



14 CFR PART 150 UPDATE
NOISE TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP (NTAG) MEETING
Thursday, January 14, 2010 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
San Diego International Airport, Commuter Terminal,
3rd Floor, Noise Monitoring Room

Meeting Summary

Introductions

Paul Webb, Project Manager for the Part150 study, welcomed the NTAG members and thanked all the members for participating. He then introduced Dan Frazee, Director of the Airport Noise Mitigation Department, who thanked everyone for their hard work and participation in the NTAG. He then turned the meeting over to Gene Reindel, the Consultant's Project Manager from Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc. (HMMH), who also thanked the NTAG for their participation and input. He asked for each NTAG member to introduce themselves and the organization they represent. Each consultant then introduced themselves and the company they represent: Bob Behr HMMH, Mike Carr, HMMH, Ken Brody from Mead & Hunt, Christina Tigert and Chris Eberhard from CommuniQuest. A "thank you" cake was cut and passed around to each member.

Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) Measures Recommended

Mr. Reindel explained that there should be no new information given today. The NTAG had seen these measures, commented on them and the presentation today would highlight what measures were being moved forward for approval. He also stated that if anyone has questions to please bring them forward as the presentation would be about 20 minutes and there would be plenty of time to go over anything.

He also indicated that copies of the accepted NEMs were available for the members if they wanted one. Mr. Reindel reminded the NTAG that later this evening a public hearing would take place at 5 p.m. and encouraged the members to attend. He went on to say that this is an update to the previous NCP and only new or modified measures would be included in the NCP Update.

Mr. Reindel reviewed the measures recommended:

- Three Noise Abatement Measures:

- Six Land Use Measures:
- Ten Program Measures:

Mr. Reindel then discussed the NCP measures not recommended:

- Noise Abatement Departure Profiles (NADP),
- Preferential runway use during departure curfew,
- RNAV departure for 290 heading departure and,
- 310 heading departure.

Group Discussion

The following discussions were held during the presentation by Mr. Reindel.

Regarding the recommended measure NA-1 (left turn over the bay departure), Mr. Mike Tussey asked how many flights per day would use this departure. Mr. Garret Hollarn from the Noise Mitigation Office answered a monthly average comes out to five or six flights per day, mostly Monday through Friday. Mr. Tussey asked when they go northwest bound do they continue with a climbing left turn. Mr. Hollarn answered no because they are going to Imperial and this is to avoid them crossing over Point Loma. Mr. Tussey continued, asking if the aircraft will pick up Victor 66 going east bound. Mr. Hollarn replied, if they were to take a 310 heading and turn right there is typically an airspace conflict with Montgomery. They do not go that direction generally, they head south and around. Mr. Tussey asked, if he was over the bay would he make a left turn to intercept Victor 66. Mr. Hollarn interjected that they would intercept the 086 track to Poggi and continue east as if operating on the 275 departure procedure.

Mr. Suhail Khalil added that Point Loma appreciates this procedure. He asked if this eliminates the 250 heading. Mr. Reindel answered no. Mr. Khalil went on to ask if this would be a standard departure. Mr. Reindel replied that it is recommended for the small propeller aircraft that would normally take the 250 heading. Mr. Khalil continued to ask if the control tower would advise aircraft to take the new heading. Mr. Hollarn answered no that this would not be an instrument procedure; this is for visual flight rules (VFR) aircraft that would be called out to the pilot, a pilot cannot fly Poggi 2 departure procedure.

Mr. Khalil then asked how often this procedure would be used. Mr. Hollarn again answered roughly 5-6 flights per day. Mr. Victor Globa from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airports District Office replied, "This is what it is at now. Typically if they were to voluntarily ask for it, if the airspace allows it, the tower will allow them to do so. And if you look at it, it does not show any benefit in the noise contour" noting that is one of his concerns when he looked at the measure.

Mr. Dan Burkhart from the National Business Aviation Association (NBAA) clarified that it is voluntary. Mr. Reindel answered yes. Mr. Frazee added that it will take away aircraft that ATC has moved so faster aircraft can use the airspace. A member stated that it looked like it would not benefit the CNEL but the single event noise levels. Mr. Globa commented that members should keep in mind that it has not been through

the FAA line of business review yet; Flight Procedures and Flight Standards will look at this as well before signing it off for approval.

Mr. Frazee reminded everyone that these are just proposed measures. Mr. Peter Drinkwater commented that it would be beneficial for those traveling that way. It would be a more direct route and therefore more appealing as voluntary. Mr. David Borcalli from the Air Traffic Control Tower stated that it would be opposite direction traffic for North Island; Monday through Friday that traffic would be in the face of aircraft heading onto Runway 29.

Mr. Frazee asked to go back to say that part of Mr. Khalil's question had not been answered as to how will pilots know this procedure exists if it is voluntary. Mr. Reindel replied that that would be included in the implementation phase, if it were approved as part of the NCP there would be an educational process. Mr. Frazee interjected that there are published procedures called visual departure procedures.

Mr. Khalil asked Mr. Globa about the further review process. Mr. Globa responded that Air Traffic, Flight Procedures, and different branches of the FAA have to review the draft NCP to make sure it is safe. If they create new procedures it will have to go into the Jeppesen flight charts so pilots would be aware these procedures are out there. Mr. Globa cautioned members to also remember that North Island is a huge impediment and just because it is on the books does not mean they will force aircraft to use it. The more they scream from Point Loma it does not matter, it is a safety issue.

Mr. Drinkwater interjected that this route is already a VFR flight corridor and if the flight sequence is cleared it should be deconflicted. Mr. Borcalli responded that they already have an established 115 heading that keeps VFR aircraft in Class Bravo airspace. He noted that this is what pilots are told on the ground to expect – “fly left downwind departure” to keep them away from North Island airspace. He said, “Once the aircraft is over the city, we turn them to a 115 heading and send them to SoCal approach.”

