PORT AUTHORITY OF NY & NEW JERSEY

NEW YORK COMMUNITY AVIATION ROUNDTABLE
September 26, 2018
Kew Gardens, New York

JANE ROSE REPORTING
La Tonia Lewis, Court Reporter

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Barbara Brown
Bill Huisman
Henry Schreiber
Marie Becce
Cindy Rogers
Don Capalbi
Susan Carroll
Raida Hassain
Allan Swisher
Edward Braunstein
Teresa Tai
Jevaughn Williams
Philippa Karteron
Yvette Dennis
Steven Jones
James Hileman
James Heyliger
Beverly Brown
Ralph Tamburra
Andrew Weiss
Len Schaner
Stacy Gilbert
Larry Hoppenhauer

A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont.):

Maria Figueroa
Sharina Bryce
Jackie Campbell
Mike Anderson
Clive Williams
Dolores Orr
Justin Connor
Thomas Curry
Dan Mundy
Frieda Menos
Patrick Evans
Aidan Hughes
Barbara Brown
Conner Dunlevy
Norman Jones
Elaine Miller
M. Chapoteau
Andrew Brooks
Jane Herndon
Glenn Morse
Edgar Mantel
Terrence Cullen
Suzanne Monteverdi

Proceedings

MR. SCHREIBER: Good evening, everyone. I want to thank everyone for being here. I am Henry Schreiber one of the co-chairs for the aviation roundtable. First thing we're going to do quickly if we can go around the room and introduce ourselves.

MR. HUISMAN: Bill Huisman, Aviation Development Council, also facilitator for the New York Community Aviation Roundtable and also the JFK and LaGuardia communities.

MS. BECCE: Maria Becce, I represent Congresswoman Grace Meng.

MS. ORR: Dolores Orr, Community Board 14, the Rockaways.

MR. MUNDY: Dan Mundy representing Congressman Meeks.

MR. EDWARDS: Joseph Edwards, Congressman Meeks.

MS. MILLER: Elaine Miller, citizen member, LaGuardia Community.

MS. FIGUEROA: Maria Figueroa, Congressman Jeffries' office.

Proceedings

MS. MENOS: Frieda Menos, Congressman Jeffries' office.

MS. CARROLL: Susan Carroll representing Queens Borough President Melinda Katz on LaGuardia Committee.

MR. CHEN: Ron Chen, member of New York City Assembly Professional Board.

MR. SWISHER: Allan Swisher for Queens Borough President Melinda Katz.

MS. KARTERON: Philippa Karteron, JFK Chamber of Commerce.

MR. HILEMAN: James Hileman (inaudible).

MS. GREEN: Yvette Green (inaudible).

MR. SCHANER: Len Schaner, Quietskies.net.

MS. GOLDENBERG: Jana Goldenberg, Queens Sense.

MS. LASITA: Maria Lasita, (phonetic) Corona resident.

MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel, Roslyn Heights.

MR. CAPALBI: Don Capalbi,

Proceedings

Congresswoman Meng.

MS. GILBERT: Stacy Gilbert, Port Authority Government Relations.

MS. MITCHELL: Kelly Mitchell, Port Authority.

MR. HUGHES: Aidan Hughes, representing State Senator Todd Kaminsky.

MR. CHALA: Ricki Chala (phonetic) (inaudible).

MS. BOYE-CHARLES: Gloria Boye-Charles representing Borough President Katz for the JFK Airport Committee.

MEMBER BROWN: Stephanie Brown representing Council Member Donovan Richards.

MR. HOPPENHAUER: Larry Hoppenhauer, citizen member.

MS. MONTEVERDI: Suzanne Monteverdi representing Councilman Paul Vallone.

MS. HOSSAIN: Raida Hossain representing State Senator Tony Ann Stavisky.

MR. TAMBURRA: Ralph Tamburra, Port

Proceedings

Authority.

MR. HARDEN: Bill Harden, member of the Center of the National Association (inaudible).

MS. O'CONNOR: Wendy O'Connor, FAA headquarters for traffic services.

MR. JONES: Steven Jones, Federal Aviation Administration.

MR. BOWMAN: Jim Bowman, Federal Aviation Administration.

MR. BROOKS: Andrew Brooks, Federal Aviation Administration.

MR. CONNOR: Justin Connor, office of Congressman Tom Suozzi and I have Cindy Rogers our assistant district director coming also.

MR. CURRY: Tom Curry, representative of Kathleen Rice.

MR. WEISS: Andrew Weiss, Town of Hempstead.

MR. SMITH: Dennis Smith, Whitestone Bayside guest.

MS. CHAPOTEAU: Marilyn Chapoteau for the Part 150 study.

Proceedings

MR. SCHREIBER: Bill, before you go, was there somebody from the Town of Hempstead?

MR. WEISS: Andrew Weiss.

MR. SCHREIBER: Andrew, you should be sitting at the table.

MS. HERNDON: Jane Herndon, Port Authority Aviation.

MR. KRAMER: Dennis Kramer, borough president.

MR. HUISMAN: While we're waiting for some other members to come in and guests, I just wanted to mention that we have a different room than we normally have here. But we want to thank Alan Swisher and the Queens borough president's office, of course, for making this room available to us. I know that the Chairs would like to thank you.

In any case, we have restrooms outside to the left if you need to leave for the restroom. And I will at times to facilitate or move the meeting along, please, I would try to do that as politely

Page 9

Proceedings

and diplomatic as we can. I would like any Q and A when we do get to the Q and A that it be done in a civil manner and I thank you for that in advance.

MR. SHAW: Paris Shaw.

MS. BRYCE: Sharina Bryce.

MR. MORSE: And Glenn Morse from United Airlines.

MR. ANDERSON: Mike Anderson, the Town of Hempstead.

MR. SCHREIBER: So what we're going to do, we're going to move around a little bit. We're going to move to --

We're going to go right to agenda item number four. And as most of you know the noise metric that's used in New York State to measure airplane noise is DNL day and night levels. And in California, they actually use a different method, it's CNEL. And Lynn Shyer (phonetic) actually made a presentation about that at one of the LaGuardia meetings. And now taking up that cause is Assemblymember Ron Kim, so assemblyman, ready?

Page 10

Proceedings

MR. KIM: Thank you, Bill. Thank you Warren, Barbara, the co-chairs, all the representatives and officials that have joined us and all the residents who have also taken the time to be here with us tonight. Let me just begin by just thanking all of your efforts over the last couple of years now coming together and addressing, you know, all of our residents' concerns about the airplane noise. This is something that Maria, ever since I've been elected I've been getting daily e-mails between you, Susan and Maria, and a number of constituents included in the audience today.

I grew up in Flushing. I never left Flushing. And I think everyone knows, you know, how it's gotten worse over the last few years. And I think --

A lot of that has to do with, you know, stuff that's out of our control within the last four years. There's been a rapid change towards rewarding efficient behavior in our markets and every

Page 11

Proceedings

government agency was driven by performance measurements that only captures how proficient the market is moving taking people from point A to point B while making as much money for our economy as possible.

Now, we lost sight of what is important to our local communities the agency, Port Authority, MTA. All our local authorities have a duty to make sure we capture quality of life, that's not being done at the highest level, but at the lowest level. And that's really what my opinion is, the driving cause of why we are where we are right now. Having said that, there are small things we can incrementally change to change the narrative to really take ownership of our communities back and really prioritize our lives and our quality of lives in the communities. And this, for me, Bill Number 11277 would change how we capture airplane noises. Like Warren has said, instead of using the DNL day/night average

Page 12

Proceedings

sound level, CNEL would penalize airplanes that are flown from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Right now, under the current metrics there is no penalty for that time slot. There is a penalty of ten decibels that are added to airplanes that are clearly flown from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. This new metrics would do the main change -- would be that we would add an extra layer of penalty of airplanes that are flown between 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., three more hours of five decibels of penalties in that time frame.

This for me is critical. It may seem like a little, but when you add up those decibels, we would create a critical movement against the federal government that there is significant damage in terms of quality of life, airplane noise. And hopefully, we will -- hopefully, we can get support from the members around the table. One immediate thing you can do is ask our -- my colleagues, Ed Braunstein and Ed Ra sponsors, they're already

Proceedings

completely on board. So if we can get our local electives, state senate members to support this and also reach out to chair of the environmental committee, Steve Englebright from Long Island as well as Speaker Carl Heastie (phonetic) to support this measure, that's one action we can take in doing this. Thank you very much.

MR. CURRY: I just want to -- What's the expectation about the bill passing?

MR. KIM: This was introduced toward the end of the session. We did some internal vetting with the members to analyze the noise of the environmental committee. And they actually understood, they are receptive. So pursuant to section session 2019 because it's already been done in California, there is already precedence. FAA had already accepted the state metrics of California so we can make the same argument that the larger state is already doing this, we should follow suit.

MS. CARROLL: If the CNEL bill is

Proceedings

passed, this is a question for the Port Authority how this affects the Part 150 and does this further delay the Part 150, this is if you're including -- if you're changing to CNEL?

