

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

## **SUMMARY OF MEETING**

**Virtual Meeting  
April 26, 2023, 6:00PM  
ATTENDANCE**

Maria S. Sheridan, Manager Teterboro Airport and TANAAC Co-Chairperson	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Scott Marsh, Manager Operations & Security Teterboro Airport	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Rick Vander Wende, Manager Contract Services Teterboro Airport	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Edelana Van Marter, Deputy General Manager NJ Airports	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Ralph Tamburro, Program Manager	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Cheryl Ann Albiez, Media Relations	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Juan Rojas, Government & Community Relations Representative	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Calder Orr, Environmental Program Manager	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Gabriel Andino, Manager Noise Abatement	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Michael Fiscus, Assistant Manager Noise Abatement	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Matthew Reese, Noise Abatement Specialist	Teterboro Airport/Avports
John Kastens, Manager Airport Services	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Bruno Eiras, Manager Airport Operations	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Brandon A'Hara, Assistant Manager Airport Operations	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Veda L. Simmons, Community Engagement Officer	FAA
Paul J Griffo, TANAAC Co-Chairperson	Borough of Rutherford
Deputy Mayor Kathy Canestrino	City of Hackensack
Councilmember Ron Kistner	Borough of Hasbrouck Heights
Councilmember George Cronk	Borough of East Rutherford
Councilmember Sam Conoscenti	Borough of Maywood
Councilmember Louis Roer	Borough of Maywood
Roy Luyster	Township of Rochelle Park
Dave Kingma	Township of Rochelle Park
Gina Affuso, Borough Clerk	Borough of Wood-Ridge
Peter Kortright III	Bergen County Government
Dickinson, Joseph	Teterboro Users Group (TUG)
Alex Gertsen	NBAA
Abby	Guest
Councilmember Andrea Slowikowski	Guest
Audrey Herget	Guest
Christine Currens	Guest
Commissioner Wanda Porterorreal	Guest
Councilmember Jacquie Gadaleta	Guest
Councilmember Sarah Drennan	Guest
Diana Castino	Guest
Ella Raber	Guest
Gregory Hoffman	Guest
Jim Linsalata	Guest
Joanne Florio	Guest
Joe Chic	Guest
John Brown	Guest
Katharine Fletcher	Guest
Lois DiTommaso	Guest

Mary Ellen Stickel  
Mike K.  
Nancy Gross  
Theodore F. Preusch  
Warren Feldman

Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest

**TANAAC – 1st Quarter 2023**  
**Teterboro Airport**  
**April 26, 2023 – 6PM**  
**Virtual Meeting**  
**Minutes Summary**

Maria Sheridan, Manager, Teterboro Airport welcomed the committee members and guests to the meeting. Ms. Sheridan reviewed meeting protocols with the group prior to the start of the meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Ms. Sheridan began the meeting by providing a brief description of TANAAC for the benefit of any new members and guests at the meeting, as summarized here:

TANAAC is a community based advisory group formed for communication and meaningful dialogue between residential communities, the Port Authority, and the FAA. It offers an opportunity to work collaboratively to enhance the quality of life of residents while ensuring the efficient operations of the airport. The Port Authority operates the airport environment by creating a safe and secure landing and takeoff environment. The FAA operates and regulates the airspace as directed by Congress. TANAAC’s mission is to make recommendations that will enhance the quality of life for the residents living within the Airport Traffic Area, (approximately five-mile radius of the airport.) Membership is open to locally elected officials representing the interest of the population that is located within the Airport Traffic Area.

TANAAC By-Laws can be found at the link below:

<https://aircraftnoise.panynj.gov/tanaac-by-laws/>

Ms. Sheridan then welcomed East Rutherford to the TANAAC committee and introduced Mayor Jeffrey Lahullier and Councilmember George Cronk as the newest members of the TANAAC committee.

At this point, Ms. Sheridan turned the meeting over to Paul Griffo, Co-Chair for his opening remarks.

Mr. Griffo welcomed everyone to the meeting and shared his hopes for a productive and successful meeting.

Ms. Sheridan turned the meeting over to Scott Marsh, Teterboro Airport Manager, Operations & Security, for an update on airport related construction.