Mr. Drinkwater responded that it looks like it exists now so there should be no conflict in the line of business review, it would just be to formalize it. Mr. Borcalli agreed that it is already established and that the lines of business review would look at what could they safely do in a way that it will not cause a communication nightmare with North Island. Mr. Gottschalk asked if this conflicts with the Navy pattern. Mr. Borcalli indicated that is why they keeps them on the 090 heading until they are close to the city and then turn them to VFR 115 heading because then it is a mile and a half inside the boundary of the Bravo airspace. But if they do what the figure is showing which is over the bay that looks to be inside North Island Delta airspace. He noted that would have to be coordinated, their final would have to be completely clear because the VFR aircraft climb much slower than the jets. Mr. Gottschalk went on to ask if the Navy had agreed to this procedure. Mr. Reindel responded to keep in mind where the actual line is. (See Figure 4 in presentation).

Mr. Khalil asked what the difference between the left turn toward North Island is versus a right turn toward Montgomery. Mr. Hollarn replied that three of the aircraft depart between 6:30 a.m. to 7:15 a.m. before North Island has operations which was

why they chose that route. Mr. Khalil went on to ask if there is conflicting operations at Montgomery at that time. Mr. Hollarn answered yes. Mr. Borcalli reminded members that minimum vectoring altitude to the north climb is extremely higher to get over Mount Soledad. It is quicker to get onto Victor 66 but it is the terrain that the small aircraft cannot get over that quickly. Mr. Globa interjected that this is why there is an FAA line of business review, to make sure all the ducks are in a row.

The group moved on to discuss recommended measure NA-2 (Encourage use of continuous descent approaches for arrival onto Runway 27). Mr. Khalil asked if the procedure would be an RNAV procedure. Mr. Reindel responded that yes it could be. Mr. Billy Self gave an explanation as to what RNAV was and stated that airlines like this procedure because it saves them fuel. He also indicated that he would be willing to work with the airport to have them come to the simulators, and it would be a win-win situation because noise would also be reduced. Mr. Globa reminded everyone that the noise reduction would be outside the 65 decibel CNEL contour and from a Part 150 perspective it would not be applicable. Mr. Reindel went back to Mr. Khalil's question that it could be an RNAV procedure and noted that there are different names for them.

Regarding recommended measure NA-3 (to minimize early turns on Runway 27 departures) Mr. Khalil commented that the departure gates look similar to the ones established in 1993 and wondered how these differ. Mr. Reindel replied it is an existing procedure and what they want to do is formalize it so when they have deviations the airport can go back to the tower and have discussions to reduce deviations. It is part of the noise program. Mr. Khalil commented that this measure does not have much "teeth." He also asked if this is again voluntary. Mr. Reindel replied yes. Mr. Hollarn reminded him that ultimately it is the pilot in command and air traffic control that make that decision. What this measure will do is allow them to talk with the pilot and tower and see why they are not getting compliance.

Discussion regarding recommended land-use measure LU-4 (to urge the City of San Diego to prohibit new incompatible land use development) commenced. Mr. Khalil commented that there was a lot of push back from the community on that point. He said it is because of the fact that it puts more restrictions historically on properties that were considered commercial and now can no longer be used in that manner. Mr. Reindel responded that yes they can be used for commercial or industrial uses. There are some uses that would be restricted, that being residential, educational, and sensitive ones like hospitals. Mr. Brody interjected that the ALUCP Update is also focusing on noise and land use compatibility, like the Part 150, but also safety.

The group moved on to discuss recommended measure PM-3 (design and implement a Fly Quiet Program). Mr. Khalil asked if the program would become more incentive based. Mr. Frazee replied no, but at other airports like San Francisco air carriers vie for the top spot. Mr. Hollarn interjected that it would give the public more access to see what air carriers are doing. Mr. Reindel reminded those that this program is not designed yet and in the implementation phase the program would be designed and what would go into the program would be decided.

Mr. Globa commented that the concern he has is because the program has not been designed and it would be hard to approve something that has not been designed. Second, from a federal funding perspective that they keep mentioning San Francisco; however, San Francisco pays for their program out of their general fund, not federal funds. Third, certain air carriers that operate new aircraft versus the old MD-80s and both depart at the same time, the MD-80 will be louder than the new aircraft. And technically they are not operating out of procedure; it would be hard for the federal government to support something that would give accolades to someone operating an Airbus versus someone operating the MD-80.

Mr. Globa went on to say that if the measure were to come to them as is they would not approve it until additional information was provided, to have a better understanding of what is going into the program. If they are going to have a Fly Quiet program it needs to include everyone, including general aviation. The idea is to address everyone. It needs to be across the board and provide the information to everyone. Mr. Hollarn clarified for Mr. Globa that they have regularly scheduled operators and typically they only apply the reward programs to the passenger or commercial operators. But likely this would include all and any new operator that meets that requirement as regularly scheduled operators would be a part of this incentive program. Mr. Globa reaffirms that it should encompass everyone, to not pick and choose who you will be targeting. Mr. Reindel asked Mr. Globa to take a look at paragraph two of that section because they incorporated the comments he gave at the last meeting to include General Aviation in the program..

Next Steps / Wrap-up

Mr. Reindel noted that the next steps would include the development of the final draft NCP which would be submitted to the FAA by March 2010. The FAA would then go through its line of business review and, when completed, the finalized NCP will be on the Airport Authority Board agenda for their review and approval. Once the Board approves the NCP it will be submitted to the FAA with the expectation of record of approval from the FAA by the end of calendar year 2010.

He thanked everyone for their participation and attendance at the final NTAG meeting.

#