MR. BROOKS: So Andrew Brooks, FAA. The FAA can't comment on pending legislation. And to be honest, we wouldn't be able to answer that until the legislation were enacted.

MS. BECCE: Maria Becce for Congresswoman Grace Meng. Assemblymember Kim, what action do you propose to get support from this; are you planning a press conference? What would you expect the roundtable to do to help you with this?

MR. KIM: I mean, any opportunities to speak about this and to use this as a platform to talk about the airplane noise, I'm more than happy to come to the individual meetings and to different communities. But also if there is power to pass a resolution in this body as well

Proceedings

I think it would be also helpful as well.

MR. GRAHAM: Dennis Graham. This new measure CNEL, does it separate day and night noise?

MR. SCHANER: It is the evening noise. I mean, its main feature is the fact. Let me just make sure I understand your question correctly.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, the present levels of DNL are a combination of day and night together and they come up with a measure. So this new level would it be night and day together and then in decibels or --

MR. SCHANER: Right now, it is the average over a day, a typical day is the noise level from seven in the morning until 10 o'clock at night straight. Whatever the airplane noise is that's what it is, that's what it is recorded at. That's how it's simulated from 10 o'clock at night to seven in the morning, you add ten DB for every airplane. But what's not penalized is quiet time when kids are

Proceedings

doing homework and people are resting or whatever. And from seven in the evening to 10 o'clock at night, that three-hour period has made, in previous studies, a one-and-a-half DB difference in the overall day/night average, whether it is from seven in the morning to ten at night, straight airplane noise from seven to ten.

MR. GRAHAM: I got it. That's fine. I understand completely.

MR. SCHANER: For the same price you can have the rest. For the next three hours you get penalized and then over the --

MR. GRAHAM: The reason why I bring it up is because most of the healthcare data is measured on nighttime noise. And so if you don't separate them out and you just get this big measurement and you don't measure the nighttime noise that's why I bring it up.

MR. HUISMAN: Any other questions on this situation?

MR. WILLIAMS: Clive Williams,

Proceedings
Queens Community Board 13. Does your proposal take into consideration the -- obviously simulating the platform -- but you're dealing with two different scales, the scale is different in California it is a much bigger territory. I take that into consideration the scaling and based on the federal response of California have you any anticipation what to expect as to the response?

MR. KIM: I think it's my understanding that the federal government was receptive to working with California to determine what best metric system they can use. The current metric system was created almost like thirty, almost 35 years ago when the circumstances were very different and they didn't properly capture, like you said, the operable scale and the population that are severely impacted from seven to ten p.m. Let's just put it this way we almost double -- we almost triple the population in certain neighborhoods since 35 years ago. So more

Proceedings
lives and more community people lives are impacted. But the critical time period should be more. But not under this current metric system, I think also if you do, if you take the step, we can also add other improvements. This isn't the only metric system. We can also add what they did with a better metric system. If they get this done now we have precedence to actually work on it.

MR. HOPPENHAUER: Larry Hoppenhauer. I think my question is similar to one that was already asked and that is in California has the CNEL affected the noise exposure maps?

MR. KIM: Yes.

MR. SCHANER: The answer is yes.

MR. HOPPENHAUER: The area that will be included would get larger.

MR. SCHANER: Well, that would be the tendency, but where you are -- you have to be where the airplanes are.

MR. HOPPENHAUER: Correct. Thank you.

Proceedings
MR. SCHREIBER: Just one last question -- Warren Schreiber. So this new metric, if it passes, this would only apply to airplane noise, that's correct? The reason I'm asking this, when we discussed --

When we discussed this before the city council, they were concerned that it might also have to apply to construction noise, what -- just airplane noise -- what are we --

MR. KIM: Right now I know there are some --

Under the --

The way that the bill -- it doesn't --

We can further clarify that if that's a concern, we only want to be focused on airplane noise.

MR. SCHREIBER: Okay.

MR. KIM: Differences to the bill number, if there is any amendments, I assume this is our co-sponsor. If you have any tough questions you can ask

Proceedings
Braunstein.

MR. SCHREIBER: We've just been joined by Assemblyman Ed Braunstein, who is a co-sponsor of this bill, which is A11277.

Assemblyman, you want to add anything --

This is the CNEL bill.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I'm sure Ron went through the details of the bill. And, you know, we're in the process of engaging the Environmental Conservation Committee and we're going to make this a priority next session to make sure that we have something similar to what they have in California where they take more consideration into account of airplane noise during hours later in the evening and the early morning. And you'll have my full support, I will be there with Ron and we have other colleagues whose districts are impacted by airplane noise as well and we will bring them on board.

MR. SCHREIBER: Thank you both

Proceedings
Assemblymember Kim, thank you for introducing the legislation. Assemblyman Braunstein, thank you for your sponsorship. And Ed Ra thank you also. And now I'm going to turn this over to my co-chair, Barbara Brown.
MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. Before we move forward, I do want to ask any members of the roundtable who came in after we started to please make sure, one, that you've signed in. And secondly, that you sit in the circle so that if we do vote for something we know who you are and have your vote. If you are a member you should be sitting at the table. Okay.
Just going through the --
Item two on the agenda says minutes. But the last roundtable meeting we did not have a quorum so, in essence, we don't have minutes. What I did send out to every member was a transcript of the last meeting, 117 pages because although it wasn't an official meeting, we had 117 pages worth of discussion and information.

Proceedings
MR. SCHREIBER: Do we have printed copies in the back here?
MEMBER BROWN: We're environmentally friendly so to save paper we sent it to you. So hopefully you will read it to get a sense of what went on last time. Moving right along.
Item three, we're going to hold until the end because at this point, we don't have a quorum and so those are actionable items.
So at this time, we're going to hear several FAA presentations. The first one is on CLEEN, which is one of the initiatives of the FAA and they will be giving you detailed information about that with a Q and A answer.
The second item AEDT versus INM model, that's a -- that's an important item because both airports are in the middle of a Part 150 study. And the Part 150 studies are using the INM model, however, AEDT is the newer model that was recently approved. And --

Proceedings
What we have been told that the Part 150 study still has to use the INM model because that was the model that they started with. So we want to find out the best for the presentation so we know what the differences are and whether -- if the --
If they had switched from one model to the other how would that have impacted or how would that impact the results of the Part 150 study. And that will --
There will be a Q and A for that. And finally, we will be getting from the FAA an update on the Northeast Corridor project. So Steven Jones is the person who has coordinated all of this so Steven is going to tell us who is speaking about what and we'll move right into that.
MR. JONES: Thank you, everybody. Barbara has placed this request for the CLEEN and the AEDT versus INM. What we did was spoke to our headquarters and we have James Hileman, the chief scientist for the Federal Aviation Administration.

Proceedings
So what we did was spoke to our headquarters some people and we have James Hileman here, who is our chief scientist or technical advisor for environment and energy for the FAA. He has been gracious to come and provide this presentation. James, I will turn it over to you.
MR. HILEMAN: Thanks, Steve. Thank you everyone for giving me a chance to talk about things going on with the FAA. I will stand here and float around. Just by a brief introduction, I'm one of about half dozen chief scientists at the FAA. We have various responsibilities for a number of things. I'm the chief scientist for environment and energy. I have responsibility for the environment and energy research and development program of the FAA. And that covers a number of things including the CLEEN program that I'll talk about in this briefing as well as the AEDT model that I will talk about in this briefing.
So I've got 16 slides here and I

Page 25

Proceedings

can --

I'm happy to walk-through the first part in CLEEN and stop, take questions and then I can walk-through the second part, it's one deck. It makes no difference, I can walk-through the whole thing. But more importantly, I will just get going. Because you guys are spending your evenings here as opposed to being with your families and I appreciate that.

So just a little background, one slide, got to talk about metrics because it's important to the CLEEN program and AEDT. I'm going to talk about INM and AEDT. And if people have clarifications along the way, I don't care I've done many, many briefings in my life.

So community noise from aircraft. You guys obviously know quite a bit about community noise. But there is actually two metrics or two types of metrics that we in the FAA care about. So the first noise metric is that we use the certify aircraft. All aircrafts that are produced

Page 26

Proceedings

have to meet a certain maximum noise standard and it's been that way since the 1970's. And so we have a noise standard that is based on landing/take-off cycle. There's measurements that the aircraft comes in and the two measurements made as the aircraft takes off. And all aircrafts has to meet the standard to -- in order to meet the air worthiness requirements. It is the same as safety they've got to meet a certain noise level. And all the sources of the aircraft contribute to the noise you guys know that.

Now the other set of metrics is in terms of community exposure. So we have a certification requirement for the operation of a single aircraft and then the community exposure is set by all the operations during the course of the day, accounting for DNL, accounts for 10 DB penalty, it's two very different metrics. So commercial aircraft have actually become much, much, much wider since the 1970's. The chart up on the screen shows

Page 27

Proceedings

that certification noise and the stages there are the certification requirements from the FAA on the manufacturer. And you can see over time we have rationed it down, the amount of noise that aircrafts are allowed to make.

