

# **TETERBORO AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TANAAC)**

## **MEETING**

### **SUMMARY OF MINUTES**

**April 27, 2016**

#### **ATTENDANCE**

Renee Spann, Manager, Teterboro Airport	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Pam Phillips, Manager, Ops and Security	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Rick Vander Wende, Manager Contract Svcs.	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Richard Heslin, GM NJ Airports	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Tim Middleton, Project Manager, Part 150 Study	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Gabriel Andino, Manager, Noise Abatement	Teterboro Airport/AvPORTS
Michael Fiscus, Asst. Manager, Noise Abatement	Teterboro Airport/AvPORTS
John Panarello, Manager of Airport Services	Teterboro Airport/AvPORTS
Gary Palm, TEB ATCT Manager	FAA
Frederick Dressel, TANAAC Co-Chair	Borough of Moonachie
Albert Dib, Representative	City of Hackensack
Pierre Gaillard, Representative	City of Hackensack
Fritz Rethage, Representative	Borough of Hasbrouck Heights
Frank Messar, Councilman	Borough of Maywood
Paul Griffo, Representative	Borough of Rutherford
Ken Goffstein, Representative	Township of Teaneck
John P. Watt, Mayor	Borough of Teterboro
Tom Gonnella, Representative	Borough of Wood-Ridge
Peter Kortright, Representative	Bergen County
Marc N. Schriecks, Representative	Bergen County Executive's Office
Jessica Goetz, Representative	Congressman Pascrell's Office
Steve Riethof, Representative	AOPA - ASN
Alex Gertsen Representative	National Business Aviation Association
Chris Hillman, Representative	Assemblyman Timothy Eustace
Anthony Griffin, Guest	City of Hackensack
Marie and Al DePierro, Guests	City of Hackensack
Rory Parker, Guest	City of Hackensack
Cathy Krostek, Guest	Borough of Hasbrouck Heights
Carol Skiba, Guest	Borough of Hasbrouck Heights
Corinne Wehrle, Former Representative	Borough of Little Ferry
George Wehrle, Guest	Borough of Little Ferry
John Brown, Guest	Borough of Maywood
John Gil, Guest	Assemblywoman Holly Schepisi
Ron Kistner, Guest	Borough of Allendale
Bill Laforet, Guest	Township of Mahwah
Joseph D'Arco, Guest	Borough of Paramus
Joseph H. Schisani, Guest	Borough of Paramus
Deirdre Dillon, Guest	Borough of Ramsey
Joe Carey, Guest	Borough of Ramsey
J.P. Tristani, Guest	Borough of Ramsey
Michael Kazimir, Guest	Township of Rochelle Park
Roy Luyster, Guest	Township of Rochelle Park
Robert Davidson, Guest	Township of Rochelle Park
Andre Tatarenko, Guest	Borough of Waldwick
Thomas Giordano, Guest	Borough of Waldwick
Joe Oravetz, Guest	Borough of Waldwick

**TANAAC  
Teterboro Airport  
April 27, 2016  
90 Moonachie Avenue, PA Conference Room  
Minutes Summary**

Frederick Dressel, former Mayor of Moonachie and TANAAC Co-Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees. Due to many guests being in attendance to discuss the agenda item regarding the “Quiet Visual” charted visual approach to miss the Hackensack University Medical Center, Mayor Dressel asked TANAAC members to introduce themselves. Mayor Dressel announced that, although it has been a long-standing policy that the TANAAC meetings are not open to the press, an exception has been made and the press was present for tonight’s meeting.

Mayor Dressel introduced Mr. Gabriel Andino to recognize Mrs. Corinne Wehrle, who retired from TANAAC last year after many years of service. Mr. Andino presented Ms. Wehrle with a plaque in appreciation for her years of dutiful service and honoring her contributions to the committee. Corinne thanked the committee and said a few words about her service on the committee and the importance of the new approach that misses the hospital in Hackensack.

Ms. Renee Spann, Teterboro Airport Manager and Co-Chair of TANAAC, presented some airport information.

- There is no significant construction at Teterboro Airport at this time. We have no extensive airport closures planned.
- Upcoming events include a Career Day for some local high school students in May, the annual Teterboro Airport Community Benefit Fund awards luncheon in June, and the annual Bergen County United Way 5 K Run at the airport in July.
- The Port Authority is retaining a consultant to provide input on what Teterboro Airport can do to better serve its customers, as part of the Port Authority effort to focus on its core mission of operating transportation facilities. We expect to have the consultant speak at the July meeting of TANAAC.

