two audio messages from Congressman Adam Schiff and Congressman Brad Sherman were played. All Federal representatives also wrote a letter to FAA Administrator Dickerson.
- Agenda item 10 began with a presentation by HMMH titled "Final 7th Meeting of the South Fernando Valley Airplane Noise Task Force", a summary of the presentation follows:
 - Task Force Member Voting 19 Recommendations-Background
 - Members were asked to provide recommendations
 - HMMH consolidated the recommendations, each member recommendation(s) will be provided to the responsible entity(ies)
 - Task Force Member Voting 19 Recommendations - Expectations
 - No additional recommendations to those provided to the Task Force Members on April 30, 2020.
 - No major revisions should be made at this point.
 - Task Force Member Voting Process
 - Facilitator will read the consolidated recommendations and summarize HMMH's notes.
 - Facilitator will then ask for a motion and then a second to approve each recommendation.
 - Chair will then ask if there is any discussion on the recommendation.
 - Facilitator will ask each voting member individually for their vote.
- The recommendation voting process began.
- The 19 recommendations covered six categories:
 - southern shift in flight tracks
 - low departing aircraft
 - concentration of flight tracks
 - unequal distribution of aircraft noise
 - nighttime aircraft noise, and
 - insufficient noise mitigation.
- Discussion started with the Southern Shift of Flight Tracks
- Recommendation 1: Immediately restore the BUR Runway 15 departure flight tracks to 2007 conditions without implementing a new procedure.
- Recommendation 11: Maintain current dispersion for BUR departures rather than moving the southernmost departures to more northerly flight routes.
- Mr. Koretz moved to vote on recommendation 1; Ms. Springer seconded the motion.
- Mr. Sanchez moved to vote on recommendation 11; there was no second so the motion on recommendation 11 failed.



- Members voted on recommendation 1. The recommendation was approved with a unanimous vote of 7 to 0; please note the City of Pasadena was not present for this vote.
- Recommendation 2: Design and implement an “open” Standard Instrument Departure (SID) procedure using waypoints along the 101 Freeway for Runway 15 departures from BUR.
- Mr. Krekorian: “One of my goals and the goals of the community groups is to increase dispersion. I wonder if it would work if we said design and implement an open SID designed for maximum dispersion for Runway 15 departures. Does that make sense?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “You currently have essentially an open SID, the aircraft depart a runway heading and turn off that heading up to when ATC turn them off. What you are asking for is not so relying on the ATC, and it would be more of a dispersed open SID.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “So the impact of that would be to increase dispersal of the flights?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “It may not increase dispersion of the flights over what is there today or back to 2007, it may still concentrate them somewhat, you are having all the aircraft fly a particular procedure. You won’t have the dispersion you have today as it is relying on ATC to turn the aircraft.”
- Ms. Springer: “To clarify recommendation 2 as written, it will create more dispersal as opposed to the proposed amendment by Mr. Krekorian?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “What an open SID would do, as the Vice Chair restated, is that you would still have dispersion, but not as much as today, or 2007. It would not be a full instrument departure which is a very concentrated flight path. It would not be as dispersed as a controller-based procedure.”
- Mr. Greif held up a graphic from a HMMH presentation showing the FAA proposed Runway 15 departure out of BUR and asked the question: “would it essentially be similar to that pushed along the waypoint further north along the 101? When we discussed the FAA waypoints JAYTE and TEGAN there would be more concentration and the Task Force, and the public did not want that.”
 - Mr. Reindel: “What you saw in that graphic you put up is exactly how the recommendation is written now. ATC would not allow aircraft to go south beyond those waypoints. You would have some dispersion, but it would be north of the waypoints.”
- Mr. Koretz: “My understanding of this without the waypoint at the 101, flights would go too far south buzzing homes in the Santa Monica Mountains.”
 - Mr. Reindel: That is the intent of the recommendation as written.
- Mr. Krekorian: “We have dealt with that in recommendation 1.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “I understand we have begun to deal with dispersal with recommendation 1 and with recommendation 2 it still would be a concentrated path although it would be concentrated northerly of Ventura Boulevard and the 101 Freeway.”
 - Mr. Reindel: “It would not be a concentrated path it would be more concentrated than now, but still a dispersed path. What the procedure is intending to do is eliminate all flight paths south of the 101.”
- Mr. Greif: “From a process standpoint it looks like we have moved off of Q&A, we should see if there is a motion and a second.”
- Mr. Koretz moved to vote on recommendation 2 as written; Ms. Springer seconded the motion.
- Mr. Sanchez asked: “Can you elaborate on the issues the FAA has regarding arrivals to Runway 8? What would be the elevations of these waypoints? What is the required separation?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “The FAA stated multiple times that maintaining separation of aircraft is required which is one of the reasons the aircraft do not immediately turn north. The 101 does not provide the separation the FAA would like to ensure that every operation would have the required separation using that procedure. If you move the waypoints to the south then the FAA believe you can get the separation. You need 3 nm of lateral separation and 1000 feet vertical separation. And the problem with this proposal is the 3 nm of lateral separation.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy interrupted discussion to announce the arrival of the City of Pasadena representative, Mr. Tornek and updated him on the progress of the meeting thus far.



- Mr. Greif: "I wanted to mention to the Task Force, the origin of the Task Force was the southern shift at VNY and BUR airports. The Task Force is not trying to move it to new communities but trying to say communities that have faced this noise before and how do we shift southern flight tracks that are over high elevated communities that are more impacted. Recommendation 1 was about this, recommendation 2 which I have concerns about make a substantial shift back to where we were in 2007, but it will lead to concentration. My recommendation is a no vote on this recommendation."
- Mr. Krekorian: "I would like to add a point to this the FAA proposed procedure. I think the Task Force should take a stand against the SLAAP and OROSZ procedures as written. I would make a motion that this Task Force oppose the FAA proposed changes to the SLAAP and OROSZ procedures as written."
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "We already had a motion, normally we would vote on the first motion, but what would the members like to do?"
- Mr. Krekorian: "I did not mean for it to be a secondary motion."
- Mr. Najarian: "Is the proposed motion by Mr. Krekorian submitted in any other recommendation? Mr. Reindel, let us know if we can add it into another recommendation."
- Mr. Greif: "I was going to suggest that I think the motion or amendment Mr. Krekorian made would be a good addition to Recommendation 1. I think adding it to Recommendation 2 would be contradictory. We could make a stand-alone motion to create a new recommendation."
- Mr. Reindel: "I tend to agree with the last statement. I think we should vote on recommendation 2 first and then we can make a motion as a substitute to recommendation 2 instead of adding it to recommendation 1."
- Mr. Koretz: "I am still trying to determine if this recommendation will create an over concentration of flights over the 101, like is happening in the hills, even though I think what is happening in the hills is worse base of the closer location to the flights due to the elevations. I do not want to move the air freeway to over the 101."
 - Mr. Reindel: "The recommendation is clear; it would be attempting to have no aircraft fly south of the 101. Which means by default it would create a concentration of flights along the 101 and north of the 101 that you currently do not have now."
- Mr. Koretz: "What do you think the actual impact of would be on the areas that are not currently covered? So, the hillsides would be protected but what would be the impact on the rest of the area?"
 - Mr. Reindel: "It would potentially eliminate the flights south of the 101. You would then be having all flights turn at the 101 or north of the 101. They would concentrate at the 101 before they can get clearance to turn north."
- Mr. Krekorian: "Can you have an open SID procedure without waypoints?"
 - Mr. Reindel: "Pilots need to have waypoints somewhere because they need a direction to go. What an open SID allows, is for the aircraft to turn towards the waypoint. Where they turn is not dictated in an open SID, so you get dispersion by them not all turning at the same point."
- Mr. Krekorian: "Specifically, between the airport and OROSZ waypoint, or airport and TILLER waypoint or the airport and SLAAP waypoint could you have open SID procedures to get there and then they pick up the waypoints and go on their merry way?"
 - Mr. Reindel: "You essentially have that today. What you have is open SID once they are turned off initial heading they are turned towards one of those northerly waypoints. They turn when they are directed to turn. With closer in waypoints you are looking for more of a procedure in before they turn to the outer waypoints."
- Mr. Krekorian: "So if procedures are created in the hills as they are not proposed to be in OROSZ3 and SLAPP2, it would more a greater concentration of tracks to the hills conversely under recommendation 2 it would more a greater concentration of flights over the 101 Freeway?"
 - Mr. Reindel: "That is correct. That is the intention of this recommendation."
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "Is there any further comment or discussion on this item?"
- Ms. Springer: "Is there a motion for recommendation 2 as written?"
 - Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "There is a motion to adopt recommendation 2 as written."
 - Mr. Reindel: "Yes, that is correct."