Mr. Marsh provided the following operations report for the airport:

- FAA Construction of new Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)
  - Construction continues and is moving ahead on schedule. The new ATCT is anticipated to be fully operational by the Fall of 2024.

Ms. Sheridan then turned the meeting to Mr. Andino for the Noise Office Statistical report.

Mr. Andino introduced Matthew Reese, Noise Abatement Specialist, who gave a brief update on the progress of the aircraft operator outreach initiatives currently taking place at Teterboro Airport.

Mr. Reese described noise abatement outreach efforts as summarized here:

As part of continued outreach efforts, the Noise Office has reached out to FlightSafety International in Moonachie. FlightSafety International is one of the largest pilot training organizations in the world. They are responsible for both initial and 6 month recurrent training for many of the business jet pilots who use Teterboro Airport. The intention of the outreach effort is to establish a collaboration focusing on open lines of communication and information between Teterboro Airport and the instructors who train on the operations and approaches available at Teterboro. FlightSafety International has agreed to post promotional materials at their facility and to share our materials with their students and instructors to bring into focus noise abatement and the Teterboro Fly Quiet Program. Teterboro Airport flight information such as the RNAV GPS X-Ray (the “Route 17”) approach which affects Hackensack, Maywood, and all points North of the airport, and the Circle to Land - Runway 1 approach over the Meadowlands, which affects Carlstadt, Rutherford and areas to the South will be shared in Flight Safety pilot training programs at their facility.

In addition, the Noise Office staff approached the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) and held an open dialogue involving the topics of noise abatement, flight safety and the orderly flow of traffic arriving and departing the airport. This dialogue was very successful.

The next step is the inclusion of some of the largest operators at Teterboro Airport in the Fly Neighborly outreach efforts. Noise Office staff have reached out to NetJets, Executive Jet Management, Solairus Aviation and FlexJet. These five operators made up over 25% of aircraft movements at Teterboro last year. The Noise Office has engaged with them to take active steps to mitigate noise and to fly quietly. In addition, NetJets, as part of its standard operating procedure, has mandated that all departures from Teterboro, day or night, be flown under noise abatement criteria. Mr. Reese publicly applauded NetJets for their efforts to be good neighbors and for their ongoing participation.

It is hoped that these efforts will produce enhanced safety, operational awareness, and a marked increase in the usage of Teterboro noise abatement protocols.

Mr. Andino continued the meeting by providing a Statistical Report for the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2023 as summarized below:

#### Aircraft Movements – 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2023:

The airport had a total of 37,460 movements in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2023. This reflected a 2.18% increase in movements over 1st quarter last year. The most frequent users were jets and turbo prop aircraft. 1,908 of these movements were between the hours of 11:00PM and 6:00AM. Teterboro has a voluntary curfew in effect for these hours. Nighttime flights made up 5.09% of total movements. Nighttime movements are down 0.21% from last year at this time.

#### Runway Utilization –1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2023:

The most utilized runway for arrivals continues to be Runway 19 with 45.71% of arriving flights using this runway. The most utilized runway for departures was Runway 24 with 52.25% of departing flights using this runway. Runway usage depends on many factors including prevailing winds.

#### Helicopter Route Utilization – 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2023:

The southern route to and from Manhattan continues to be the primary helicopter route used for 78.12% of arrivals and 80.60% of departures.

### RNAV (GPS) X Runway 19 Offset Approach Utilization – 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2023:

*Runway 19 Arrivals: 24 Hours* – During the 1st quarter of 2023 we had a total of 8,105 arrivals, 215 of them utilized the offset approach. This reflects an overall 24 hour usage of 2.65%.

*Runway 19 Arrivals: (Nighttime) - 10:00PM – 7:00AM* – 711 arrivals occurred during nighttime hours, 209 of them utilized the offset approach. This reflects a usage of 29.40% during nighttime hours.

The approach is available for use at any time via pilot request and it continues to be advertised by the FAA on the ATIS during nighttime hours.

### Noise Exceedance Violations -1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2023:

The airport issued a total of 7 first time noise exceedance violation notices during the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2023. Violation notices issued are average compared to prior years. The airport has a policy of “three strikes and you are out”. This means that three violations notices issued within a two year period can result in an aircraft being banned from Teterboro Airport permanently.