Ms. Spann announced that Mr. Richard Heslin, GM of NJ Airports, is retiring next month.

- Mr. Heslin noted that this would be his last TANAAC meeting, as he will retire at the end of May after 45 years of service with the Port Authority.
- He also noted that he appreciated the TANAAC group because they worked collaboratively with the airport to bring their concerns to light and seek solutions together.
- Mayor Dressel thanked Mr. Heslin for his time with the committee especially during his tenure as Teterboro Airport Manager.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### Charted Quiet Visual Approach

Mayor Dressel recognized the elected officials or their designees from the municipalities that were invited guests at the meeting. Those included Allendale, Mahwah, Paramus, Ramsey, Rochelle Park, Waldwick, and NJ Legislative District 39.

Mr. Gabriel Andino introduced Mr. Gary Palm, Manager of Teterboro Airport Air Traffic Control Tower, to make a presentation on the Charted Quiet Visual approach for Runway 19 at Teterboro Airport that avoids the Hackensack University Medical Center (HUMC).

Mr. Palm introduced the members of the FAA who were also in attendance: Ms. Dana Rose-Kelly, Mr. Jeffrey Clarke, and Mr. Jim Peters.

- The Charted Quiet Visual Approach was published on March 31 of this year.
- A flight test period began on April 4, not to exceed six months.
- TANAAC raised safety and noise impact concerns about the approach to Runway 19 that directly overflies the HUMC in 2007.
- A letter was sent in 2007 to the FAA Administrator requesting that the agency work with the Port Authority of NY&NJ to investigate the possibility of diverting or developing a new approach that would move aircraft away from the HUMC. This letter was signed by Senators Lautenberg and Menendez, as well as Representative Rothman.
- Throughout 2008 to 2014, several design ideas were submitted and reviewed, but were ultimately rejected due to deficiencies with the approach or fly-ability issues.
- In 2015, the FAA completed the finalized design and that design was reviewed, tested and flight checked, and it passed that inspection on February 4 of 2016 and was published on March 31.
- Mr. Palm showed slides of the new approach track, the current approach tracks, and compared the two.
- Two important take-aways are that the new Charted Quiet Visual is contained within existing flight paths that are flown every day at TEB. Secondly, the descent profile of the new approach from 3,000 to 2,000 feet and continuing descent to the runway is identical to the descent profile that is used currently.
- Additional slides showed the flight tracks that exist today as they pass directly over the HUMC, which is about a mile and a half from the airport, and their comparison to the new approach that brings aircraft slightly west of the medical complex.
- This new approach is a charted visual approach, which means that there are certain weather requirements. First, the airport must be landing Runway 19. The ceiling (the cloud bases) must be at 3,500 feet or above. Visibility must be 5 miles or greater.
- A slide depicted the Approach plate that was published on March 31 and the refinements that are in the process to update/correct it. The revised plate will be published in the next charting cycle, which is about 45 days from the date of the meeting.

Upon completion of Mr. Palm's presentation, the floor was opened for questions. Below is a summary of the question and answer period. This is not a transcript, but includes relevant portions of direct quotes. All answers are from the FAA unless otherwise noted.

1. "Is the visual approach optional for pilots?"  
*"Yes. Pilots can stay on the instrument approach even if conditions are acceptable for the visual approach"*
2. "Is the test affecting the Runway 24 approach at all? There seems to be more traffic on that runway lately."  
*"No. It has no impact on Runway 24."*
3. "It seems like a good approach, but it doesn't appear that pilots are taking it."

*“We are in the testing phase. We anticipate that pilots will be more receptive to using the approach once the new plate with the refinements is published. (Wasn’t there an error on the first plate?) There was a radial labeling error on the published plate, which has been corrected. However, the procedure has moved forward regardless of this. There has been one pilot use the approach so far.”*

4. “What is the rationale for the 6-month testing period?”

*“The 6-month period is used to collect data, such as usage of the approach and environmental impacts that may be raised. Then that information is used to determine whether the approach will be made permanent. The 6-month period is a designated amount of time, but the data could be collected in a shorter period of time. The average time for data collection in this kind of testing is 60 to 90 days. We should have sufficient data well within the 6 month designated period.”*

5. In reference to the slide showing all the current flight tracks, “is it to be assumed that all of those tracks will be realigned to cross over Mahwah?”