And there is a definite decrease in the amount of noise made from today's aircraft versus those produced in the 1960's. If you want a reminder you can watch the movie All the President's Men. There is a wonderful scene in there where the conversation has to stop because there's an aircraft literally going over the top of the Watergate complex. They captured that in the movie.

That's the experience in the 1970's because it was that loud. There is different operations today. The aircraft noise has gone down dramatically, that's a function of aircraft technology and their fleet. What I need to note is that it takes a while for new aircraft to enter the fleet and penetrate the fleet. And to

Page 28

Proceedings

a great extent the newest aircraft coming off the assembly line are those in the lower right hand, aircrafts such as the Being 737, the Max 787 and the A320 and other engine options. Those aircrafts are dramatically quieter and that's because of all the technology that's gone into their development.

So what we and the FAA are doing we're going to continue that trend. We have a program called the CLEEN program it's continuous lower emissions, energy and noise program. This is a public/private partnership a true partnership with industry, where industry has to put in over 50 percent of the cost. We, the federal government, put in less than 50 percent, the industry puts in more than 50 percent. And by doing that, we know that industry has a vested interest in seeing these products get into the fleet, they have skin in the game too. And so we work with them and what we're working on are our technologies that

reduce fuel emissions and noise.

We're also using this program to work on with the industry, advance on alternative fuel. And we work with industry to conduct ground and/or flight test to show that the technologies are certifiable and can be introduced into the fleet. And this is important because there is not necessarily an economic incentive to develop some of these technologies. So by the government working with the private sector, we're helping to incentivize these technologies to enter the fleet faster than they would have on their own in these market forces. We set up the CLEEN air program in five-year phases. The first five-year phases from 2010 to 2015.

We're currently in the second phase 2016 to 2020. We're laying down the groundwork for a third phase from 2021 to 2025. These are all included within the president's budget. So the budget that we had for phase one and phase two that's the

FAA contribution for phase one and phase two of the program, the FAA would have invested roughly $225 million matched with industry that equates that to nearly half a billion of investment and technology reducing noise emissions and fuel. We have a noise reduction goal and an emissions reduction goal and fuel burn reduction goal shown on the screen here. That would take the noise levels from that previous chart I showed you that was 25 DB below stage five.

So if you follow the mouse, the goal would be to get down here. Now, I'll tell you right now that noise reduction is an incredibly hard thing to do. I've been working on technology development for about 20 years now and I know it's hard to believe but it's an incredibly hard thing to do to get to introduce to an aircraft. But we're working very hard on it and then obviously emissions are very important, we need to keep emissions from the fleet being reduced. Air quality is important

to us and introducing fuel burn is also important both from an airline economics perspective and also from a climate perspective.

The last straw there we have a goal of technologies that would enter in the service. We, thus far, have some technologies entered in the service. But we're working with industry and you have certain windows that you have to hit in order for the technology to be operated. These are multibillion dollar programs that are offering to buy the manufacturers and they have certain windows where the technology has to be available to go on to the industry. So while some of our technologies aren't getting in right now, they are available for the next aircraft lines that come out.

MS. MENOS: Frieda Menos, Congressman Jeffries. You mentioned something about the funding, can you just repeat that again? What was fully funded? Both parts are --

MR. HILEMAN: So the moneys that you see up here --

The question was about the funding. So the phase one program is obviously already money already spent because that's in the past.

The phase two program is funded. The expectation with the current budget sitting on the hill would be that it would meet the hundred million dollar level shown there.

Phase three budget levels are not shown here because they are still in development as people here pay attention to what's going on in Washington, they know that there is a bit of a difference between what the administration wants and what congress wants. Phase three is TBD, but it is included in the present budget.

MR. HOPPENHAUER: On the noise overcome reduction goal, we're currently in --

You said that the planes they are producing here are stage five aircraft,

does that mean they have the 25 DB noise reduction?

MR. HILEMAN: The 25 DB cumulative noise reduction is the goal for the program. That is our goal that we're going to achieve. The aircrafts that are in production is shown on the previous slide and those aircrafts are the ones seen here. This is not an all encompassing list, this is select Boeing and Airbus aircraft. And obviously there are other manufacturers such as, RDA, Gulfstream to name just a few. You can see that the levels I'm eyeballing them off the chart are anywhere from stage five minus eight to stage five minus 15. Again, I'm eyeballing this.

MR. HUISMAN: Can I make a suggestion? I know people want to ask questions and you were willing to take questions during the presentation. Can you just wait and hold your question, write it down if you need to. Wait until the presentation ends.

MR. HILEMAN: Great idea. I will go through the full deck to make sure we get everything covered. I appreciate that.

MR. HUISMAN: Thank you much.

MR. HILEMAN: So the CLEEN program itself, we're in partnership with eight different companies I'm shown here. And this covers both the first five-year phase and the second five-year phase. The phase one technology is focused on a revolutionary engine design, an engine -- different engine components. The CLEEN technology is changing the flight (inaudible) system in the cockpit and then improve combustion (inaudible) the engine and (inaudible) emissions.

Phase two covers similar ground on the project on fuselage redesign. So I have two slides to talk a bit more about the technology that are here. This is not an all-encompassing list. I was very happy to see that the fact sheet for the program is in front of many of you. That has very, very good information. And then

we also have a website shown here, faa.gov/go/cleen. Those have the full list of technologies.

I think the fact sheet has all the technologies and provides this information and more. But what I'm covering here in technologies that specifically have noise benefit is that I was told was the primary interest. So we've worked with Boeing to develop what's called an adaptive training edge. What this could potentially do is tweak the airflow geometry such that you can achieve the additional benefit of 2 DB and fuel reduction. The use of new material for the nozzle on the engine. This could deal a 2 DB direct noise benefit, but it would enable engines to go to a more efficient design. That more efficient design burns less fuel and would result in less noise. So it is an amazing technology. We've worked very closely with Brett and Whitney on the turbo fan. This is an engine concept that's in operation right now. We were working with

them to expand it's applicability to larger aircraft and to go over the large reductions to a larger part of the fleet.

We've worked very closely with General Electric first in the development of the open motor engine. We did an actual engine test in a wind tunnel facility and measured the noise and found out that it could actually meet the stage four requirements on the substantial margin, it would also meet the stage five requirement with margin. So we thought that was a pretty good success. We're current --

That was part of CLEEN phase one. We're currently working with GE to figure out how we could further reduce fan noise. What has happened over the course of time over the last few decades, if you go back to the 1970's and you heard an aircraft taking off, all you heard was the jet exhaust that was a very loud large rumble. If you hear a modern aircraft takeoff you still hear the jet exhaust, but you're

also going to hear the fan from the front of the engine. The technology development that has been done for the last couple decades is focused on going to larger diameter engine, reduce the fan exit velocity that makes the jet noise less. Now we have to deal with fan noise. This is what technology is about you solve one problem such that then you can work on other problems all in the interest of bringing all the noise down.

We are also working with Aurora Flight Sciences, which was bought last year by the Boeing company and developing a different fuselage configuration one that is (inaudible) lifting. So that the fuselage actually lifts which makes the aircraft more efficient and lighter. Lighter aircrafts are quite better, they don't have as much thrust. It also could enable a revolutionary concept of putting the engines above the fuselage, which is something that in the FAA the technology development for technologies that are

fairly close and ready for entering in the service, NASA focuses us more on technologies that are further out. And I could tell you more about other technologies we're developing. I will note that one of the technologies that we matured in CLEEN general electric is a low knots combuster. That is actually on every single Boeing 737 Max leaving the assembly line and it had over a 60 percent reduction in knots submissions. So there it's clearly successful and will reduce nitrogen oxide pollution.

So the other thing we've done besides working directly with the industry. I'm the program manager for the (inaudible) Center of Excellence. Georgia Tech is one of our members and we asked Georgia Tech to go through and do an assessment of the CLEEN technologies to estimate how they would enter the fleet, what their benefits would be and basically go through and do an independent check of what industry has said. They published

their findings and they report to whoever is available here in the bottom. So they looked at the impact on fuel burn and noise out to 2050 for these technologies. They looked at the phase one clean technologies for this initial report that's shown here and also in the lower right. That report was put out in 2015.

So the clean phase two technologies had not been evaluated, they're currently going to evaluate clean phase two technologies. The key result is that if the CLEEN phase two technologies were fully introduced into the fleet, there would be 22 million gallons of jet fuel saved. This is going to be equivalent to taking 1.7 million cars off the road between 2025 and 2050. And there would be a 13 percent decrease of (inaudible) the land area and this is for that initial $125 million investment by the federal government with industry. So we're looking for these technologies to say the least. So that's what I have in the CLEEN

program. Again, I can deep dive, but I'm going to go through AEDT to be mindful of your time and be respectful of my time here with you.

So I want to shift gears completely. So that was the CLEEN program, it is a public/private partnership between the FAA and industry to accelerate the technologies of their fleet. So another thing we do in my office is we have responsibilities for the Aviation Environmental Design Tool, AEDT. Prior to that my office had responsibility for the Integrated Noise Model. So the Integrated Noise Model is the FAA's legacy tool. It's introduced in 1978 and it was the regulatory tool through to the middle of 2015.