### Day/Night Aircraft Noise Average – DNL(A) – 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2023:

RMS 101 – (7<sup>th</sup> & Berry Street in Carlstadt) – 55.7 decibels (-1.4 decrease)  
RMS 102 – (Hamilton Street in Hasbrouck Heights) – 33.3 decibels (-1.3 decrease)  
RMS 103 – (Prospect Ave – Hackensack) – 59.5 decibels (-1.1 decrease)  
RMS 104 – (Park Street – Hackensack) – 53.1 decibels (+1.9 increase)  
RMS 105 – (Bogota High School) – 48.3 decibels (-0.1 decrease)  
RMS 106 – (Joseph Street – Moonachie) – 52.1 decibels (+0.9 increase)  
RMS 110 – (Mountain Way – Rutherford) – 56.8 decibels (11/22/2022 to 2/20/23)

### Noise Complaints - 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2023:

The airport received 18,648 noise complaints from 228 individual households. Approximately 90% of the overall complaints that came in during the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2023 came from 6 individual residents. Residents have a variety of ways to register complaints including phone calls, use of an online complaint form, and through third-party application software. 9,128 of the complaints received during the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter came from a total of 23 residents using third-party application software.

### Aircraft Noise Complaints – TANAAC Member Communities (Within 5-mile radius of the airport):

The top 3 communities with the most noise complaints were Maywood which registered 7,450 complaints from 3 residents, (One Maywood resident registered 7,447 of those complaints all by themself.), Rutherford registered 1,663 complaints from 12 residents, and Hackensack registered 1,224 complaints from 26 residents.

### Aircraft Noise Complaints – Non-TANAAC Member Communities (Outside of 5-mile radius of the airport):

The top 3 communities with the most noise complaints were Newark which registered 16,105 complaints from 7 residents, Tenafly which registered 500 complaints from 8 residents, and Lyndhurst which registered 306 complaints from 6 residents.

Noise Complaints – Nature of Disturbance – Full Year 2022:

The top reasons given for the majority of complaints was *Too Loud & Low* with 15,952, *Too Loud* with 2,283, *Too Early, or Late* with 173, *General Complaint/Other* with 163, *Too Low* 47, and *Too Frequent* with 32.

Noise Complaints – Regional Complaints –1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2023:

The majority of complaints from within a 5-mile radius of the airport came from Hackensack, South Hackensack, Teaneck, and Maywood to the north of the airport. Lyndhurst, Carlstadt, Rutherford, and East Rutherford to the south of the airport. A larger volume of complaints from within a 20-miles radius of the airport came from areas to the north in Upper Bergen County.

Portable Noise Monitor – Rutherford - Final Report:

*Monitor Site FMS 110 – 172 Mountain Way, Rutherford, NJ*

A temporary portable noise monitor was installed in Rutherford at the request of TANAAC and the Borough of Rutherford. This monitor collected data for a three month period. The date presented here reflects the period of November 22, 2022 to February 20, 2023. The monitor was located approximately 3 miles southwest of the center of the airport and is adjacent to departures from Runway 24 and the instrument approach path for Runway 6.

The results are outlined in the following tables:

Aircraft Day/Night Average Sound Level (DNL) and Noise Events at RMS 110*		
Month	DNL (Aircraft Noise)	DNL (Normal Community Noise)
November (22-30)	55.9	58.8
December	57.9	59.5
January	57.0	57.5
February (1-20)	54.1	57.8
Total	56.4	58.5

\*Average noise levels are measured using the Day/Night Average Sound Level (DNL is a long-term weighted average that adds a 10 decibel(dB) penalty to any noise events occurring between 10:00 PM and 7:00AM. DNL is the federally mandated system used by the FAA and airport to measure aircraft noise exposure levels.

Under FAA Part 150 regulations 65 DNL and above is considered to be non-compatible for operations. Anything below this is compatible with airport operations and more in line with nuisance noise.