- Ms. Springer: "I am inclined to oppose it as I do not support concentration of flight paths. An informative vote would concentrate it more than it is now."
 - Mr. Reindel: "Essentially yes, I would not say a no vote would assume more dispersion. If you are aiming for dispersion this recommendation as written will concentrate flight tracks along the 101 Freeway."
- Members voted on recommendation 2.
 - The recommendation was not approved with a majority no vote of 7 to 1.
- Mr. Krekorian: "I would like to create a new recommendation 2. I move the Task Force oppose the FAA proposed changes to SLAAP2 and OROSZ3 and design and implement a procedure designed for maximum dispersal for Runway 15 departures at BUR airport. Mr. Koretz seconded."
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "Can you explain how this might change any other recommendations this evening, if this might contradict any other recommendations?"
 - Mr. Reindel: "I do not believe it directly contradicts any recommendations, however there are some recommendations that discuss those procedures. I recommend we continue with the vote on this and if we need to bring it back later we can."
- Ms. Springer: "Is this a new recommendation like recommendation 2.5?"
 - Mr. Reindel: "Since recommendation is no longer on the table I would be recommend this replace recommendation 2."
- Mr. Najarian: "Can you restate the motion?"
- Mr. Krekorian: "I move to oppose the FAA proposed changes to the SLAAP2 and OROSZ3 as written and design and implement a procedure designed for maximum dispersal for Runway 15 departure from BUR airport."
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "What is your intent with this recommendation? What does it do?"
- Mr. Krekorian: "It would oppose the new procedures that would cement the southern shift over the hills and number two it would put the onus on the FAA to design departure procedures to achieve what the Task Force members and public are requesting, that is dispersal of flights so no one has to take the majority of flights. By maximizing dispersion, it helps alleviate the burden of one community."
- Members voted on the new recommendation 2.
 - The recommendation was approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Recommendation 3: Design and implement a modified RNAV (Required Navigation) procedure for Van Nuys Airport (VNY) Runway 16R that results in earlier turns of departing flights and allow a greater percentage of the departing flight tracks to be over the uninhabited Sepulveda Basin as is the case when using the 2.2 DME departure procedure at VNY
- Recommendation 10: Maintain current dispersion for Van Nuys Airport (VNY) departures to the south crossing over Victory Boulevard and over the Sepulveda Basin rather than moving the southernmost departures to more northerly paths.
- Mr. Koretz moved to vote on recommendation 3, Mr. Najarian seconded the motion.
- Mr. Sanchez: "The big concerns for this area is where you previous had early turns that went over Van Nuys. My understanding is the FAA corrected it PPPRY 2.6 over the Sepulveda basin. I would strongly urge a no vote and maintain it as it is. Later we talk about a recommendation to increase altitude faster. Having this waypoint is very helpful for the communities in this area."
- Mr. Najarian: "Recommendation 3 as it is written sounds pretty good, it would direct tracks over the uninhabited Sepulveda basin and presumable there will be less impact to the residents with this flight path, am I mistaken?"
 - Mr. Reindel: "The way I understand what is happening now is slightly different. and has the flight tracks more south then they were with the 2.2 DME, so this recommendation is trying to put it back to the 2.2 DME where most flight tracks use to be out of VNY."
- Mr. Greif provided a brief history to explain the issue to members.
- Mr. Tornek: "To be clear you are saying is that you support 3 and reject 10?"



- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “Correct, if you approve 3 we should not give recommendation 10 as a recommendation.”
- The amendment was accepted by the maker of the main motion.
- Mr. Reindel: “The motion is to approve recommendation 3 with a slight amendment to it saying to immediately stop the use of the procedure with the PPPRY Waypoint.”
- Mr. Koretz: “Are we clear enough on recommendation 3; we are not looking to go back to exactly where it was but to go back as close to where it was? Looking to go back to almost what it was?”
- Mr. Greif: “I believe it is and I believe in the full document that all specific recommendations from our office cover that, I will defer to Mr. Sanchez.”
- Mr. Sanchez: “We are going to go into recommendation 4 which would be to increase the climb gradient, what then would be the projected elevation of those flights over Victory Boulevard and the noise implication?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “We do not have that analysis at this time.”
- Members voted on the amended recommendation 3.
 - The recommendation is approved with a majority vote of 7 to 1.
- Mr. Reindel: “Is there a motion to vote for recommendation 10?”
- Mr. Sanchez moved to vote on recommendation 10; Ms. Springer seconded the motion.
- Task Force Members voted on recommendation 10.
 - The recommendation was not approved, with a majority no vote of 7 to 1.
- Recommendation 4 was discussed: In the near term, increase the climb gradient for aircraft departure procedures at BUR and VNY to above 500 feet per nautical mile.
- Recommendation 5 was discussed: Conduct a study to determine how to obtain the lowest noise levels from aircraft departures from Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Runway 15 and Van Nuys Airport (VNY) Runway 16R in the South San Fernando Valley communities through increased climb gradients, noise abatement departures profile (NADP) procedures, de-rated takeoff procedures, or a combination of the three alternatives.
 - HMMH has added text to the recommendation “and implement the best procedure(s) based on the study findings.
- Ms. Springer moved to vote on recommendation 4; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Mr. Najarian: “We would like to have these airplanes get altitude as quickly as possible to reduce any impact, how realistic that 500 foot, it says some aircraft cannot obtain this rate? Are there any implications with safety or compliance, how many cannot obtain it? Is 500 feet at a realistic climb rate to obtain?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “The FAA addressed this multiple times and said they could look into increased climb gradients at both airports. The FAA stated if you go above 500 feet you need safety waivers. Climb gradients are very specific at airports, the FAA looks at surrounding terrain and at the aircraft that are flying at the airport. It is my understanding that the FAA believes the climb gradients are adequate at the airports at this time. But this recommendation you would be recommending that the FAA looks into this.
- Mr. Najarian: “How about the noise issue? In the next motion we are going to consider we are looking at lowering noise levels. Higher climb rate means gunning the engines are we contradicting what we are trying to do with these two motions?”
- Mr. Reindel: “The answer to that is it depends on where you are in relation to the flight path. To get up and out quicker you need more thrust, but it is likely to lead to the slowing of the aircraft how it moves on the ground. The time that it is over a place could decrease but the time you hear it could increase. This recommendation would be likely to increase noise close to airport and decrease noise out further. The FAA recommend you study the procedure and see how the best way to fly out is. This is why the FAA has two pre-prescribed noise abatement profiles that aircraft can use: NADP-1 close in- which is a climb fast and do a thrust cut back to reduce over people close into airport and NADP 2- further out. At some point both require a thrust increase and may then increase noise further out.