*“No. The approaches are not necessarily all confined to that one radial.”*

6. “My concern is, as is for the rest of us, the amount and volume and density of traffic. Just the mere fact that the blue line [displayed in the slide presentation] that traverses Mahwah and goes down Route 17, leads me to believe that the traffic that we didn’t have before will be compounded exponentially by the realignment of this route. I want you to understand that Mahwah has a cell tower on it, the county cell tower is up there and that tower is 1,200 feet. You said they would come down and cross this approach at 3,000 feet. (Reply: at or above.) But it won’t be more than 3,500 feet. Is that correct? (Reply: More than likely not.) So, I’m only saying if you look at the perspective of Mahwah between the mountain with this tower on it of 1200 feet that is approximately twice that height, it seems like an issue for jets lining up on this vector through Mahwah that wasn’t taken into consideration. I think someone here stated at the last meeting that we were very concerned about this. Hackensack has its own unique problems, and 9 years ago, I venture a guess that they weren’t landing critical care helicopters on the roof, but there are now about 3 hospitals along Route 17. There are several schools at certain elevations. Mahwah has one that is at one of the highest elevations that will be impacted by all of this. The test is the test; we’re very very concerned about it. We’re also concerned about what is the data you are going to collect. How is it going to be disseminated? What does our voice here mean to ultimately deciding, and obviously we’re very concerned about it, deciding that this is not a good test? Is this something that 6 months opens the door for it’s going to happen? I think that’s what concerns us most of all. We want you to take in consideration that you’re impacting more schools, more hospitals, etc. that you didn’t have before.”

*“In response, firstly, the altitude of the approach is the same descent profile that you see today. There is no change in altitude. The aircraft that fly over that area are at or above 3,000 feet if they are established on any approach that lands presently at Teterboro Airport”.*

7. “I have an app on my phone and it says a lot of those aircraft in that area are at 2100 feet.”

*“I cannot respond to that because I don’t have statistics, however, I can tell you that aircraft flying this approach are required to be at 3,000 feet or above in the Mahwah area.”*

*Further response to #6. “The data assimilated will include following the flight tracks, compliance by the pilots to follow the right flight, compliance by the pilots to follow the right altitude, noise (they will draw a noise profile from that). They will use that data to comply with any environmental requirements. They will determine if it meets the environmental requirements and if it does, it is a very good possibility that it will become a permanent*

*approach to the airport. Concerns that were already voiced at the previous meeting, (TAC meeting) have already been taken back to the FAA.”*

8. It was posed for consideration that one of the Mayors of the towns outside TANAAC jurisdiction be included as part of TANAAC until such time as the concerns about the Charted Quiet Visual Approach are resolved.

*“This will be taken under advisement.”*

9. Ms. Spann asked for clarification that the operations currently being observed in the northern part of NJ are flying our current flight procedures because the new approach has only been flown once. Is that correct?

*“Yes.”*

10. “Most of the aircraft today are not entering the approach at SLANE (waypoint), but entering the approach at ARRTY, which is over Waldwick at about 2,000 feet. Have you ever considered making the approach for Runway 24 and come down the Hackensack River?”

*“Several options have been considered over the last decade; however, we are intricately connected with Newark Airport and have very little airspace to work with.”*

(Added comment) “It’s basically noise abatement that we’re concerned about, coming over the reservoir and down the Hackensack River would take aircraft to the other side of the hospital.”

*“Your thoughts will be taken back to the FAA”.*

11. Mayor Dressel commented that TANAAC voiced serious concerns about safety and noise over the HUMC as early as 2004. “It was more than just a noise concern; it was also a safety concern. If anyone here has ever stayed at that hospital, as I have, they know that the planes passing over the facility are loud and quite frankly can be scary. So, we as TANAAC asked what could be done to alleviate these concerns, which seemed like a reasonable thing to ask. And when we started this quest, we received a quite favorable response from the hospital working with former Mayor Ron Jones. When the FAA came to us with this proposed new approach last year, we sent letters to the towns that were identified as possibly being affected, and that’s where this conversation began. We are not battling here, and whatever concerns raised will be taken into consideration by the FAA. And the FAA will do what they need to do by law, which includes an environmental impact study. And changes like that only came around because of groups like TANAAC. The approach is not a done deal. We are pursuing what we think is a good idea, but if it’s proven to not be, then we will accept that.”