Number of Aircraft Noise Events Above Threshold (NAT) at RMS 110*				
Month	NAT 65dB – Total Number of Events	NAT 65dB – Daily Average Number of Events	NAT 70dB – Total Number of Events	NAT 70dB – Daily Average Number of Events
November (22-30)	1,269	141	655	73
December	4,996	161	3,567	115
January	4,433	143	2,993	97
February (1-20)	1,805	90	876	44
Total	12,503	139	8,091	90

\*Individual aircraft noise events were measured using the Maximum Noise Level (Lmax) metric. Lmax is the maximum/peak level that noise reaches during an aircraft overflight. Lmax values for RMS 110 ranged from 63dB to 89dB during the monitoring period.

Most of the noise events were between the 70 and 80 decibel range at their maximum level. The higher noise levels were on arrivals to Runway 6. As a level of comparison, city traffic will generally fall in the 80 to 85 decibel range.

### RMS 110 - Flight Track Analysis – Single Day:

Flight track data captured for a single day on December 6, 2022 and December 12, 2022. The results are summarized below:

December 6, 2022 (TEB Departures):

- A total of 640 TEB movements occurred. 301 departures and 339 arrivals.
- 273 TEB departures flew within ½ a mile of RMS 110.
- The majority of TEB departures were at approximately 1,500 feet above RMS 110.

December 12, 2022 (TEB Arrivals):

- A total of 504 TEB movements occurred. 237 departures and 267 arrivals.
- 261 TEB arrivals flew within ½ mile of RMS 110.
- The majority of TEB arrivals were at approximately 800 feet above RMS 110.

### **TANAAC Community Co-Chair Nomination**

According to the TANAAC by-laws, every two years the community co-Chairperson is up for election/re-election. A request for nominations was placed to all the TANAAC member communities at the end of March and a follow up request was made in April. The only nomination that was received during that time came from Mayor Nunziato of Rutherford, who renominated Paul Griffo.

Ms. Sheridan presented the re-nomination of Paul Griffo for the Community Co-Chairperson position to the TANAAC committee. Mr. Griffo accepted the re-nomination. The TANAAC committee will vote on this re-nomination during the next TANAAC meeting in July.

### **Runway 01 & 06 Alternate Approach Discussion**

Ms. Sheridan turned the meeting over to Paul Griffo and Ralph Tamburro for a brief summary of the Runway 01 & 06 Alternate Approach proposal to the FAA.

Paul Griffo commented that the noise statistics showing individual noise events for aircraft landing near Rutherford at 75 or more decibels was troublesome. Paul asked the TANAAC committee to allow himself and Ms. Sheridan to write a letter to the FAA to see if Rutherford can get relief by moving the approach traffic to Teterboro to more over the Meadowlands area which would be just east of Route 17 or to use Runway 1 which is more over the Meadowlands.

Ralph Tamburro added that there was a request to develop the Runway 1 approach made by several of the companies that fly into Teterboro. An option has been in the planning stage since last year. As a result, an approach was designed that will be published late next year. In the interim there are two waypoints with GPS

coordinates that allow pilots to navigate to them that will follow the path of the future approach. The new route would be easier for pilots to fly since it will use GPS waypoints and allow for a more precise landing approach. This is very good progress. They are also working with some of the local pilot groups and the FAA to look at some other potential approaches.

Paul Griffo expressed his hope that by next year the landing to Runway 1 will be more east of Route 17.

Mr. Tamburro said the current Runway 1 approach is a circling approach. Pilots fly the ILS to Runway 6 and then at some point break off and circle to Runway 1 however this approach relies on pilot familiarity with the area and so the paths can change quite a bit. Therefore, it was requested, primarily for safety reasons, to develop an RNAV approach which would be a GPS guided approach to Runway 1. Through multiple coordination meetings with the FAA and several of the pilots, an approach to Runway 1 was developed and the design was accepted. That design will be published, meaning that it will be a public procedure for any pilot that flies into Teterboro to use. But in the interim there is a separate set of waypoints that have been published that will allow pilots to navigate to Runway 1 basically using the same coordinates as the official approach. It would make it easier for the pilots to navigate and would allow for a more consistent flight pattern over the Meadowlands area so this would not be a major noise concern.