So anything that was done during that period of time uses INM. It is also used by hundreds upon hundreds of international users. And it's actually (inaudible) some foreign countries. And its methodology is based upon

international agreed upon standards. And it is the basis for AEDT noise and performance calculations.

So what happened in about 2004, five, there was a realization that we had a tool for noise, tools for emissions and tools to do regional noise and tools to do local noise and tools to do global noise. And we realized it is one aircraft. So we enter from having INM in a variety of tools to instead going with AEDT. So AEDT was developed and was released to replace all of our legacy tools for environmental assessments. So we had magenta which is a global noise tool. INM, local noise tool. Then NIRS regional noise tool. We had EDMS which is a local emissions tool and then SAGE, a global emissions tool.

AEDT replaces all these tools for environmental compliance, research and policy analysis. So this is one word that is used for the program and needs and it is the tool that we're continuing to develop. It's the aviation and

environmental design tool. And there actually was a question associated with that which was what was the acronym name. So AEDT is a commuter program as a graphical user interface, there is over 300 licenses out to the world. More than half the licenses are actually to entities outside the United States.

It computes noise, fuel burn, emissions and air quality simultaneously. It is able to do it in airport, regions, for the nation or the globe. We use it at all of these spaces. It is used for air space and airport design and planning. Any review under the National Environmental Policy Act would require the use of AEDT.

We use it to inform the standard setting process to make noise in emissions standards within the international civil organizations committee on aviation environmental protection. And we also use it to assess the benefits from NexGen introduction as well as new aircraft and

engine technology. We've used it for FAA, CLEEN and NASA programs. And there's a website here where you can learn more. Download it, anything else. The website is aedt.faa.gov.

We have a plan for AEDT to continue its developments, specifically geared towards improving noise calculations. When INM was developed and subsequently AEDT, it was really focused in on modeling DNL 56 because that was the best data we had and that's where the majority of the issues were in the 1970's.

We are currently going through and approving its ability to model noise at a lower DNL. There is a very appropriate tool for modeling DNL 55, but that is not to say we can't make it better. That's a large part of the program.

So we're adding noise and performance information for additional aircraft types. We're improving take-off weight and thrust modeling. We're improving the aircraft performance module

and we're laying groundwork to more explicitly consider all of the sources of noises from aircraft, not just the engine noise. So there had been some methodology updates since INM, so there are legacy capabilities within NIRS that have been brought over. NIRS is used for National Environmental Policy Abnormality, which requires certain types of graphics on certain types of and it has those outputs. It is not an INM and it now has those features. It can compute a variety of metrics such as number of above calculations for some metrics. And it's A-rated (inaudible) noise, AMC (inaudible) rated noise exposure level. We build capability to look at environmental justice populations. Such that we can better understand communities that are impacted by changes in -- on basically anything.

And then we have upgraded and updated the algorithm regarding how sound dissipates between aircrafts and what is

experienced on the ground. Honestly the only thing that would affect noise between INM and the last bullet point and that's minor, it's not really a large difference. So the INM calculations are the same as the AEDT calculations or the current version. Functionality, we're getting ready to release a new version of AEDT, AEDT 3A. The current version is 2D. We're hoping to release 3A this calendar year and it's going to have a more accurate and unified model aircraft performance. And it's going to have improved aircraft take-off wait and take-off thrust modeling. And then it will deal with the speed of the aircraft on take-off. We're also including some fleet database updates so whenever we do any one of these we update the database. So we will have the 737 Max, the Gulfstream G650 and Boeing aircraft.

So this is my closing slide, you know, noise from aircraft has been reduced considerably on a per operation basis.

That's obvious from looking at the certification data. It is also obvious that noise remains a challenge. And I will note that the first aircraft noise editorial was written four years prior to the first commercial flight, this is 1911 was that first editorial. 1915 was the first flight. Here we are 107 years later and this is still a challenge. So we have a comprehensive approach within the FAA to try to address this challenge. We know it's been a challenge for a long time. The technology is essential to achieve additional introductions. We need to introduce a new set of source and we also need to be able to model them more accurately so you can get a better understanding of noise and also so we are in a better position to think about how noise can be reduced. So I really do appreciate the opportunity to come and talk. It's important to communicate what we're doing now at headquarters. So thank you for your time.

I can answer as many questions as these gentleman think that's useful and Steve can take anything that we're not able to address down.

MR. HUISMAN: James, before we open up the questions, which we will momentarily, will this presentation be available to this group, can we get a copy of it? And you mentioned the website address, that's on the presentation.

MR. HILEMAN: There is a couple of slides that have web links at the bottom.

MR. HUISMAN: Any questions?

(Inaudible speaker.)

MR. HILEMAN: The question is about designing and any technologies dealing with deicing. CLEEN program does not deal with deicing?

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Assemblyman Ed Braunstein, Northeast Queens. In Northeast Queens for the FAA, we've been experiencing -- I believe, it's either the Whitestone or the Tennis Climb, either one for about three weeks in a row now. It

seems to me like from 6 o'clock in the morning until midnight every single day. I don't understand why --

And I get the same e-mail when I reach out to Jennifer Solomon that says well, we make these decisions based on weather patterns and flights at JFK. But I don't understand --

I see --

I look at web trackers I see JFK's flight configurations continuing to change. But it never changed for Northeast Queens pretty much the northeast climb 18 hours a day I believe that in the Whitestone Climb there are two other departures that can be available, that can be used at the same time at JFK. Am I right?

MR. HILEMAN: I will just note that I'm with the office of environment and energy so I have nothing to do with Monica Levy.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you don't mind why don't you wait until after the

briefing because this kind of talks to that a little bit.

MS. CARROLL: Susan Carroll representing Borough President Melinda Katz. I just want to know since you're lead scientist, are you involved with the noise survey that FAA is undergoing because you know as --

MR. HILEMAN: What's your question?

MS. CARROLL: I'm just asking if you're involved in that survey, that's supposed to be coming out. As I'm sure you know there has been a lot of questions about the DNL metric and whether or not it's obsolete. I know that people have been waiting for the results of this study so I just wanted to know.

MR. HILEMAN: Yes, I am a part of that.

MS. CARROLL: You have no other information?

MR. HILEMAN: The report is under review by the FAA department.

MR. MUNDY: Just a quick question,

so the clean technologies that are being developed and, you know, you're coming out with better fuel consumption and lower noise, are those, you know, goals going to be mandates for the industry to the top or separate discussions and maybe have it in there? So is that something that they are going to adopt or is that our goal to develop that technology?

MR. HILEMAN: That's a great question. We need to be clear on these things. These are actually the operational goals that we set out when we setup the program. Then we ask industry to respond to these goals and, you know, provide technologies that can help us move them. There is actually no mandates implied by this. There is nothing about standard setting implied with these goals. It is just aspirational goals to guide the program.

MR. MUNDY: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Clive Williams, chair

of Community Board 13. So having answered that about the CLEEN program, would it be a fair statement to say that it's kind of futile for us who are looking for benefits in our communities that are inundated with emissions and so forth. Would it be a fair statement to say that any kind of efforts we make to mitigate these events would be futile given the fact that you have already said all of this depends on the ongoing technology and design that you're developing? So how dare us even talk about these emissions when, in fact, it is contingent on your ongoing scientific technology and developments?

MR. HILEMAN: Well, actually, I respectfully disagree with you. So the way that we have dealt with -- so if you go back again to the 1970's, not only were the engines horribly loud, you can actually see the aircraft before you hear it because of the black soot coming out of the engines, you would actually see the pollution coming out of the engines.

Through technology, you look at a modern aircraft taking off, you can't see the plane anymore. You can actually see the difference between an A380 and a 737. The technology that we've developed through this program on the 737 Max on the assembly line everyday is a 60 percent reduction in knots. And I think, something like a 60 percent reduction in black (inaudible). So the fact that we spent that money and made those developments means that aircraft taking off are leading to less pollution that affects all of our lives. So I think it's necessary to make these as future aircrafts are also quieter and less polluting. If we don't make these investments, we're due to having continued pollution.

MS. BECCE: Maria Becce. I have one major question if you can just expand on and then I have others that are integrated with each other concerning economic incentive. You made a point in saying

that noise reduction is very hard, can you just expand on that a little bit? Why --

Can you give us a couple of ideas why it is so hard?

MR. HILEMAN: Absolutely, so from technological standpoints the reason why noise reduction is difficult is you have multiple sources. So you have an aircraft that's taking off and what you hear coming -- what you hear depending how old the aircraft is, you will hear the engine exhaust and you will hear the fan. Those are two different sources of noise. If you want to deal with them, you have to deal with them separately. When the aircraft is approaching you will hear the high lift system, the things that deploy off the wings and you will hear the landing gear. So what you have to do is find ways to make everything more aerodynamically smooth. But that's really hard with something like a landing gear. So how do you do that? It's a matter of thinking this through and how you deal

with the aerodynamics. And from the engine side we have tremendous strides in reducing the jet velocity, the air coming out of the back engine. That's like the large reductions in jet noise.