12. “I have been asked to look at the information prior to this decision by the FAA. I need to see the original reports and studies that the FAA based this decision on and what you are going to compare the findings of this 6-month testing period to. The previous report, I can’t find it anywhere.”

*“The noise and environmental specialist of the FAA have strict procedures and requirements that they must adhere to. The decision won’t be made until after the data is collected.”*

#12 continued. “I’m looking for the original reports that were used to make the decision that there was a safety issue and an environmental issue. Because if it’s a safety issue with one hospital, flights are going to descend over Route 17, over Paramus, where I’m sure the population that is going to be affected every day is in the hundreds of thousands. I need to read those reports because that is the charge I have from my governing body. And then I’ll need the reports that you are going to make in 6 months so I can read them and disseminate them to the public.”

*“I do not personally have that data. We do want your request and your input, that is what this is all about. We can provide a web address for you to submit your requests.” (Included at the end of the discussion)*

13. “You are not making this very user friendly at all for us. How about you help us? We all have concerns. Sending emails to a website is useless if we don’t get a response from a responsible person. Don’t forget the FAA works for us, the taxpayers. Please act like it.”
14. A resident of Hackensack, who lives very near the HUMC, noted that the altitude is the factor that needs to be considered. “It isn’t enough to say that the airplanes are flying over your area; you need to consider the altitude. Aircraft fly very low over the HUMC. She referred to an article in the Bergen Record on April 1, 2016 in which a mother wrote, ‘While my daughter was a patient at HUMC, I cringed every time a plane zoomed overhead low and close to the hospital. The noise was loud. The sight of the jet so close did frighten me.’ It is so loud and it shakes the windows and it interrupts our conversations because of the altitude. In addition, we have the engine fumes and the noise. There is no doubt that this path needed to be changed. And this is a densely populated area, a residential area; this is where thousands of people live every day. We can’t go out in our back yards, on the sidewalks, we can’t open our windows.”
- Another Hackensack resident added that HUMC has grown very large and there are also a lot of high rises in the area. “It is scary because the planes are so low; they are not at 3,000 feet or 2,100 feet that they would be up north on this approach.”

*“The existing flight paths are at approximately 200-300 feet over the hospital.”*

15. Mayor Dressel asked, “As the FAA goes through its information gathering and decision making process, what avenues do these people have to voice their concerns to the FAA? Is there a public hearing? Is it sufficient enough for them to voice their concerns to you?”
- “To come to me directly is not sufficient. The required process is the public outreach like we are doing now. We want the input. We provided a web address before, but I will verify the address and try to come up with something that is more user- friendly. I can’t tell you exactly what route we’ll follow, there may be other avenues we can direct information through and gather information from. As we move forward through the testing period, we will continue with the briefings. We do make note of your concerns and move them up to the higher levels of authority in the FAA”.*
16. A resident from Hasbrouck Heights cited her concerns because she lives ¼ mile from the airport off route 46: “I know that new route is going to affect me. And the flight path goes right over Bergen Community College. So no matter what changes you make, there are going to be problems”.
- “Living in close proximity to the airport, there is only so much we can do. The aircraft are going to continue to descend regardless of what direction they come from. This new approach is trying to appease the request from the locals to at least lessen those approaches that go directly over or adjacent in close proximity to the HUMC. There is one other important thing the people need to understand. Teterboro Airport has four runways. Runway 19, 24, 6, and 1. Two each operating from each end. The design of this approach is for one runway, Runway 19. The flight tracks that I showed you earlier are not necessarily an everyday occurrence. The use of our runways is based on several things. It’s based on weather. It’s based on wind. And we are intricately linked to the flow at Newark Airport. So, if the weather favors, the winds are coming from the south, we are usually on the south flow. The south flow is landing on Runway 19 and Runway 24. That would be the time that this approach would be available to aircraft to utilize. It is not all encompassing, every day. The flight tracks that I showed you were assimilated over the period of 30 days. So, the question from the mayor about them all being condensed into one—no, not necessarily, every day is different. We could be in the south flow one day and the north flow the other day, which would mean that we are departing off Runway 1 and landing Runway 6, or vice versa or even both at the same time. So I want to make sure that everybody understands that this is not a daily configuration. This configuration is only used, and our statistics show that, the*