Noise is like a balloon it is going to decrease somewhere and increase somewhere else. This is why I think it is advantageous to study it.”

- Mr. Koretz: “Point out even if it requires a special waiver over 500 feet I am assuming, even if we did the 500 feet I am assuming it would create less noise than at even higher elevations and would be a significant help to resolve the problem we are looking at. Certainly, the problem of overly southernly routes that are largely caused by low elevation, if they went at 500 feet a min you would be considerable higher than they are departing now. I think that would be an assist at resolving the problem. In addition to dispersion so it is not a freeway over the hills, I think the noise level would be improved if each flight departing at 500 foot rate instead of a 340 rate which I suspect many use as they depart currently.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “I agree with Mr. Koretz. I would like to throw a concept out kind of building on this, I know many people have concerns that if we start with a study before we get to increasing gradient we will not see an increase in this decade. Once you hit the 500-foot benchmark, waivers are required for all the reasons Gene listed. I think we should immediately increase the climb gradient to the max allowed and expedite the waiver process to exceed the 500 foot/nm gradient. I think for recommendation 5 a study is important; we might find that an increase of that gradient to that level is not beneficial, there will be winners and losers, and some might see a decrease, and some might see an increase. I think we should request a study be done once the increase in gradient is implemented to see if there is a reduction or increase in noise or where those occurred. The study should come after the increase in climb gradient.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “I will go ahead and move that recommendation 4 be amended to read “In the near term increase the climb gradient for aircraft departure procedures at Hollywood Burbank Airport and Van Nuys Airport to the maximum allowable immediately and expedite any waivers required to exceed 500 feet/nm.””
- Mr. Greif: “I second that.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “I am ok with the recommendation as it currently stands, but the idea that you would expedite a gradient that even more steep potentially causes more noise over the immediate adjacent community has to bear consideration before jumping ahead and asking for a waiver. The fact of the matter is that with increase thrust at the point of departure there is a potential stronger noise impact on neighborhoods directly under the departure path. I have a problem with Mr. Krekorian’s amendment to seek a steeper angle.”
- Ms. Springer: “So, it increases the noise around the airport to expedite it?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “So, the steeper the climb gradient often the higher the thrust settings. Sometimes they can get a steeper climb gradient by slowing the aircraft. Typically, the steeper the climb the higher the noise close into the airport and then you get the benefits further out from the airport.”
- Mr. Tornek: “Madame Chair I do not think I understand the problem between how it is written now and Mr. Krekorian’s amendment. If recommendation 4 says near term, he says immediately both push it to a climb rate above 500 feet/nm.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “If I understand Mr. Krekorian’s motion he is suggesting that recommendation 4 be further modified to include an expedited waiver to go beyond 500 feet/nm.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “Yes, that is the motion, but it is already contained in the recommendation as it is written it already recommending going to 500 feet/nm. The point I am making is a question of timing in anticipation of going above 500 feet/nm, in the mean time we should have the FAA increase it now to whatever they can do now, while that is happening start the work to get the waiver to go beyond 500 feet/nm. It captures the concept in recommendation 5 but ensures it happens.”
- Mr. Reindel: “I agree with Mr. Krekorian. All he is trying to do is say let’s not wait for them to file and wait for waiver to increase the climb gradient. Let’s increase to what we can now and then seek to get a waiver to above 500 feet.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “What would that number be and how would it be determined?”
- Mr. Greif: “I think the answer is we are recommending in the post waiver phase a number that is deemed safe from the FAA. The levels might be different depending on weather or other conditions.”



Recommending the max they can do without a waiver and then to do a waiver process to see how high they can go.”

- Ms. Springer: “I think we want to do that, but this impacts the noise in neighborhoods near the airport and we have thought about 500 feet and if it is acceptable and it sounds like the proposed changes increase the noise in the Burbank neighborhood.”
 - Mr. Reindel: “I disagree, I believe the way Mr. Krekorian stated the measure was simply to get at the same end game, it is already saying to get to above 500 feet/nm. What he is saying is there is something you can do in the interim while we are waiting for the waiver. We don’t know how high the FAA can get it; they will have to look at that it is based on a lot of things. Basically, this recommendation is saying get the aircraft up and out as fast as you can.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “That is one of the things we have talked about is getting them up and out. I think this is a fine amendment to go on with, instead of saying near term say immediately.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “Immediately increase the climb gradient for aircraft departure procedure at BUR and VNY to the maximum allowable and expedite any waiver to exceed 500 feet/nm.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “I would like to see the 500 feet/nm included in parentheses when you to maximum allowable.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “That is fine by me, I only put it that way because I did not know whether they might be some constraint below 500 that may be recognized for some aircraft tor procedure. If we can say that 500 is the current max allowable then I think it makes sense to do it that way.”
- Mr. Reindel: “We are only basing that off of what the FAA told us in the meeting that they have that waiver requirement of 500 feet. I have not researched that to see if that is their cut off.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “Madame Chair, since I do not know that answer to that either I would rather leave at max allowing until we know. I think we should go to the max whatever that might be and seek the waiver the FAA needs to go above 500.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “We think the waiver is above 500 so it seems logical that maximum is 500.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “It does, but there might be some other legal or regulatory restraint below 500 for some aircraft. I wanted to suggest whatever the maximum is.”
- Members voted on the amended recommendation 4.
 - The recommendation is approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Recommendation 5: Conduct a study to determine how to obtain the lowest noise levels from aircraft departures from Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) Runway 15 and Van Nuys Airport (VNY) Runway 16R in the South San Fernando Valley communities through increased climb gradients, noise abatement departures profile (NADP) procedures, de-rated takeoff procedures, or a combination of the three alternatives.
- Ms. Springer moved to vote on Recommendation 5; Mr. Najarian seconded the motion.
- Mr. Krekorian: “Mr. Reindel, my concern adding that final phrase is the Task Force is worked to come up with a number of recommendations with that addition we are essentially saying to the FAA after you do your study go ahead and change everything we agreed on based on what you find in your study, surrendering our role to the FAA. I think a study is fine as long as we are not surrounding authority with that study.”
 - Mr. Reindel: “I understand that completely. I did want to at least put it in there as there was nothing say they were going to do something with the findings. I wanted to point out what might be missing.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “I think had we not approved recommendation 4, your addition would have been critical; I would suggest striking the added language.”
- Mr. Koretz: “I don’t think there is anything additional we should do, but I think in some way I think we should acknowledge the fact this is the long term fix by conducting a study it won’t provide immediate or midterm relief it could be 2-3 year before we get a study back. It is not be viewed as a solution to provide relief to our constituents any time soon. I would not want this to be viewed by anyone or the FAA as a substitute for anything else we are recommending, everything else is more immediate and provide more help with us. I support it but I do not know how to make that clear to them.”



- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “Mr. Reindel, in your opinion how long do studies like this take? Or maybe an airport representative can answer that.”
 - Mr. Reindel: “These studies are typically done in relationship to noise and land use compatibility studies, Part 150 type studies. Studies like that can take 1-3 years. A study focused like this probably would take 1 year, to make sure all the data is right, and the findings are correct. Probably 1 year to 18 months.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “So, a study like this could go quicker because it is more focused?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “It is quicker or more efficient then doing a full Part 150 study, but that is another way to go about it you could add this to the Part 150 recommendation. It could go quicker outside of the Part 150 but could be added to the Part 150.
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “Maker of the motion, Ms. Springer, do you want to remove the added language by Gene?”
- Ms. Springer: “It is not necessary to include that language Mr. Reindel?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “Indeed, it is not, and it was not part of the actual recommendations brought forth by the actual members, but I did want to bring it forth.”
- Mr. Reindel: “I want to be clear, what we are voting on is Recommendation 5 without the addition of the HMMH provided language.”
- Members voted on Recommendation 5. The recommendation is approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Recommendation 6: Replace current NextGen aircraft procedures at Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) and Van Nuys Airport (VNY) with procedures that provide better dispersion of flight tracks, such as “open” departures and diverse vector area (DVA) procedures.
- Mr. Najarian moved to vote on Recommendation 6; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Mr. Tornek: “I understand the intent here as my notes suggest, is that implementing an open SID would potentially concentrate flight tracks, and there is no available technology or procedure that could be implemented that would disperse flight paths more than today.. I need to understand from Mr. Reindel are there examples in the recommendation that would lead to less or more concentration?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “The way it is worded, in my opinion, is you are looking for ways to increase dispersion. If you already have an open SID like you do on Runway 15 out of BUR. What you are asking for here is to look at other procedures where open SIDs do not exist and disperse them more then today.
- Mr. Greif: “Mr. Reindel, considering we adopted recommendation 1 - move BUR back to 2007 flight paths and recommendation 3-similar for VNY, what does recommendation 6 do differently? Is there a possibility that the FAA could implement recommendation 6 and implement new flight paths that could then be problematic?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “I am not the author of this. It is a good point you bring up, and it is a possibility that they could introduce flight path that create more problems than they solve. I think this is coming from the fact that you have some concentration of flight tracks specifically on arrivals into the airports and trying to see if you have way to alleviate that. The FAA is currently saying this is difficult to impossible to do. It does not mean you should not recommend. But I think you bring up a great point that it could cause problems you do not have currently.”
- Mr. Gabel-Luddy: “I have a concern about concentration because of approving this. I think with our change to recommendation 2 it might be contradictory. I do not support it.”
- Mr. Greif: “Since these were compiled and merged, if you did not write the language for recommendation 6, who did?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “Well, the consolidated item, yes was written by me, but it was trying to consolidate the recommendations brought forth without being so specific. Remember, don’t just look at the language I wrote but look at the language of each of the recommendations on the following page of the memo. There are a lot of specifics in the recommendations that they will see if you vote yes for this it will come along with all the specifics with it.”



- Mr. Greif: "I was trying to look at all the recommendations that got bottled up by category and it is hard to know which specific ones are contained in this one. I think this one is broad enough it loses its specifics and we might be adopting something that isn't clear enough. I am not sure it is doing what we want."
- Mr. Najarian: "What gets me is the note, they are talking about having a systemic system that NextGen cannot do, don't we want to encourage a satellite-based system with systemic dispersal? Even though it is not here yet, isn't greater dispersal something we want to encourage? We are overthinking this, you have new technology coming up."
- Mr. Krekorian: "I agree with you except I don't have enough confidence in the FAA assurance that they are going to roll out dispersion technology someday. I am not satisfied to wait for the FAA to say when that technology will be ready. What I would like to do is urge them to create dispersion now, and their response assumes their policy conclusion. We are moving to satellite and will have waypoints and we cannot do anything about dispersal until we develop a new technology that is going to help us. In the meantime there are many techniques they can implement tomorrow and there are things they can be doing to avoid more concentration in the future, utilization of the JATYE and TEGAN waypoints is going to cause more concentration in the hills. We have already dealt with that in some of our other issues, there are a number of different things that aviation experts have told us that can create greater dispersion of flight tracks, essentially immediate and a number of them are included specific requests I have that are rolled up in this generic consolidated recommendation. I am ok with the consolidated recommendation as long as it includes all the other things Task Force members have recommended to achieve the end and at least requires the FAA to respond to those things and tell us why they can't do it and if there is not a darn good reason they could be doing it now."
- Mr. Najarian: "I think we are on different pages Mr. Krekorian; your suggestion is to utilize DVA and that is what this motion is calling for."
- Mr. Krekorian: "Yes, that is one of the things that is incorporated in the recommendation. I was not trying to suggest we weren't on the same page Mr. Najarian."
- Mr. Najarian: "It is a matter of; I think this is a great recommendation to show essentially gets to the core of what we want greater dispersion with better technology. If you think it is covered in other recommendations without. I did not write this; it is not my recommendation."
- Mr. Krekorian: "To be clear I think we should keep this with the specific recommendations as Gene has said that are included in this report. Maybe some of them work and some do not work but we should be putting them in front of the FAA."
- Mr. Reindel: "I think it is a good time for me to reiterate: it is going to be clear to the FAA and other entities responsible for implementation - that it is not just the recommending measure they need to review it is also the supporting recommendations made by the members that accompany it so they can see what you had in mind and more specifically how to solve the problem in front of us. It is going to be clear to them in the cover letter written that they look at the recommendation approved, and the supporting recommendation as well."
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "Can you clarify that the open SID reference is a discussion on ground-based navigation and that the FAA in January of 2020 said that it is not possible to replicate dispersion of ground-based navigation as experience prior to the implementation of NextGen?"
 - Mr. Reindel: "Open SID is a term the FAA are using now with NextGen, to where they do not actually apply the NextGen measures to that portion of the SID that is open. While they are not using ground based navigation to get there, it is more of other means, tower communication, such things as controlling an aircraft to fly to a certain place or to fly to a heading until they get to a certain place. It is not something that is in the cockpit flight management system. It is flown by the pilot until they are given the directive to get onto the RNAV, during the portion of the procedure that is open it is not using ground-based navigation either, it is just not using the navigation system, but is controlled by the pilot as directed by ATC."
- Ms. Springer: "Could that result in concentration of flights?"