**TANAAC Committee Vote**

Ms. Sheridan put the issue of sending a letter to the FAA requesting that they investigate any opportunities for an alternate approach for Runway 6 before the members of TANAAC present at tonight’s meeting to a vote. At this point a rollcall vote was taken by voting members of TANAAC as follows:

Member	Official/Designated Representative	Vote
Borough of Bogota	Not Present	
Bergen County	Peter Kortright	Yes
Borough of Carlstadt	Not Present	
Borough of East Rutherford	Councilmember George Cronk	Yes
City of Hackensack	Deputy Mayor Kathy Canestrino	Yes
Borough of Hasbrouck Heights	Councilmember Ron Kistner	Yes
Borough of Little Ferry	Not Present	
Borough of Maywood	Councilmember Sam Conoscenti	Yes
Borough of Moonachie	Not Present	
Village of Ridgely Park	Commissioner Wonda Porterorreal	Yes
Township of Rochelle Park	Roy Luyster	Yes
Borough of Rutherford	Paul Griffo	Yes
Town of Secaucus	Not Present	
Township of South Hackensack	Not Present	
Township of Teaneck	Not Present	
Borough of Teterboro	Not Present	
Borough of Wood-Ridge	Borough Clerk Gina Affuso	Yes

The resolution passed with 9 yes votes to send a letter to the FAA, on behalf of the TANAAC committee and the communities south of the airport, requesting that the FAA consider options for an alternate approach to Runway 6.

## OPEN DISCUSSION

At this point Ms. Sheridan opened the meeting to questions and comments from TANAAC committee member towns as summarized below:

Ms. Sheridan recognized Deputy Mayor of Hackensack, Kathy Canestrino.

Kathy Canestrino, Deputy Mayor of Hackensack observed that her focus was mostly on the volume of air traffic that was coming and going into Teterboro airport and the use of the alternate flight path. She went on to address four points that she wanted to cover. She mentioned that she had received several articles recently about limits that the FAA allowed for traffic volume/capacity. One of these was a method called “*slot control*” which was used at major airports such as JFK and LGA. At EWR the FAA allowed for a limit of 79 combined take offs and landings per hour. Ms. Canestrino observed that data she received, (which reflected the maximum number of take offs and landings during January through April), showed that Teterboro had 38 arrivals and 40 departures totaling 78 flights per hour on a random day she selected. She wondered if it was feasible for the FAA to use limits such as those in place at JFK, LGA and EWR at Teterboro Airport to control traffic volume. In addition, she went on to say that she realizes that Teterboro had a weight limit of 100,000 lbs. for aircraft, but she wondered if larger wing span size and not just weight would have an impact on increased noise. She questioned if some kind of limitation could be placed on the actual size (foot print) of the planes landing at Teterboro. Her third point was in regard to the alternate flight path. She appreciated the fact that the nighttime use of the alternate flight path was stable at 30% usage during nighttime hours, however, she still wanted to see an increased usage during daytime hours. She requested that the FAA look into a way to use the alternate path on Saturday during the day and overnight into Sunday morning. Her final point was in regard to the multiple ways to fly into Teterboro airport. She speculated that perhaps there was a way to distribute the traffic so that the other flight paths were used more evenly so that the volume was not predominately going to Runway 19.

Ms. Sheridan commented that General Aviation airports, like Teterboro, don’t have slot controls since they don’t have commercial service. She asked Mr. Tamburro if he would be able to comment on Ms. Canestrino’s point about slot restrictions.

Mr. Tamburro explained that he worked with major airports on slot restriction and that Ms. Canestrino was correct when she said that both JFK and LGA operated with slot restriction. Newark used a managed slot and was not a true slot restriction. He went on to say that slots are used strictly to manage delays and have nothing to do with limiting the volume of flights. Slot restrictions spread out the demand over a longer period of time but do not reduce the volume. For example, at peak demand flights would normally be concentrated into a two or three hour period. Under slot controls this demand is spread out over five or six consecutive hours. At Newark airport the 79 flights per hour is spread over a consistent five or six hour period of 79 flights per hour. Mr. Tamburro went on to observe that Teterboro’s average demand would be much lower than 79 flights per hour and was mostly likely closer to 50 flights per hour with peak demand in the early afternoon. In contrast peak demand under slot control for the other major airports consistently runs late into the evening. To summarize, the primary goal of slot controls is to spread out demand to reduce delays not to reduce volume. Only four airports in the entire country currently have the slot control program in effect.