*southbound configuration in which Runway 19 would be in use is approximately 51% of the year. So basically, we could be on the north flow today and the south flow tomorrow. Not every pilot will fly the visual approach. There may be a small difference in the number of aircraft that fly that approach, but the ultimate outcome in this is that there will be less aircraft that will be flying directly over the HUMC complex and they'll be just a little further west. In reference to your altitude concerns, being such close proximity to the airport, the aircraft have to continue their descent to the approach end of the runway, they are going to land. So as the approaches begin, at or above Mahwah, they are at 3,000 feet and above, (it could be lower in some cases because of the flight path or what NY TRACON is telling them. They will continue on a descent to the airport. The ultimate outcome of this endeavor was to at least minimize the impact and the exposure that the HUMC experiences continuously throughout the year, maybe not on a daily basis, but throughout the year. We want to continue our outreach to everyone. I want to re-emphasize that this is a test period. And this test period will not be any longer than 6 months. From that point on, decisions, reviewing of the data and hopefully getting everyone the information that they want will end contributing to the final decision."*

*Additional response: "An instrument approach is almost always the approach of choice for the FAA. The truth of the matter is that those airplanes are in that airspace at those altitudes today. That has not changed. The real difference, if you look at the charts is closer in to the airport. It's not even at Mahwah."*

17. "You said that there are 51% of the flights that could use this approach."

*"No, that is not what I said. I said that approximately 51% of the time the airport is in the south flow configuration."*

Continued: "So, if half of the flights come from SLANE, over Mahwah, and if only a small percentage, say 20% of those come directly over Mahwah, currently we have basically very little of your flights, less than 1% because your yearly flight count is over 300,000, is that correct?"

*"No." Renee Spann replied, "We did about 170,000 operations last year, and that includes arrivals and departures."*

"I'm trying to eliminate the impact on Mahwah and the Route 17 corridor that brings us all here tonight."

*"The impact on the Mahwah area and up along the Route 17 corridor is basically negligible. The flights that fly into Teterboro today on the ILS or the charted visual approach are going to be navigating that same route, at the same altitudes, with the same descent profile. It takes a variation along the route closest to the HUMC."*

18. A long-time Paramus resident expressed his anger because there have been no changes in the flight pattern. "This new approach was supposed to start on April 4, why hasn't it started? He is seeing the exact same traffic as he always has. No changes. He would like some relief. We need better answers than we are getting."

*"You are saying just what we have been trying to say. The new Charters Quiet Visual Approach will not be much of a change. The FAA is at the meeting tonight to provide information and to receive input. What we are trying to do with the new approach is not a massive change."*

19. "How is this flight path change recognized by the FAA? Is it a minor change? Is it something larger that would require an environmental impact study? If the airport begins to use RNAV, will this path become more appreciated by pilots?"

*"I can't answer your environmental questions because that is out of my jurisdiction. However, environmental data will be gathered and used in making the final decision about*

*the approach. RNAV capabilities, when they become available would enhance the approach and give pilots more capability to navigate it using their instruments.”*

20. “Are there speed restrictions on the approach?”

*“The approach carries the normal speed restrictions for the airport. They begin their descent, or slow their speed when they are approximately 20 miles from the airport.”*

*“What speed would they be?”*

*“It depends on the aircraft, but normally around 130 to 110 knots and reducing by about 5 miles from the airport.”*

*“What about around Mahwah because that effects the noise level?”*

*“That’s about 20 miles away, they would be at around 180 knots descending and reducing.”*

21. “I know there is also an impact on transient traffic vs. locally based traffic for noise. Do you have indication of the percentage of transient vs. based traffic?”

*Mr. Andino noted that the majority of our traffic would be considered transient in nature. “I don’t have the exact numbers, but I guess 80-90% would be non-based operators.”*

*Continued: “I know locally based operators would be more sensitive to the noise impacts.”*

*“The airport tries very hard to reach out to all operators to educate them equally on our noise rules and community sensitivities. A lot of our operators may not be based here, but are frequent users and familiar with these concerns. But we work hard to try to get all users on the same page.”*

22. “On environmental impact, do you have published criteria on how you are going to be measuring that?”