Now, we have the fan being the largest thing on the aircraft and we have to think about how do we bring down that noise. So it's a matter of -- it's lack of technology. Where soon as you get one something else pops up and you have to beat that one and that one. It's not to say it's not possible, the trend I showed earlier showed that it is very much possible and there is continued improvements. It's just hard, it's difficult, it's definitely possible, but not easy.

MR. WEISS: Andrew Weiss, Town of Hempstead. Just a quick question, I know that you talked a lot about trying to reduce noise on individual aircrafts, but is there any discussion where the thought process about quantity, one of the things

I'm thinking about is the NexGen technology coming in is more efficient in the sky. Although each individual aircraft will be quieter if there is more aircrafts in the sky the quantity of noise doesn't change.

MR. HILEMAN: Obviously, if you have two resources that is louder than one resource. If you have four it's going to be louder than two and so on. That goes without saying. So what we're doing is we're working on a variety of them, one is to reduce noise at the source. We're also working with researchers at MIT and Meyer to figure out operational procedures and are there opportunities there to get noise reductions. Then we're developing the modeling that you saw here and also the science of understanding. And we're bringing these together to try to develop solutions to reduce noise.

Now, I can't comment on, you know, if you have many more operations what that does to noise, that's a choice by a number

of other entities. But my work here at this program is to understand and develop solutions.

MR. WEISS: But for an individual aircraft specifically as opposed to the sky, just so I understand, your work is based on the noise of the individual aircraft, not as the sky as a whole.

MR. HILEMAN: Yes, we're focused on reducing the noise from individual operation not the entire cumulative operation.

MR. EVANS: Good evening. My name is Patrick Evans representing Congressman Meeks. My question relates to the noise model, the INM model versus the AEDT model. My question is: Given that this roll out seemed to take place sometime around 2015 why wasn't -- and then it showed through your presentation that the AEDT model is significantly superior to the INM model. Why wasn't the AEDT model chosen as the preferred model for the Part 150 studies that are being undertaken at

JFK and LaGuardia airports?

MR. BROOKS: Andrew Brooks with the FAA. So as Jim mentioned AEDT became the official model of record in May of 2015. As you recall the Part 150 studies actually started prior to that. So the kickoff meeting that we had with consultants for the New York studies was actually October 28, 2014. I remember it because I'm a Giants fan and the Giants won the series, so that's how I know for sure that that's when it happened.

So I don't want to talk about this year or last year, but we'll talk about 2014 all you want. I know specifically that's when that occurred. Soon following the New Jersey studies had their kickoff, we started up the tact meeting in early 2015. The roundtable efforts got underway in 2015, all of that was tied into that. However, the technical development of the model, the core model that generated the actual maps that we accepted was well underway by May of 2015. So we had

already done a full data pool. When I say "we", I mean, the Port Authority and their consultants with FAA supporting them and the majority of the structure of the model, the actual base case analysis and the development of the fleet mix was all underway by the time INM transitioned to AEDT.

So we actually engaged in a series of internal discussions and at the time the decision was made to stay with INM because it would have resulted in a substantial schedule delay to the Part 150 processes, all four of them to transition to AEDT at that time. But the commitment is that Part 150 is not a one-shot deal, it is a regulation that speaks to the noise exposure map; in other words, as you start implementing the program over the course of time and other changes to operations of the airport, the data underlying the map becomes old, too old to rely on to make decisions and you need to make it more current. And the Port

Authority has repeatedly expressed a commitment to, in the currency, use the latest version of AEDT. It is actually fortunate the way it's sequencing out because of the new capabilities of AEDT 3A as Jim discussed advanced the model even more.

So, you know, really the idea was to get something, get a framework, get it going as soon as possible to start moving towards a compatibility program and implementing that as it develops. And then as the program goes on and is updated to keep it more current.

MR. HILEMAN: I would just follow that by reiterating something I said, I know I talked a lot. I said a number of things. Had they gone forward with the AEDT at the time, you would not get a different number, they are essentially the same results so it's essentially the same model. I love AEDT. There is a lot of great things INM cannot, but for this particular purpose, it doesn't get much

different.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My question is about this technology, CLEEN technology. The newer jets coming off the timeline, what does the timeline look like for the planes coming off the assembly line to permeating to the dominant planes that you see going over the skies?

MR. HILEMAN: That's an excellent question. That's the reason I showed that graphic in the upper right hand corner, it is just to maintain some level. So that graphic in the upper right hand corner goes from the 1950's through to the early 1970's. And what it is, it is the penetration of jet aircraft into the airline. There is no technology that I can envision that would transform from flying in prop to flying in chair. It took 15 years to turn over the entire fleet. There is a time, I can't give you an exact timeline because it is going to depend on a lot of things involving airline behavior and what airlines want to

do and the ability of their fleet.

MR. HUISMAN: I'm just going to ask everybody to use the microphone. These microphones are a little bit different, you actually have to speak into the head for best results.

MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. I'm going to use my teacher voice today. So your office is improving technologies to reduce sound and that seems to some of us on the ground to be --

That's great if the size of the airplane remains constant. But it almost sometimes seem like a zero gain, the sound is reduced but the planes are getting bigger. So my question is how are you factoring size of airplanes into the technologies that you're implementing because the A380s and that ilk more and more of them are flying over us and so they seem as noisy as maybe 20, 30 years ago, a plane you might see 20, 30 years ago.

MR. HILEMAN: I'm not sure if this

answers your question, but the noise metric here is based on the certification noise and the certification varies with aircraft take-off weight. So that there is an accounting for weight here in the certification metric. And so that there is a correction for that within our air units. Not quite sure if that is getting precisely to your question.

MEMBER BROWN: Well, the larger planes seem as noisy and noisier as planes that were flying over us before. So before the -- and we keep hearing that planes are getting quieter, but they're also getting bigger so the quiet -- if the planes that were flying 10, 15 years ago got quieter, we would have quieter skies.

MR. HILEMAN: So the CLEEN program is focused on reducing the noise, single aisle versus twin aisles, one aisle, versus two aisles. What you're pointing out is it's very hard to do a baseline comparison. What I would say, it is not only hard to do that comparison if you

have a smaller aircraft that's noisy being replaced by a larger aircraft that may be the same noise that is louder. It's actually more complicated than that because one aircraft may be replacing one-and-a-half smaller aircrafts. So there is a lot of complicating factors that have to be taken into account. I'm not saying that's exactly --

MS. BECCE: Mary Becce. In your corporation, going to the aviation with Pratt Whitney, Rolls Royce, do they ever discuss with you what they would like to see in terms of economic incentives? Can congress be of any help in providing economic incentives to these corporations to advance the technology that we're talking about because your models are evaluating impact and noise after 2050 and I'm not getting any younger. And I'm just curious on a practical level can congress be of any help with economic incentives?

MR. HILEMAN: I would never tell congress what they should or should not

spend their money on, definitely not in a public forum. I would say that the CLEEN program has actually received considerable bipartisan orders over the years as a mechanism of dealing with aircraft emissions. It's one thing that has brought both parties together in this program. I'm assuming it is because those folks think it is something that can help deal with noise and emissions, it is not the total solution but noise of the package.

MR. HUISMAN: We have one more question and then the next presentation.

MR. CURRY: Tom Curry, Senator Rice's office. Just talking about -- Bill was talking about we would like to see the new planes with new technology kind of permeate the market. Is there any way that the technology can be retrofitted to planes that are already in use?

MR. HILEMAN: That's something we actually considered. In the CLEEN program they provide us with technologies that

Proceedings

could be retrofitted. We do have some of those included. You can imagine that it is rather difficult to --

It's --

Take a 737, there is only so much space under that wing. You can't go expect them to put an engine under that wing as it would hit the ground. So there are certain things that can be retrofitted but other things cannot. And that is something that we consider. Within CLEEN phase two, our second five-year, we actually are working with Delta technical operations they have a problem with the coding company, they developed a spray coating to put on the fan blades to make it more efficient. It doesn't help with noise, but it does reduce fuel burn.

So we do look at things that can be retrofitted. That's a hard thing to do because of the fact that you just have certain things get set by aircraft through the design process. And it's just really hard to go in and rip out this and put in

Proceedings

this other technology, it's easier to do it from a clean sheet.

MEMBER BROWN: Thank you very much. That's very helpful. We're going to get the PowerPoint so that you will have them. And if you find that you have further questions if you forward them to Warren or to me we'll get them to Steven Jones to make sure that any other questions that you might have are answered. We are moving on at this point to the update on the Northeast Corridor. And while that's being -- do you have anything to setup or --

While that's being done, members, please raise your hand high so we can get a count.

MR. HOPPENHAUER: I think quorum is 50 percent plus one.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: We don't have 50 percent plus one. We're ten short.