- Mr. Reindel: “An open SID by itself is trying to gain dispersion and not concentrate flights. We did earlier discuss an open SID with waypoints along the 101 which would concentrate, but not to the extent as a closed SID would, because all the flights would be along the 101. In that case you could still have flights north of the 101 because it is open but you couldn’t have flights south of the 101 which would be creating the concentration of tracks which we are trying to avoid.”
- Members voted on Recommendation 6.
 - The recommendation was approved with a majority vote of 5 to 3.
- Recommendation 7: Provide for Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) procedures for aircraft to arrive all runways at Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR).
- Mr. Tornek moved to vote on recommendation 7; Ms. Springer seconded the motion.
- Members voted on recommendation 7.
 - The recommendation is approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Recommendation 8: Implement preferential runway use plans at both Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) and Van Nuys Airport (VNY) to have aircraft depart directly to the north when winds allow for aircraft to depart the northerly aligned runways.
- Mr. Greif moved to vote on Recommendation 8; Ms. Springer seconded the motion.
- Mr. Sanchez: “I appreciated the time this Task Force has taken since last fall but the fact that now we are at a point where you are moving flight paths to the north San Fernando Valley and there is only one voting member and one advisory member on this Task Force, this is disappointing and it is unfortunate. This was not mentioned in the public comment phase you have Council Member Monica Rodriguez, Assembly Woman, Assemblywoman Luis Reza, who submitted letters against this recommendation and, City of San Fernando opposed this recommendation. None of those organizations have a vote in this body. Moving forward, moving these flights to the north would only hurt areas that that are burdened by bad land decisions, you have California Office of Environmental Health EnviroScreen Map shows pollutions burden scores look at indicators of asthma rates, air quality rates, traffic, drinking water and low birth rates, there are communities in the South San Fernando Valley that rank in the lower percentile. You have communities to the north that 60%-85% community of Arleta another 65%, Community of Pacoima 75%-100%, more importantly the community of Sun Valley this is approved would dramatically affect these sensitive areas has a score of no less than 85%-100%. Our community has the highest asthma rates, our community has the lowest birth rates, our community has the highest unemployment rates even before Covid-19. To solve a problem to put it over poor communities and communities that bare the burden of landfills and quarries and diesel trucks is egregious and unfortunate. One thing that stuck out from the public comments was requests for equal dispersion and comments were made about having dispersion that is 25%, 25% 25% and 25%. Well, we all know each council district is not built that way with equity we know that district 6 and district in the NE San Fernando Valley these are the locations where pollution goes and where people dump to working families. To me there is not equity when it comes to that. I urge the Task Force to vote no on this. I understand that sharing the noise but to put it over poor communities is egregious and unfortunate.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “I would add a comment to those presented by Mr. Sanchez if I was just focusing on the interest of the people I represent, it would make sense to send all flights to the northern route. One of the biggest arguments I have made and many of us have made and my constituents have made, is that the southern shift was hoisted upon them without time of public review, environmental analysis and suddenly there were flights over head. As we are working hard to correct that problem I have tried to be consistent and many of the people that have spoken to us over the months have been consistent with saying it is not acceptable to take one neighborhoods problem and shove it onto another neighborhood. My concern with this recommendation without any further review or environmental analysis that is effectively what this Task Force would be doing to other neighborhoods that are not present with us. I share the concerns expressed by Mr. Sanchez. I would say though, as part of a larger solution and as the FAA continues the environmental analysis of NextGen procedures, I think in that in that environmental review process that no place should be off limits. We should not



say there will never be north bound departures because of x, y, or z, they should probably be included within the alternatives analysis that the FAA should take. But for us to recommend that they should do that kind of analysis is premature and it would be inconsistent with what we are saying to protect our constituents in the south part of the valley as well. So, I would not support recommendation as it stands now.”

- Mr. Tornek: “This was one of my recommendations. It seemed that sort of sharing the pain of the flights once we discover it was technically feasible to take off to the north that the idea of spreading the pain and have an equitable distribution of noise was an appropriate alternative to suggest. I think Mr. Krekorian has made a more effective argument in support of what Mr. Sanchez has said so eloquently. I think that it is absolute right the reason we are going through this whole experience is we had a bunch of people come to us saying that without any participation or disclosure or warning we woke up one day and we became victims without any analysis or discussion and it is simply not equitable and we would be perpetuating that format so I think Mr. Krekorian is 100% right I think we can’t ignore the social justice issues and the environmental degradation that happens in that part of the valley and even though I was one of the people advocating for this alternative I will not support this recommendation.”
- Ms. Springer: “I will also vote no on this for many reasons social equity being one of them, and the fact that northern neighborhoods are not at the table. So, my vote on 8 is also no.”
- Mr. Koretz: “I think we all have the same concerns with this especially if we implement it as it is I think we would be guilty of doing exactly what the FAA did to the southern communities. I wonder, Mr. Krekorian, if we could find some way to substitute this being considered in a very public process later with environmental review and hearings that should be done appropriately. I do not think I would ever take having northern departures off the table, but I don’t think we should mandate that 25% of our flights head north. I think that would be a mistake. I don’t know if we can figure out a way to craft this into something that would allow us to consider it as an option with everything else we are considering when we go through a more robust process to revamp all these procedures.”
- Mr. Reindel: “I am going to step in quick. There is a recommendation coming up, number 17, which is a Part 150 Update, and typically you look at runway use, which this is a preferential runway program which is one of the elements of a Part 150. If this is important enough we can add language to say including looking at a preferential runway use program in that process. You first look at it in the Part 150 and then if you go to implementation you then do the environmental review at that point, but that is typically how those are done. We could modify recommendation 17 when we get there if you wanted to add that in.”
- Mr. Greif: “This is about equity, the challenge I have faced looking at flight paths there are couple of communities that not only face flight tracks from one airport but have flight tracks from two different airports more than anywhere else in the country. There is as far as I am aware no part of the country that two airports have their main departure paths brought over the same communities. Those are the communities basically between 405, 101 and 170 which includes Van Nuys and our northern part of Sherman Oaks. Those communities get 90%+ of the BUR departures that fly of Runway 15 that head north and west and the majority of dep out of VNY head south and east and arch over the same neighborhoods they are not facing their fair share but a huge amount of flights from both airports. I am cool with the council member recommendation and do agree that it is not accurately reflected in recommendation 8 but they did ask for a study and there is no question that if we are going to put flight tracks over a new area an environmental study would need to be done it would be immoral not to. What this is asking for and what my initial recommendation was asking for is looking at fair share arrivals and departures. Arrivals are still coming in from the north and east into Burbank, how do we share the arrivals and departures more equally, it may not be 25, 25, 25, 25 or 50/50 but doing the environmental study to determine additional fair share of departures and arrivals to look at that vortex of the valley that middle income part of the valley is getting the vast majority of the flights that we could be dispersing through the valley. I am not saying what language would make sense to amend recommendation 8, but my thoughts maybe say conduct an environmental study of preferential



runway use plans and determine how more equitable sharing of arrivals and departures can be accomplished.”

- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “It was troubling to me because the communities we would be making the recommendation over have not been engaged in this process and would not see it coming I know the other members have already spoken to this. I will not support it. I think Mr. Reindel’s suggestion considering it as part of the Part 150 study makes sense. we don’t want to hoist something unexpected onto a community that has not been at the table and a part of the process. This recommendation does not have my support and I don’t think it is fair to the communities. I have been out there and all around the BUR airport to get a sense of what the noise was, this is not a recommendation I would support. I think there is an opportunity to amend recommendation 17 and add it to the Part 150 study.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “I agree with Mr. Greif too that studying equitable distribution but it should be done in light of day with public input and consideration of all the environmental, noise and social justice that we have to consider in making any of these tough choices. At the same time, we should take options off the table that we don’t even want to look at. The north end of that runway is in my district I represent those people across the street from the north end of the runway. That is very much on my mind as well even knowing that I wouldn’t say we should take it off the table without even looking at it so I support your suggestion Madame Chair and what was suggested by Mr. Greif I think we should study it and consider those things but without that we can’t recommend that the pain be thrust onto another community.
- Mr. Greif: “Before we vote I think number 8 has limited support as it is written, I am willing to table 8 and bring it up within recommendation 17 unless folks would like to amend 8.”
- Mr. Greif withdrew his motion.
- Mr. Sanchez moved to disapprove on recommendation 8; Mr. Tornek seconded the motion.
- Members voted on disapproving recommendation 8.
 - The recommendation was not approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Recommendation 9: Create “open” Standard Instrument Departure (SID) Procedures at Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) for Runway 8, Runway 26 and Runway 33 mimicking the ELMOO NINE conventional procedure.
- Mr. Krekorian moved to vote on Recommendation 9; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Mr. Krekorian: “On this one, this was based on a few specific recommendations I had which were to increase the utilization of ELMOO 9 which is an existing procedure and establish the procedure as an RNAV to create more utilization with NextGen implementation and create enforceable requirement to encourage FAA to increase use of that procedure such as constraining all other procedures to reduce their volume to pre-2007 levels I also include a request to allow eastbound departures to use Runway 8 and adopt an enforceable process to ensure meaningful reduction of Runway 15 departures as a whole. Can you talk about how that got consolidate in recommendation 9 and did you have concerns about the other recommendations?”
 - Mr. Reindel: “My understanding is that the existing procedure for ELMOO9 is limited by aircraft that can use that procedure. I may not be completely correct in that, but it is my understanding. So, to get at what you are trying to get is to try to develop a new procedure to mimic the ELMOO9 procedure so additional aircraft can fly that procedure.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “Ok, so the idea would be an RNAV that would still be the same general route so that the banking would go to the east instead of the west for Runway 15 departures.”
 - Mr. Reindel: “Yes, that is the intent of that recommendation.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “I have ten years of experience with take-offs, landings and directional regarding BUR and the recommendation as stated is fine and the details will go with the recommendation. There are things the FAA will not agree to and they presented that to us when we talked about easterly take-offs for planes that are over 12,500 pounds but I am ok we are ok with this upgrade.”
- Members voted on Recommendation 9.
 - The recommendation was approved with a majority vote of 7 to 1.



- Mr. Krekorian: “Madame Chair I had a question, didn’t the original ELMOO9 departure procedure include Runway 15 departures?”
 - Chair response: “Yes, it did have procedures for all four runway departures.
 - Response: “So if we could add Runway 15 to recommendation 9. That would be my proposed amendment to add Runway 15 in there as well.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “Let me confirm what with airport staff. I know commercial flights do not go that way. Occasionally they do but rarely due to conflicts with landing at LAX, but that is ok so we will accept that amendment.”
- The Chair agreed to add Runway 15 to recommendation 9.
- Mr. Greif:” Before we move to recommendation 12, would the Task Force support a motion to consolidate or take up together recommendations 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16? Having looked at those I think they are all non-controversial and I believe they will be unanimous since we are already past nine o’clock.”
- The Chair took a vote, 7 members agreed.
- Mr. Greif moved to vote on recommendations 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 combined; Mr. Krekorian seconded the motion.
- Mr. Tornek: “Before I vote on recommendation 15 and the noise mitigation programs the only note I would like to make and so everyone knows for the records without additional federal funding in terms of noise abatement investments required here it would financially break the airport. The assumption here would be is we would have to apply for federal assistance to implement these abatement procedures to upgrade the homes and we do that with federal funding. I am supportive of this, but it should be known we need federal funding, or it would not financially feasible for the airport to sustain it.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “We will add a clarifying note to recommendation 15 stating it requires federal funding to fully implement a program such as this.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “We have our congressional representative as non-voting members on this Task Force. As a Task Force we should ask the federal representative to request federal funding for mitigation measures. This is going to be an important deliverable for the neighborhoods that have been impacted by this noise shift. I would ask that we formally ask our representatives in Congress and the Senate to seek such funding.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “We have done that in the past and with this Task Force if you would be willing to sign a joint letter from all of us I think that would carry a lot of weight to get something like that done. Mr. Tornek why don’t you and I follow up with this and we will provide it to the Task Force.”
- Members voted on recommendations 12-16.
 - The recommendations were approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “Mr. Reindel, I would like to ask what language you would add to recommendation 17 based on the discussion we had.”
- Recommendation 17: Maintain and update when and if necessary the Noise Exposure Map (NEM) and Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) at Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) and Van Nuys Airport (VNY) in order to continue to provide noise mitigation to all potentially eligible property owners and continue to monitor the aircraft operations and associate noise levels throughout the South San Fernando Valley communities.
- Mr. Reindel: “One of the things you had mentioned is you wanted to consider preferential runway use as being a specific item that each airport entertain in their next Part 150 update. We can include language in there to specifically request that runway use be evaluated to more evenly distribute the use of the runways.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “I think we want to say the impacts of runway use.”
- Mr. Reindel: “To specifically evaluate the effects of modifying the preferential runway use program at those airports. To be clear, what a Part 150 program must do while it does not have to evaluate preferential runway use program it is one of the elements and if you do you need to show the effect it



would have on the CNEL contours and if you would be subjecting more people or fewer people to CNEL noise levels., that would be the effect that would be automatically evaluated under Part 150.”

- Mr. Sanchez: “I would remove South San Fernando Valley, make it noise levels throughout the San Fernando Valley.”
- Mr. Reindel: “One thing that comes to mind though, is that a preferential runway use that looks at more northerly operations might benefit from a coordinated approach from the two airports. I do not know if we want to add that in there when we talk about the preferential runway program. The airports would have to operate concurrently in the air space system. Do you want to add that language?”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “You are correct Mr. Reindel.”
- Mr. Greif moved to vote on amended recommendations 17; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Members voted on amended Recommendations 17.
 - The recommendation was approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Recommendation 18: Create a Citizen’s Advisory Committee at Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) to address community concerns throughout the South San Fernando Valley.
- Mr. Krekorian moved to vote on recommendation 18; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Mr. Sanchez: “I would like to make an amendment to recommendation 18, remove south, it should include all of San Fernando Valley.”
- Mr. Krekorian and Mr. Koretz agree to remove south.
- Ms. Springer: “I am neutral on this as we are a sponsor of the airport authority and it has to go to the airport to decide so I will abstain on this one.”
- Mr. Tornek: “I am a commissioner at the airport, this has not been taken up by the airport authority, but I will vote yes and am in support. I think it would be a valuable addition. I am not speaking now on behalf of the authority, but I am supportive.”
- Mr. Najarian: “This will go to the airport authority, correct?”
- Members voted on amended recommendations 18.
 - The recommendation was approved with a majority vote of 5 to 0, with 3 abstentions.
- Recommendation 19: Require the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to respond to community and Airport requests and provide post implementation results from NextGen aircraft procedures including the implementation of the Southern California Metroplex and future implementations and all supporting documents, the Noise Screen that was provided to Benedict Hills in about January 2018, and all documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act.
- Mr. Krekorian moved to vote on Recommendation 19; Mr. Tornek seconded the motion.
- Mr. Greif: “The request I would like to add, is we want them to respond and quickly do we want to include requested 45 day or quarterly updates do we want to give a specific a time recommendation?”
- Mr. Reindel: “I know in a FOIA you have a certain amount of time to respond, typically. Sometimes things take longer than others. Now I know the FA prefers to go through FOIA to request information so there is a paper trail for them for what was released and to whom.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “I would like to speak to that, because this is in response to number of requests I have. This is not meant to be aspirational, it is not meant to be referred to requests in the future, it is designed to ensure the FAA provides documents we as a Task Force and some of us individually have asked for many times. Including FOIA requests and have been denied. Immediately the FAA should respond to the requests that the Task Force have made already to them. It was not meant to be future documents turn over what we have asked for.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “How many times have you asked for it?”
- Mr. Krekorian: “Well, during the Task Force we asked for the noise screen results from Benedict Hills, maybe 8 months ago or a year ago. That is one of the things that is currently being litigated in the FOIA issue. The point here is just to say provide the things we have asked for.”
- Mr. Reindel: “I would you like to add in immediately, so request the FAA immediately respond to.”
- Mr. Greif: “I appreciate M. Krekorian’s explanation, as I was thinking it was responses to our recommendations and do we want quarterly updates on the status of the recommendations we