*“That would be something that you would have to address to the environment group of the FAA. We will try to get that information to you.”*

23. “I know you have existing noise monitors. With these changes, is the airport looking to expand that network?”

*Mr. Andino responded, “We have 6 permanent noise monitors. We do have 3 portable monitors that can be deployed remotely as needed.”*

24. “Why has nothing been said about Hackensack High School? Also, the residents in the area who will be impacted, I think you have to consider them. My second question is, you seem to have very high confidence that pilots are going to follow this route, but only one has so far. You’re blaming this on a correction, but are you really confident that pilots will take this route? Can you compel them to take this while you are doing the test, or will you only have that one flight worth of data?”

*“Air Traffic Control does control the aircraft, but ultimately the pilot is responsible for the operation of his/her aircraft. I am confident that more pilots will fly this approach because of significant number of pilots daily fly visual approaches to the airport on consistent basis. I would anticipate that they would take advantage of the new Charted Visual Approach. We have been in touch with National Business Aviation Association, (NBAA), which represents a large number of pilots and we have received their input and their recommendations. The refinements that were made to the approach plate were their recommendations. So if we give them what they want, we are confident that they will utilize this approach. The refinements to the approach plate have not yet been published. The delay in seeing pilots utilize this approach will not impact the 6-month testing period. Normally the necessary data is collected in 30 -90 days and we are confident that we will have gathered enough data in the 6-month period to make the decision. The reason for the 6-month period is that every day is*

*not going to conducive to flying this approach. Thus, 6 months give you enough time to capture the data that normally is captured in 30-90 days.”*

25. “People are asking questions that you say need to be answered by an environmental person or a pilot. Don’t you think you should have those people here to answer questions?”

*“I am going to provide an email address to submit your questions, which will be directed to the proper channel of the FAA for response.” (Included at the end of the discussion)*

*“The Environmental branch of the FAA is in Atlanta, and it’s not too easy to get those folks up here for a meeting. But we will make sure that your questions and concerns are relayed to them. They have procedures that they must follow that are mandated by Congress. They can’t sweep anything under the rug. There are stringent exacting things that they have to follow. Environmental is not our specialty, but we do know that there are exact things that they have to do.*

*I don’t know if there is a report that this gentleman has asked for. I don’t know that exists. They may be looking for the data, measure it to capture what is going to happen. So they can look at the flight tracks, they can look at the LDN(A) (day/night average aircraft noise levels)they have to measure that and compare it with procedures that they have to follow. There has to be public outreach.”*

26. “This approach could potentially be used 51% of the time?”

*“No, that number (percentage) was strictly in reference to the configuration of the airport. We use either the north flow or the south flow at the airport, which are subject to weather and wind, and statistically, it works out that we are on the south flow 51% of the year, and on the north flow 49% of the year. Those figures can vary year to year based on the weather. In addition, we have two runways available to use each flow direction.”*

27. “This approach can only be used when it’s 3500 feet and 5 miles visibility? Day and night?”

*“That’s the minimum. It is restricted to daytime use only. Although that is under review and it might be determined available for nighttime use after that review”.*

28. “So, in bad weather conditions, this approach cannot be used, right? (Correct.) So why is it that in worse weather the airplanes fly closer to the hospital and better weather they fly further away?”

*“It is a precision approach over the hospital. Precision approach aircraft are operated by the aircraft itself. It is an instrument approach, more exacting and the weather doesn’t have an impact on that. Whereas visual approaches are weather dependent.”*

29. “We sent an email to the address that was provided at the last meeting requesting the locations of the noise and air quality monitors around the airport, and we have not received a response. It’s been close to a month.”

*“Those monitors are not FAA’s, they are the airport’s, Port Authority’s.”*

Continued: “So the email that you are giving us, we should expect some kind of response from that?”