MS. W. O'CONNOR: I'm Wendy O'Connor with the FAA. My briefing is not as scientific as James. I will update you on

Proceedings

the Northeast Corridor. We last updated the NYCAR on April 11th on the Northeast Corridor so we thought we would give you a new update. We also updated the LaGuardia subcommittee I believe on May 31st as well on the Northeast Corridor on the FAA's initiatives for this project. I am with airport services and Bill Harden (inaudible), who is running the computer is my colleague and we work with Ralph Tamburra from the Port Authority as well on the Northeast Corridor and also our industry partners.

So the purpose of the Northeast Corridor basically which encompasses Washington D.C. to Boston along the Atlantic coast is to improve execution of today's operations, try to complete all scheduled operations that the airlines have scheduled and operate on time with the ability and also improve critical operations such as weather conditions. Our time frame is October 2017 to December 2021. And part one, one example of our

Proceedings

critical -- one phase of our critical weather example, Brett's going to go over which would be the Teterboro/White Plains escape routes, the climb escape routes that's critical to this and then we will go into more details later down.

So what is included in the Northeast Corridor scope? We have four initiatives, we have airports, airspace procedures, tactical initiatives, tools and technology. Airspace and procedures are pretty much the one I'm going to focus on today. We have other initiatives in there that we will not be briefing on today. They don't involve the community on a lot of those they're more within the FAA, internal FAA. So the first one we're going to update you on is the offshore airspace redesign, which is predominantly over the ocean and is above -- 18,000 feet to improve airspace efficiency in a constrained offshore airspace. We have a lot of aircraft that flies from oversees, as you know, it helps us get that aircraft

Proceedings

in and out of that particular area. The design was completed on March 2018 and the implementation is no later than December 2019.

We've also been working on the Northeast Corridor initiative of the east coast high altitude routes. This is to help basically the whole mass across the United States. This endeavor -- it's basically combining up the southern portion of it with the Florida and the Atlantic coast to measure these together a little bit better, to separate the routes a little bit better, to make it more efficient and predictable along the Atlantic coast. Those are predominantly above. Those are all above 18,000 feet. This just gives another example of how we're combining up the southern portion and the northern portion on the route segregations and making it more efficient in conversions of the routes in our airspace.

MR. TAMBURRA: Thanks, Wendy. Ralph

Proceedings

Tamburra. This is one of the first initiatives we discussed. What it is, is an escape route as we would call it for primarily the Teterboro/White Plains departures. Why we pick those aircrafts, they are typically corporate aircrafts they have high performance capabilities and it is a little hard to see on the side. But basically, we would use existing routes to take up to New York City up to higher altitudes and turn around their course. How this benefits the New York operation particularly during severe weather season like we're experiencing tonight, it reduces the number of aircraft on certain routes which would allow the major airports to run more efficiency and run closer to on time. We did test this, one flight was tested, some modification was necessary, which will be done.

The second one that we're going to discuss tonight is the LaGuardia 13 departures use Tennis Goldman and Nathans

Proceedings

is subject to some configuration at JFK. It comes with benefits and full support dispersion of runway 13 departure uses already published procedures. It does reduce average departure delay reducing emissions and providing benefit to the traveling public. This one, like I said, is dependent on JFK's configuration. We want to see greater use of this as it also disperses the noise, modifies the 22 missed approach to deconflict with Newark runway GPS approach. For those of you who are not aware, missed approach is an approach that an aircraft makes that he cannot complete meaning he cannot land. There is a confliction between those aircrafts landing number 22 to LaGuardia and the potential of RY 29 and Newark. This would allow Newark to operate more efficiently, but we have a little work to do on this one to try to resolve it, we have not resolved this particular issue.

Okay. I just want to say thank you, we're going to continue to do those

Proceedings

updates. And I guess we will take any questions.

MR. HUISMAN: Any questions?

MS. CARROLL: Susan Carroll representing Queens Borough President Melinda Katz. I have a question. I see that you're encouraging wider use using the three simultaneously. But I was reading the Tennis documents that was signed on October 2, 2012. And in those documents from six years ago, it stated that it was always the operate -- that was always the standard operating procedure to use those three climbs when JFK is on a certain runway integration. That used to be conventional climbs and now it's Tennis. So if this was always the procedure, why is there pushing out -- why hasn't it been more widely used? Why you're saying you want to increase use?

MR. TAMBURRA: You are correct in that statement. There are many factors why one climb would be chosen over the other. On a day like today it would be

Page 73

Proceedings
normal procedure, maybe a three climb procedure. But if there is thunderstorms blocking one of those routes and there is air traffic, we would actually change the normal procedure and use a different one. I'm not saying that was the cause of the reduction of the three climb. There has been a refocus of trying to use this as much as possible understanding the noise benefits.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Part of the drive and using the three together more often is because of the change in the rules that air traffic controllers have that allows them to depart two aircrafts basically closer together because they diverge within two miles.
MS. CARROLL: I guess I was just confused because that's how it was done before. So I understand what you're saying about thunderstorms and I understand about CLEEN air, but there are times I've seen Tennis being used by itself.

Page 74

Proceedings
MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Is there a set percentage of the time that you anticipate using the Whitestone Climb that you know of, can you give me that number? It seems to me like the last few weeks, aside from the last couple of hours we had with Tennis, it seems like every day for three weeks maybe we get a couple of hours here and there. Is there, like, a percentage of the time where you target?
MS. W. O'CONNOR: Not necessarily. I would have to look at the data to see for the last three weeks how the unit was used and why it was used to give you a better answer. We don't have a normal percentage on other factors that go in there that we kind of alluded to which would be weather, winds, so forth.
MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Because I mean we were here a few weeks ago the last meeting or two meetings before that where there was a breakdown. You used Tennis ten percent of the time. There was just no rhyme or reason or anticipation of what

Page 75

Proceedings
the procedure was.
MS. W. O'CONNOR: Like I said, there's a rhyme and reason why we use particular routes which we've alluded to or already talked about which would be weather conditions or it would be wind conditions or the airport configurations to get the aircraft off in arrival state.
MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Any historical data? I just want to know if it's historically stayed the same as the Whitestone Climb or if it's continued. It seems to me the Whitestone Climb is being more and more --
MR. TAMBURRA: I've been involved in aviation in New York since 1982. Whitestone Climb has been the primary climb off the water for all those years. It varies at times based on winds. Typically in New York summertime winds are south and southwest that leads to the configurations which forces 13 departure. We do not use runway 22 for departure. We use it very infrequently because of that

Page 76

Proceedings
it causes us to use configurations like we land runway four to part 13 in the northeast, we land runway 22 to part 13 when the winds are out to the south or even the southwest.
The Whitestone is driven more by JFK's configurations. You have to actually take the two of them into account to see why the Whitestone, but the Whitestone is the most used climb.
MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I understand it's the primary climb and I don't have the data to say, but it just seems to me that especially after three weeks it just seems like it's being used more and more. And as a representative for my area, I need to do my due diligence and I will followup to see if there is historical data of how frequently it has been used. And I'm curious to see if it's consistent or if it's being used more frequently.
MR. TAMBURRA: Again, the only thing I'm forced more usage at the site would be the wind direction and the speed. We may

Proceedings

catch a break after tonight because as the thunderstorms roll through, the winds will probably be out in the northwest, which typically happens. That's another point which I should make. Typically, fall/winter months you don't see runway 13 departures often. It's typically spring/summer operation. So that's one thing.

MR. CURRY: Tom Curry from Congressman Rice's office. I waited for you guys to make this presentation, but this may kind of get into this as well, you spoke a lot about how technology was going to be driving how we're going to be reducing noise for airplanes. And we appreciate the research that's been made, but throughout that time, it's also that the frequency of planes flying over the communities have increased. I mean, it's not just one big fly annoying you, it's a hundred little flies annoying you. That's a lot of complaints I received for my district, that's number one.

Proceedings

Number two, the district that we represent is on the south shore of Long Island, so it's mainly affected by JFK. Can anyone speak to how the FAA is studying a more wide -- a wider dispersal of flights over the area? And I know every little move you make at JFK ripples, I know it affects LaGuardia and moves at LaGuardia will affect Stewart or Teterboro or whatever. But have there been studies that can speak to those issues?

MS. W. O'CONNOR: So currently we do not have any studies from dispersal of the routes and so forth. And that aspect from our perspective -- I'm not sure for the noise emissions if you had something.

MR. HILEMAN: So what I'm going to decide is research. Sometimes when you do research, you find out that there is nothing there. So remember that but we've been working with MIT for the last few years to put together a conceptual noise evaluation, something that accounts for more than just the jet noises. So it's

Proceedings

more experimental. We're using that to think about what could be done with procedures. And so we've used that with an MOU at Massport to think about what can be done about procedures with the existing fleet to reduce noise. And one of the things we're currently looking at is dispersion. Now, remind you that this research may turn out to be -- it's one of the things we're thinking about and I have no idea what other research were had. But it's something that we're currently looking at.

MR. SCHREIBER: First, I want to thank everyone for the preparation. I just want to say one thing before I hand this over to Barbara. She has more information on this. Once again, unfortunately, we don't have a quorum. And that's the problem constantly. And we work really hard to attain quorum, we have interesting presentation. This is important stuff, this is --

I mean information is important.