adopted. I think we should request a quarterly, if not every 45 day update from the FAA on the status of the recommendations knowing they will say in study or not gotten to is, but a timeline that our federal representatives can hold them to and agree to come back otherwise we can send back and it could be a year and then we will have to FOIA.”

- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “We are going to address this through the transmission letter for these recommendations. Mr. Reindel, can you talk about what we have in the submittal letter when we send all the recommendations to the various agencies.”
- Mr. Reindel: “The submittal asks that the FAA provides a response within in 60 days of their findings. I think you are right in that a lot of that will be in progress or a status update what is not in the current draft of the letter is the periodic updates. If we want to add initial response in 60 days and quarterly updates we can add that in.”
- The Vice Chair and the Chair agree to add in quarterly responses to the recommendation letter.
- Members voted on amended recommendations 19.
 - The recommendation was approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Conclusion of the recommendations.
- Mr. Koretz: “I think it largely has been taken care of by the previous motion, my sense the FAA has an expectation that once they created the task for that this Task Force would now be done, but we should be clear we are not disbanding with this recommendation. As a body we should exist until problems are solved. I don’t know if that would require a motion or one would be appropriate or if it would be tagged onto our last motion need to be clear we are an ongoing body and waiting for recommendations or study results waiting for FAA response, etcetera.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “I completely agree with Mr. Koretz, I do not know off hand if the bylaws of the Task Force provide for any sunset or termination data and I don’t know if anyone knows that offhand if that requires a motion for us to continue existence of the Task Force pending completion of the requests if it was a motion I would second it.”
- Mr. Koretz: “If it was necessary as a motion it was intended to be such.”
- Mr. Reindel: “I don’t have the bylaws, but I do believe they it specifically says the Task Force to be setup for a specific number of meetings, 6 or something like that. We have expended those; probably better safe than sorry. I think if you really want to continue this you need to make a motion to.”
- Mr. Tornek: “I have no objection. Makes perfect sense I am a little concerned because it is not an agenized item and it is not in order I think we can act to reconvene at some point it just takes me by surprise not sure what the appropriate action is I will say substantially I think there is value to not disband given what we have suffered through together.”
- Mr. Reindel: “Mr. Tornek is correct that it is not agenized so we cannot proceed at voting at this time. There are probably other avenues this body can take to get at the same solution.”
- Mr. Najran: “Why don’t we just recess and not adjourn?”
- Mr. Koretz: “New item for consideration upon convening?”
- My. Gabel-Luddy: “My recommendation is that we adjourn and come back later, but not a designated time. This Task Force has been by large supported by BUR there may be some thought that the airport would give to burden sharing with LAWA and the council members may want to give thought to that as well. I am not opposed to continuing the Task Force but would be well advised to evolve somewhat before we reconvene.”
- Mr. Tornek: “I believe Mr. Najarian’ s suggestion is a good one, we just recess and not adjourn. We can pick up the thread later.”
- Mr. Koretz withdrew his request and agreed to a recess.
 - Mr. Krekorian also agrees.
- Agenda item 11 - Task Force member prioritization of approved recommendations.
- Mr. Reindel recommends prioritization by category and not by recommendation.
- Mr. Krekorian: “It does not sound ok to me; I appreciate the FAA is requesting that, but they are requesting that so that then can mollify us so they can work on the top priority. The priorities of this Task Force are everything this Task Force says. If we start the conversation with the FAA there are the



things we want and these are ok, if we prioritize them then all low priority will be given an immediate no. I can't image why we would go into a conversation with the FAA saying certain things we want are less important than other things. Those are our recommendations and FAA need to respond to every one of the recommendations. I am very much opposed to falling into a trap of stating what our highest and not highest priorities are."

- Mr. Sanchez: I agree.
- Mr. Najarian: I agree.
- Mr. Krekorian moved to table the prioritization; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "Do you not want to say that they are all high priority?"
- Mr. Krekorian withdrew his motion.
- Mr. Krekorian moved to prioritize all recommendations as high priority; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Members voted on motion.
 - The motion was approved with a unanimous vote of 8 to 0.
- Mr. Krekorian: "I think there were two recommendations that did not get incorporated into the consolidated recommendations proposed. I would like to move them as recommendations. The first issue is Runway 33 arrival procedures over the Santa Monica Mountains as it was a new unpublished procedure that has frequently been used in certain wind conditions arriving flights come over the mountains then into Runway 33. Request the FAA discontinue this use of this dangers procedure of aircraft arriving over mountains for arrivals on Runway 33.
- Mr. Krekorian moved to add a new recommendation to the list of recommendations, request the FAA discontinue the use of Runway 33 arrivals over the Santa Monica Mountains unless deemed necessary from safety conditions; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Mr. Lammerding: "When you say it is unpublished procedure it just means aircraft arriving on Runway 33. We cannot prohibit an aircraft from using any runway in their discretion."
- Mr. Krekorian: "It is the arrival I am more concerned about rather than the choice of runway, to get to Runway 33 they are flying over the Santa Monica Mountains rather than the usual arrival on Runway 8 down the center of the valley."
- Mr. Lammerding: "It is a bit confusing, if it is not a published produce like a visual to any of the runways or not an instrument arrival, what would we be proposing or voting to do? If it is not published, then it is not something in use by FAA. Asking the FAA to stop doing something that is not published does not make sense."
- Mr. Krekorian: "I do not know, maybe the consultant can tell us how to be done. Maybe it is an instruction to the operator I do not know, but this is something that has happen over recent years and rarely if never happened before. I cannot say why that is, but it is."
- Mr. Reindel: "Patrick is right, it is not a procedure, so we were not sure what the ask was going to be. I think the best you can hope for is you go out with some pilot education. You discuss with them this is not a procedure that is recommended; well it is not a procedure. The FAA is not the one to do it, maybe the airport can talk to people or have some sort of outreach material."
- Mr. Lammerding:" It not something we can do to prohibit a visual arrival or departure from the airport how they choose to do that. In the valley here it is typically so busy where you get vectored around by ATC, it may be that certain operators have their own method of doing that internally, if there is nothing unsafe about that, and frankly there is not, and there is no way to tell them not to do something for noise abatement unless it gets included in the Part 150 study. As far as things that can come out of a Part 150 study of recommendations for users and operators."
- Mr. Reindel: "How we would handle this in a Part 150, is you get with operators first to identify who they are if you can and then get together with them and find out why and how often and when and figure out ways around that. You can't tell them not to do it but can work with them and work with airport to try and solve the problem."
- Mr. Tornek: "Mr. Krekorian I am trying to understand, was it is your intention to try and direct this to the FAA? That sounds like it is not the place."