*Responding to question 26: “The way runways are selected is determined by the wind. Pilots like to land into the wind. It the aerodynamic way airplanes work. So, the winds are not always going to be coming from the south so that they can land into the wind. The 51% number is not a hard and fast number. It is dependent on the winds.”*

*Responding to question 28: “The FAA asked a professional pilot in attendance, “If it’s bad weather do you want to be on a visual approach or an instrument approach?” The pilot replied, “I’m required to file an instrument approach from wherever I take off. I see no reason to break off from that approach.”*

*Responding to question 20, regarding speed restrictions: “The FAA does not have restrictions on air speed. A pilot flies at the speed he/she needs to fly in order to properly operate the aircraft based on the conditions they are in. The answer given in question 20 is not a restriction placed by the FAA.”*

30. “Based on the slide with the green flight tracks and the blue line, that little difference makes a huge impact on areas like Rochelle Park and Paramus. What is the altitude that the airplanes will be flying on this approach over Rochelle Park?”

*“We do not have that exact information. The pilot in attendance noted that when an aircraft is coming in for a landing, he/she is usually around 1,500 feet within 5 miles of the runway.”*

31. Rochelle Park requested that a noise monitor be placed in their town.

*Mr. Andino said that he would be happy to talk about that request after the meeting.*

32. “The new approach was considered because the hospital and high rises built up under the current flight path,. If the area along route 17 begins to really get built up, will you consider changing this path in the future?”

*“I cannot answer that. That is a question for future consideration.”*

33. “The pilot in attendance indicated that pilots prefer instrument approaches. I’m concerned that pilots won’t use this approach.”

*“I respect the gentleman’s input; however, we have visual approaches that come into the airport that are flown every day. I cannot say with absolute certainty that there will be a certain number of aircraft that will fly this approach. But we have accomplished a task that is to make this approach available to move some of the aircraft away from the HUMC and surrounding area.”*

34. “I would recommend that a website be available for Bergen County residents to get the information about this approach in one place. And there has to be a baseline that you developed this from. And environmental baseline, a noise baseline, all those baselines have to be in a report that you are going to compare all of this to. We need to see that report. We have no information and we’re asking questions in the dark.”

*“Have you attempted to go on the website that we provided previously? (Answer, yes, zero response.) We really are trying to get you the information you requested. Further discussion indicated some confusion between information regarding the Chartered Quiet Visual approach for Runway 19 and the Part 150 Study being performed at the airport. They are two separate and distinct subjects. Mr. Tim Middleton, the Program Manager for the Part 150 Study, reported this study looks at the noise and land use compatibility issues of the towns that are right next to the airport in the 65 LDN(A) contour around the airport. And based our consultants’ work and known flight tracks, known contours around the airport, and historical data, a study area was determined. Towns outside that area are not included in the study. This is totally independent of the new approach that is being discussed tonight. The FAA added that they will get the information requested to contact the FAA.”*

The FAA repeated that they want to answer everyone’s questions and address all concerns. They are willing to come to future meetings to do so.

To contact the FAA regarding the Charted Quiet Visual approach for Runway 19:

Email: [9-aea-noise@faa.gov](mailto:9-aea-noise@faa.gov)

This mailbox is used to express concerns of all types. You must mention the “Charted Visual Approach to Runway 19 at Teterboro Airport” (or similar wording) in your subject line so that the email is sorted to the right people to respond. Do not use “Noise Complaint” in your subject line as that will automatically be sent to a different office. Be as specific in your request as you can be as responses are based on the specifics of the concerns.

## **REGULAR TANAAC MEETING RESUMES**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study at Teterboro and Newark Airports.

- Mr. Tim Middleton, Project Manager for the study, noted that there was a meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at TEB in March. At that meeting, we distributed the FAA approved forecasts for 2016 and 2021 noise exposure maps as well as the flight tracks.
- The summary of that meeting is on the website.
- The next meeting is May 24 at 1 p.m. in this building. At that meeting, we expect to go over some draft noise contours that we have been working on over the last year.
- TAC meetings are open to the public.
- All information about the study is online. The link to the website is:  
[http://panynjpart150.com/TEB\\_homepage.asp](http://panynjpart150.com/TEB_homepage.asp)

Mr. Andino reported that staff attended the 2016 Eastern Region Helicopter Council Fly Neighborly Kickoff meeting. There were several helicopter operators who regularly use Teterboro Airport in attendance, we discussed helicopter routes, and what we want to see as far as compliance goes with those routes. The routes are designed to avoid residential areas and follow roadways leading into and out of the airport. We also discussed the areas adjacent to the airport (Moonachie, Little Ferry and Hasbrouck Heights) that are sensitive to helicopter noise. The information that was shared was put out on their website and included in their regular email blasts to their members. Since that meeting in March, we have seen a reduction in helicopter noise complaints and less deviation from the designated routes.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Andino reviewed the statistics for the first quarter of 2016 – January - March.