Proceedings

When you have information, you can decide on a cause of action and you can decide on how to mitigate some of the noise. The last LaGuardia meeting we were two members short. We made phone calls, we sent out digital Evites. We had people RSVP. We could not have done more and we did not obtain a quorum. And tonight the same problem. We had a couple of items that should have been voted on and we're just not able to do that and it's really disappointing and we do think we have something that will help. I'm going to turn it over to Barbara to explain some of the steps that we'd like to consider taking.

MEMBER BROWN: The two items under item three we have two applications for membership JFK IBID, JFK and the Greater Flushing Chamber of Commerce. Those two entities applied for membership over nine months ago. So, in other words, we could have had a couple of babies here and these two entities are waiting -- awaiting some

Proceedings

decision. So the coordinating committee is at our next meeting and we do meet in between. We have a lot of meetings in between these roundtable meetings. We will be reviewing that and we may be -- we'll see, but we may be invoking a section -- constitution which will allow us to make a decision about those entities because they have been waiting a long time, they filed all their papers and they're still waiting for us to get back to them.

The second item, the non-attendance of members recommendations for handling. We discussed this at the last NYCAR meeting which was back in April. Each of our airport committee meetings -- at each of our airport committee meeting we had discussions. And generally the consensus of the people who were attending those meetings all seemed to be in agreement. The recommendation is that those entities that have not attended two meetings in a row have their membership suspended and

Proceedings

therefore that would lower the requirement for a quorum. And when --

We're saying suspended because at the point at which those entities decide that they do want to come and participate in meetings and vote, at that point their votes will -- their membership will be in order. So we're not taking any entity's vote away simply because the vote -- for instance, for our elected official the vote goes to the district. And we know that people change over time with community boards and other agencies the vote belongs to the community board and to the agency. So we don't want to deny entity's membership, but we are -- we can't continue to move this way because we do have actionable items that we need to be able to vote on. So I'm going to --

One question that I have here, just a straw poll because we can't vote. How many of you here, by a show of hands, would be in favor of suspension of membership for those people who don't

Proceedings

attend meetings? How many of you as members would be in favor of that? So that's a lot of hands. Anybody here who would feel strongly against that?

MS. KARTERON: Philippa Karteron, JFK. I have a question. The suspension is that where it includes the absence, how is that going to be since many of us attend other -- there is something called an excused absence so how is that going to be incorporated?

MEMBER BROWN: We said two in a row. The other thing, as an entity if someone who can't attend should send an alternate so that they -- we're not here suffering because there are no alternates or regular members here. And there are some entities who have not attended any meetings so those will be the ones whose votes are suspended. Any other questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you need a quorum to change the rules that way?

MEMBER BROWN: Technically if the decision is here, yes, we need a quorum.

Proceedings

The coordinating committee is going to meet, we will discuss this and make a decision on how we will move forward because it is becoming a catch-22 here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Do you operate with the quorum or bylaws?

MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: In other words, constitution or bylaws?

MR. SCHREIBER: Bylaws.

MR. WILLIAMS: Does it give you an option to amend the bylaws, the executor?

MR. SCHREIBER: Yes, but we need a quorum. So, again, we're right back at the same place.

MEMBER BROWN: But the coordinating committee can make decisions between meetings if there is a -- if there are time sensitive issues. There is a provision in the bylaws for that.

MR. SCHREIBER: And the --

Just to expand a little bit on what Barbara was saying what's happening when we don't have that quorum we can't move

Proceedings
forward and there are some members -- there are some community boards that have never ever attended a meeting whether it is a LaGuardia meeting or a full NYCAR meeting and just have never ever been here and they've been told by the borough president that every community board at least in Queens is supposed to be a member of this body and they have never, ever attended.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And have you notified the borough president?
MR. SCHREIBER: Yes, we have and they have never attended meetings so the bylaws they do not give us the authority to remove members, members could be removed by cause -- for cause by the entire body. But, again -- but that would require a quorum so it's kind of a --
It's a problem. So that's why we feel this is a good way to go about it and at least we can obtain a quorum and move forward.
MR. CURRY: Just for clarification

Proceedings
on the procedure that would suspend members. After two meetings, the member or the entity would actually be sent a registered letter from the board so they know that if they miss the second meeting their membership is suspended at that point. So just to address Philippa's point, an excused absence. Of course everyone is going to miss a meeting here or there, we understand, everyone's got lives. If you miss two in a row you get a letter. After the third meeting your membership is suspended your vote is suspended and that will subtract the number from the quorum which makes it much easier to do business.
MR. HOPPENHAUER: Just for clarification are you saying two in a row or just two?
MR. CURRY: Two in a row. We don't want to make it too difficult, Larry. Two consecutive meetings I think is fair. There was some discussion at some of the meetings that was the consensus I think

Proceedings
was made.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this retroactive?
MR. CURRY: The policy can't be retroactive until it's enacted. I don't know if I jumped the gun here.
MEMBER BROWN: Final question on this so we can move forward.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So how many entities have missed two consecutive meetings?
MEMBER BROWN: I don't have that information in front of me, but we do have this. So we keep a very careful attendance record on both committees and we know who is.
MR. EVANS: Can I add a point of clarification to your point of how many -- JFK, we always make quorum. At this meeting usually LaGuardia side does not put up enough members to make quorum but we --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That wasn't my --

Proceedings
MR. EVANS: All I'm just saying is that just for a point of understanding the JFK committee meets quorum every time we meet and we meet quorum at this venue. So if you're thinking about how dire this matter of attendance is it's more or less a LaGuardia problem.
MR. SCHREIBER: That's not true, Patrick.
MR. EVANS: Yes, it is.
MR. SCHREIBER: I have to answer. This is one roundtable, this is not two separate roundtables. There is not a roundtable for JFK, there is not a roundtable for LaGuardia. We have gone through this argument four years ago. We went through this argument for two years and it is one roundtable.
MR. CURRY: I agree, Warren.
MR. HUISMAN: We have a section for the public.
MEMBER BROWN: Two things I want the membership to know, one, we did send a letter, an e-mail to Senators Gillibrand

and Chuck Schumer regarding the reauthorization bill with our opinion and supporting basically what the congress has put forth so we wanted you to know that.

And secondly, at the last committee meeting we did decide on -- to try to regularize when we have meetings we came up with the following schedule so you should jot this down, the NYCAR -- the full roundtable meetings will be in January, April, June and October. And we're talking about the fourth Wednesdays of those months. So the fourth Wednesday of January, April, June and October. So our next meeting will not be until January for the full roundtable. But we felt that if everybody knows when we will be meeting it might be easier for people to respond properly by attending meetings. We do have a JFK airport committee meeting this Monday so those of you who are on the JFK airport committee please put that on your calendar if you haven't done so because we do. As Patrick said, we need you for a

quorum. We're going to open the floor to the public comment period.

MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel from Roslyn Heights. I'm just a resident. I got to tell you, this is the first time I've done this and I'm hearing a lot of acronyms and technical jargon, that's quite frustrating especially this whole quorum nonsense that's unbelievable. Here is my situation. My kid's got a 102 fever, so I've been up all night. I've listened to airplanes from 4:30 in the morning until present. I went to sleep at one last night, two airplanes. I woke up at 4:30, two airplanes, because of this fever. I've been experiencing planes all day because I've been home with the kid probably 60 to 90 seconds going over the house in East Hills, Roslyn Heights, New York. This is a neighborhood that, you know, people work really hard, they pay a lot of taxes not that that really matters, but, hey, we deserve a little bit of peace and quiet. And I'm just wondering why

does this plane and this path have to be right over this town and incessantly punish this town with these planes. Without the acronyms, I just want an answer.

MR. TAMBURRA: Ralph Tamburra to answer your questions, operational decisions are made. Again, I know some people won't believe in this, but it is based on runway availability. We do a number of construction projects overnight because we have to. We have to maintain the runways to be safe so that aircrafts can land there. It is also based on wind.

Unfortunately, the winds in the last few days in particular have been out of the south, southeast, a couple of days ago, they were out of the northeast. So, you know, we didn't land over -- we didn't fly over Roslyn Heights or East Hills. So there is rotation of runways, but, again, a similar problem with LaGuardia, a typical weather pattern for this time of the year especially JFK as they get to Sea

Bridge. And unfortunately it doesn't always workout where we can change. Kennedy actually does it quite a lot more than LaGuardia does.

Kennedy will go to 13 at times. There will be stuff -- aircrafts landing 22 left. But the majority land at 13. So there aren't changes made to the JFK configuration and it's actually doing it quite often instead. There are periods though, there are no other options, you have to land into the wind at certain velocities and with the weather conditions we've had that's our only option.

MR. HUISMAN: I have to move on unfortunately it's 9:05.

MR. FRANKEL: Why the altitude, why does it got to be that I can read the letters of Delta?

MR. TAMBURRA: Airspace and separation. There's a separation between LaGuardia and JFK that's how controllers operate to keep the air safe.