- Mr. Krekorian: "It does not sound like not the place as they do not operate it in the first place. I am looking to my consultant and airport staff to figure out what the solution would be. All I know is there is a relatively recent problem with the arrivals that has be associated with the southern shift. The southern communities are being affected when the wind shifts in certain directions by those arrivals."
- Mr. Lammerding: "Arrivals on Runway 33 and departure to the north on Runway 33 are typical during Santa Ana wind conditions, it maybe that some operators might have more of an internally published procedure on Runway 33, it wouldn't be the case of that never happening before that is the case of arrivals during Santa Ana wind conditions which is around 5% of the year."
- Mr. Krekorian: "That is my point if wind conditions require it. It is a big noise impact and safety impact when those flights are on arrival coming in low and loud over those hills."
- Ms. Springer: "How many flights are we talking about? What is the impact of the neighborhoods they would be diverted over?"
- Mr. Krekorian: "I would imagine the diversion would be they would come in on Runway 8 like the vast majority of arrivals that are coming in over the valley. That would be over areas where they are not as close into the topography and the topography doesn't increase the noise effect. Can we incorporate this into the Part 150 recommendation?"
- Mr. Reindel: "I think we can modify that recommendation to not only specifically look at runway use but also look at arrivals on Runway 33 and see if there is a way when wind conditions don't require it to not fly that unpublish the procedure. Could just direct it to the airport to address and let them decide how to deal with it."
- Mr. Krekorian: "Maybe directing the airport might get simpler and get a quicker solution directing the airport to address that solution."
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "I do not think that the airport is in opposition to direct arrivals. If that is the case then doing pilot education, you may raise an expectation you cannot meet. I think you should add it to the Part 150 study to globally look at the effects."
- Mr. Krekorian: "Ok, I am convinced to add it to the Part 150 recommendation."
- Mr. Krekorian moved to add and modify to approved Recommendation 17 incorporating the study of Runway 33 arrivals into the Part 150 study; Mr. Koretz seconded the motion.
- Ms. Springer: "This is not something we have considered in the previous eight months; it is just now being raised? Is everyone ok with it?"
- Mr. Krekorian: "It has come up, it was presented by community groups, it was one of the requests I made from the consultant it has come up."
- Ms. Springer: "Why was it not in one of the recommendations, why was it not included like when we had them to review?"
- Mr. Krekorian: "You have to ask the consultant; I included it in writing when I gave my recommendations. I think we just heard from Mr. Reindel they thought about it but did not include it in the recommendations. I raised it and the public has raised it."
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "Mr. Krekorian I believe there is another item you would like to raise?"
- Mr. Krekorian: "This is a deficiency raised by the public, a lot of the decisions we are relying on are based on noise modeling and there has not be a formal noise study as to the noise impacts on the City of Los Angeles. I would like to request the FAA conduct a formal noise study noise patterns surrounding VNY and BUR and commit to regular renewals of that study so we can monitor how the noise impacts are changing with the recommendations we are making today."
- Mr. Koretz: "Seconded."
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: "I am not sure what the direction is."
- Mr. Najarian: "Let's get some clarification, isn't that done anyway by a 5-year basis, when they continue doing the studies? "
- Mr. Lammerding: "Both airports have NEMs as a part or Part 150 study, they show the average decibel CNEL level around the airport. NEMs are used for eligibility of residential sound insulation. I think what is being discussed here is something like that is noise modeling and then noise monitoring to confirm computer modeling to be done in City of Los Angeles in between the airports. This would take place



not in the vicinity of the 65-60 CNEL contours of the airport but outside that. The trick would be to decide who would be the sponsor of this, sound like asking FAA to participate in this same process but not at an airport, but in a localized area, the City of Los Angeles would need to be a sponsor of that. Not something that is typically done but you can make that request.”

- Mr. Reindel: “I think you are correct. I think we felt the Part 150 study would do a noise analysis, and that is a basis for noise mitigation or noise abatement. A Part 150 does that, but not out to the extent to the areas you would like, it really focuses on the 65 CNEL, most of what we have been taking about is well outside that 65 CNEL. So how does it get paid for and who does that study and how it gets paid for? The FAA will not fund a study outside the 65 CNEL.”
- Mr. Krekorian: “Are there permanent noise monitors located in Los Angeles portion of the San Fernando valley?”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “I believe there are. Mr. Lammerding can you confirm?”
- Mr. Lammerding: “The airport operates noise monitoring system on either side of the noise contours modeled to confirm the locations of the border of the 65 CNEL contour to find out eligibility line for RSIP.”
- Mr. Reindel: “So, if it is within or near 65 CNEL then Part 150 and title 21 cover that, but if you’re talking well outside that then you are talking about who is responsible for that and where does the money come from. The FAA will not fund a study much outside of the 65 CNEL.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “It may be a matter of you and the Los Angeles Representatives of the Task Force and sit down and discuss if the city of Los Angeles wants to sponsor that study. I think that is what Mr. Lammerding and Mr. Reindel are saying. It is my experience with the FAA and how they conduct studies, and monitors that he communities you have considered are so far away from the airport the sponsor needs to come from the city of Los Angeles.”
- Mr. Greif: “Back to Runway 33, in Mr. Krekorian’s letter he had a recommendation showing a picture of the narrowing of the Runway 33 arrivals coming in. The arrivals have been narrowed based on RNAV procedures. Arrivals have been narrowed into a narrow path. We focused on departures, but arrivals are also an issue and I think it is a great thing to bring up.”
- Ms. Gabel-Luddy: “Are there any other recommendations that are going to come up this evening? At least it would have been helpful to have this discussion earlier.”
- Mr. Reindel: “What we are recommending now is an amendment to Recommendation 17. We already amended to include preferential runway use review, this would also include a review of Runway 33 arrival procedures over the Santa Monica Mountains and look at alternatives to that or eliminating that through Part 150 process.”
- Members voted on motion to modify Recommendation 17.
 - The motion was approved with a majority vote of 6 to 0, with two abstentions.
- Agenda item 12 - next steps.
- HMMH will document the voting and results, and everything will be deemed as a high priority.
- HMMH will prepare the formal submittal to the FAA and other entities.
- HMMH will prepare submittal letters for the Chair and Vice Chair to sign.
- Closing comments.
- The Chair recessed the meeting.



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: Gene Reindel, HMMH Vice President and Task Force Facilitator