Total operations for the quarter were 36,991, an increase of 2.49% over 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2015. Jet movements were 31,385. Nighttime operations (between 11:00 pm and 6:00 am) for the quarter were 1,866, which was 5.04% of total operations.

Mr. Andino also reviewed the LDN(A) (day/night average aircraft noise levels) on the 6 permanent noise monitors for the first quarter of 2016. There was an increase in noise levels on 3 of the monitors compared to 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2015. RMS 1 in Wood-Ridge showed a 1.2-decibel (dB) increase, RMS 4 in Hackensack showed

a .8-decibel (dB) increase, and RMS 5 in Bogota showed an increase of 2.3 decibels (dB). RMS 2, 3 and 6 showed decreases of .6, 1.6 and 1.1 decibels (dB) respectively.

In the first quarter 2016, there were 168 noise complaints from 69 residents, which include 65 complaints from 4 residents in South Hackensack.

With regard to noise violations during the first quarter of 2016, there were 15 first violations and 2 second violations. No aircraft were banned.

Further explanation of the noise abatement procedures and policies at the airport was given for the benefits of the guests who remained for the meeting and some questions and answers ensued.

## **OPEN DISCUSSION**

A question was raised about scheduled service at Teterboro Airport because some information was discovered indicating that there is scheduled service operation taking place at the airport. Scheduled service is not permitted at TEB as defined by the FAA. Charter operators are permitted to have a certain number of planned flights (not scheduled but planned) and how they advertise that sometimes looks like scheduled service when it is not. The FAA published a report of enplanements every year for airports. We review that list and if something is referred to as scheduled on that list, we contact the operator and they will work with the FAA to clarify if it is a misnomer or if it is scheduled service as defined by the FAA, they were told to cease and desist.

Mr. Griffo commented that he has been part of TANAAC for many years and has seen significant improvements in noise levels during that time, because of the efforts of TANAAC and because the airport has an aggressive noise abatement program. Some of the genesis of the Chartered Quiet Visual approach for Runway 19 was when the committee saw a problem (the hospital had noise events over 95 decibels and, at 300 feet above the hospital the pilot may or may not have time to adjust his flight path to avoid an accident). So the group and the airport working together tried to get some help for the Hackensack hospital. This new approach is only in good weather, only in daylight. Referring to the flight tracks slide, he said all that traffic has been here, and is here now. It will be here 6 months from now, that is not going to change. We hoped that this new approach may give a little bit of help to the hospital. I don't think that the areas farther away will experience the noise issues that we do closer to the airport.

The discussion arose again concerning amending the TANAAC membership to include representatives from the guest towns concerned about the new approach. It was suggested that membership is probably not necessary, perhaps getting on the mailing list would suffice. It was also suggested that it would be a positive gesture to allow those representatives to sit at the table for the duration of this project.

Mr. Griffo continued. The planes are there now. They will be at the same altitude that they are now on the new approach. If the guests come to future meetings, please come with statistics from your towns so we can investigate any issues. Call the noise complaint line and log your complaint.

Residents are complaining because there is hypersensitivity to noise right now. They want answers.

Mr. Andino added that the noise office has been closely monitoring and tracking complaints from the towns affected, those numbers weren't included in the presentation because it was for the first quarter only. However, since April 1, we have accounted for about 250 complaints and have investigated all of them and responded to some. The complaints are being logged and our investigation shows that a lot of the flights are

the current approach; some are related to Newark Airport traffic, some for White Plains. We will continue to monitor and investigate complaints received from northern Bergen County. Mr. Andino recommended the WebTrak flight-tracking program that the Port Authority offers as a good tool. Magnets with the information about the website were distributed. Access to the program is available through the Port Authority website.

It was determined that the towns affected by the new approach could be added to the mailing list of TANAAC for the duration of the project.

Discussion ensued concerning the presence of the press at TANAAC meetings. It has been a long-standing policy that our meetings are not open to the press. It may be in our best interests to rescind that policy. After further discussion, a motion was made that TANAAC meetings be open to the press. Motion seconded and passed.

With no other business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.

The next regular meeting of TANAAC is **July 27, 2016**, at **6:00** p.m.