MR. HUISMAN: Anybody else from the

Proceedings

public?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This question is to the Port Authority so Plane Sense worked with a developer in California to bring down air noise to all airports across the country. The complaints that are now being filed to the Port Authority are unbelievable. So this month our August report between the Port Authority website and air noise were 16,000 complaints. What is the Port Authority doing to research these complaints. 16,000 -- last month was 15,000, the month before was 14,000. I mean, isn't this putting up a red flag to somebody that there is major problems going on? We have people from Brooklyn, Queens, Manhattan, all of Long Island, Suffolk, Nassau that are part of the air noise. What are you going to do to recognize these complaints?

MR. HUISMAN: We may not have an answer at this particular point.

MS. HERNDON: Port Authority reports the monthly complaint reports to the

Proceedings

monthly circulation, correct?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. HERNDON: In terms of research, we do -- we are aware that the number of complaints has gone up since this act has grown. But interestingly, the number of complaints has not gone up significantly, it's gone up a little bit.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why should that matter? It's still a complaint. One complaint. If you call the phone number, they call it a single event occurrence. A single event occurrence is one plane, what does it matter if it's coming from my house or the person next door. I'm not crazy, I know what I'm hearing, so it shouldn't be household, it should be every single complaint that's filed.

MS. HERNDON: I think the best thing to do is if I can get your name and number after the meeting concludes and the head of our noise office can get in touch with you and explain the research that goes on.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that a

Proceedings

deal?

MS. HERNDON: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We just got to find something. I love a deal.

MS. MITCHELL: Kelly Mitchell from the Port Authority just to --

I just need to understand what type of research were you looking for the Port Authority to do?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are they looking to --

I mean, isn't this a red flag to know that these communities are being inundated over and over again. I recently moved because I was 300 feet above sea level and I was getting planes at 900 feet. Bill knows all of this. I moved six miles from my house and I'm just as inundated and I'm six miles further away in Jericho than I was in East Hills. So I just want you to know that the same communities and the same areas are being inundated dated over and over again with the 22 arrivals and the four departures.

Proceedings

I mean, the 22 arrivals last month had 9,000 arrivals on the 22, we were killed.

MS. MITCHELL: So just so that everyone else understands how the Port Authority looks at the complaints, we review them, we see where they're coming from, we put them together into a report as was mentioned by my colleague, Jane. We distribute these reports so the amount of the complaints that we receive is identified and so it is researched. If it is a new one that has been a new complainant then we reach out to the new complainant to see what exactly was their issue as they had outlined it. You're referencing a new kind of system that the communities around the airport is utilizing other than what the airport has put out as far as their website and calling in on their hotline. So it is research and it is distributed to the communities and to the FAA. And so I just wanted everyone to understand that that's not being hidden from anyone or ignored.

Proceedings

So as Jane mentioned, we can talk offline as far as really what do you want to see happen other than how we have been reporting that information.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We just need to know that some of these neighborhoods --

And listen, I don't care if you live in the airport or away from it.

MR. SCHREIBER: We can't --

I don't understand. This is a real problem, but we can't have a debate going back and forth right now.

MS. MITCHELL: I'm --

MR. SCHREIBER: I'm not saying you, Kelly.

And I understand you're not happy with the answer, Janet, but they did answer the question. I'm sure none of us are happy with the answers. But, you know, at least for time itself --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess my last request is if you're aware of research that other airports like San

Proceedings

Diego they have the noise --

MS. HERNDON: It's throughout the country, the whole country has it.

MS. HERNDON: I just threw that out as an example. If you are aware of any particular research they are doing that you think might be effective, please, let us know.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Got it.

MR. HUISMAN: Stacey Gilbert has an announcement to make.

MS. CAMPBELL: Hi, Jackie Campbell. So do we still use the data from the noise monitors that were installed? I know we installed some -- you guys installed some in key locations, no? Are you using the noise monitors or you don't know? And second part of it is do you have plans to install more of those monitors?

MR. HUISMAN: I can give you an answer. I think the noise monitor data is sent out on a monthly -- it's gathered and sent out on a monthly basis if you're talking about the permanent monitors as

Proceedings

well as the current monitors -- portables that are out so that is sent out to communities.

MS. CAMPBELL: Do they utilize it? I mean, send out -- do they use it for anything or just send out the data?

MR. HUISMAN: Does the PA Port Authority use the data?

MS. CAMPBELL: And do they plan to install anymore?

MS. HERNDON: So for the --

Some of the monitors will detect if there is a violation of a noise rule from the airport. And if there is a violation of the noise rule then Port Authority follows up with the aircraft operator.

MS. CAMPBELL: Do you factor it into your numbers when you're doing the noise complaints?

MS. HERNDON: That's not registered as a complaint, that's a separate process.

MS. CAMPBELL: It's not factored in. I know it's a level, but if it's in a particular area, then it should be.

Proceedings

MS. HERNDON: We can talk after.

MR. HUISMAN: Thank you, Jane. We're getting late and I know everybody has somewhere else to go at this hour of the evening. Stacey Gilbert is going to talk.

MS. GILBERT: I'm sorry. I will make a very quick announcement. I just wanted everyone in attendance to be aware there's a runway project coming up at JFK, Runway 13 left, 31 right. It will be taking place next year, however, there will be two public information sessions taking place on Tuesday, October 16th and don't worry, you don't have to write this down because the information is going to be published in several newspapers throughout Queens and Long Island. So I'm going to send the draft environmental assessment they're actually the 16th and 17th -- pardon me.

I will send the link for the two sessions to Barbara so she can distribute to the roundtable members. Anybody who

Proceedings

would like my business card, who may not be on the distribution list, I am right here, you can find me. I will provide that to you and send the link to you as well. It is posted on the Port Authority's website, however, I think it's simpler if you take my card and I forward you the link that way the environmental assessment is posted there.

The information sessions will provide more background on the scope of the work that's being done on the runways. It is a state of repair project and without me pontificating on exactly what that all involves, if you are able to attend the meetings I strongly urge you do so. One will be in Rockaways and the other in Rosedale. Again, all that information is posted in the notification, the notifications will also be distributed from the Port Authority to community board elected officials and other interested stakeholders and anyone, as I said, that would like to see me after can grab a

Proceedings

business card.

MR. HOPPENHAUER: Can we request one in Nassau County, please?

MS. GILBERT: I will take that information back to --

MR. HOPPENHAUER: Please do, we don't like being forgotten.

MS. GILBERT: I understand.

MEMBER BROWN: We will be getting all of the links and PowerPoints to you. We can also review the information. I do want to say to the Port Authority regarding the noise complaints, it was mentioned that you count the number of people that are complaining. I do want to make the comment that you should not rely on the number of people who comment because that's a very low number. When I look at your data it -- it almost looks like nobody is upset.

But there are large number of people throughout our communities who are very upset but they work. I mean, they have all sorts of other things going on in

Proceedings

their lives and they don't have time to make those reports. There are many claims that annoy me and I don't send in a report every time because I'm doing a thousand things. So there needs to be a better way of calculating the annoyance because you can't just look at how many people actually made the complaint. So I just wanted to make that comment.

MR. HOPPENHAUER: Can I add on to that, please, because I notice that the reports now have eliminated the number of complaints for each airport, the graphics, all they do is the household. We need to see those graphics back that show the actual number of complaints because if you're under Runway 4 left departure, of course, you're going to be calling a lot. So I want to see the number of households -- the number of people complaints as well as graphed out as they used to do as well as the number of households.

MEMBER BROWN: Okay. And, as I

Proceedings

said, you need to extrapolate out and understand that a whole lot more people are more annoyed with you than have actually made the complaints. I want to thank --

MS. GILBERT: I'm sorry, Barbara, can I add quickly one thing. I don't need the mic.

The comment period for the draft assessment, environmental assessment begins officially tomorrow and ends on October 29th. Even if you're not able to attend those public meetings you can submit comment and that information will be provided in the link that I forwarded to Barbara and distributed to anyone else that's interested.

MEMBER BROWN: How can you start a comment period before people have the thing which they are supposed to comment?

MS. GILBERT: The environmental assessment is posted on the Port Authority website and the notice for the assessment is also going to be distributed in

Proceedings
newspapers in Queens and Long Island.
MEMBER BROWN: When?
MS. GILBERT: Tomorrow. Once the notice is published that's when the official comment period begins. But the draft EA, presuming that you have internet access and the official reports are available at JFK and downtown at 4 World Trade Center, I realize a lot of you are probably Queens.
MEMBER BROWN: So it starts when the notice is published?
MS. GILBERT: Yes. It ends on October 29th.
MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Thank you and I want to thank all of you for coming out. JFK meeting Monday October 1st.
(Whereupon, at 9:20 p.m., the above matter concluded.)

CERTIFICATION

I, LA TONIA C. LEWIS, a Notary Public for and within the State of New York, do hereby certify that the above is a correct transcription of my stenographic notes.

Jane Rose Reporting

LA TONIA C. LEWIS

T