Ms. Canestrino commented that she respected what he was saying but that she could still see that slots would have some type of mechanism to control volume coming in and out of the area. She found it interesting that Teterboro could have a number like 78 flights in an hour when Newark, which is a much larger airport, had 79. She felt that they needed to look into any avenue that was available to reduce traffic volume. This felt that this would help everyone.

Ms. Sheridan asked Mr. Andino to comment on Ms. Canestrino's second point about aircraft size.

Mr. Andino observed that newer generation aircraft flying into Teterboro are much quieter than their predecessor aircraft of the past. He observed that Ms. Canestrino was correct and that some of the sound of an aircraft overhead does come from the airframe. He went on to explain that the sound would be different, depending on the wind passing over the plane, but not necessarily louder. A larger size aircraft would produce a different sound, but it would not necessarily be a louder sound. A larger wing span would not create more noise as the air passed over it in terms of decibel levels, it would simply create a different type of sound.

Ms. Canestrino thanked him for Mr. Andino for his answer but said she will continue to push for reduced traffic volume and felt that size restrictions at Teterboro would help reduce traffic volume.

Ms. Sheridan asked Ms. Veda Simmons, Community Engagement Officer for the FAA, if she had any comments regarding Ms. Canestrino's concerns.

Mr. Andino replied that Ms. Simmons had left the meeting a few minutes earlier due to a prior commitment.

Ms. Canestrino asked that they continue to pursue the Saturday daytime use of the offset flight path over Route 17. She thought it was a wonderful idea to try to encourage the FAA to advertise the offset approach on Saturday. Ms. Canestrino asked Ms. Sheridan to assist her by reaching out to the FAA to try to get this in motion.

Ms. Sheridan proposed that they add this as part of the letter they are currently preparing to the FAA. They would include the request for relief to the southern communities of an alternate approach to Runway 6 and include a request for relief to the northern communities of the use of the offset approach on Saturday and Sunday mornings.

Mr. Griffo was amenable to this idea.

Ms. Canestrino thanked Ms. Sheridan for her efforts.

Ms. Sheridan continued the meeting with questions from member towns.

Roy Luyster, Representative from Rochelle Park, complimented Laz Arteaga on the good job that the ATCT was doing keeping the airspace safe. He also thanked Ms. Sheridan and Mr. Marsh for their efforts on behalf of the Port Authority. He asked that the FAA please continue to look into the issues presented today.

Ms. Sheridan thanked Mr. Luyster for his comments. Ms. Sheridan then accepted a question from Lois DiTommaso a resident from Rutherford.

Ms. DiTommaso questioned night flights. She wanted to know if it was possible for flights to stop using Runway 6 for arrivals overnight and to use Runway 1. She said the flights flying over Rutherford wake up herself and her neighbors during the night.

Ms. Sheridan turned the question over to Mr. Andino for response.

Ms. Andino responded that it was one of their goals to address this with the FAA. The recently completed Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study included recommendations for enhancing the use of preferred runways. In cooperation with the FAA (which controls the airspace), we are advocating for the use of Runway 1 for arrivals when possible for late night flights. The biggest issue with this is the nature of the landing approach.

Runway 6 has an instrument approach which allows for a precision guided straight in approach to Runway 6. This type of approach is considered by the aviation industry as the safest way to land an airplane. Runway 1 is not equipped with this technology. In addition, because of our proximity to Newark Airport, Teterboro flights cannot have a straight in approach to Runway 1. The flight path requires flying in towards Runway 6 and then breaking off to circle around to Runway 1. Doing this at night presents challenges to a pilot due to visibility issues, wind direction, weather conditions and obstructions in the area. Some pilots (who are familiar with Teterboro Airport) do use this route and we are actively trying to increase that usage. The hope is that a GPS approach will be implemented (which would have waypoints that can be used for pilot reference). Once we have a little bit more of a precision approach it would enhance the safety and make it more readily available for pilots to use. Mr. Andino stressed that residents' concerns were being heard and that this was definitely a work in progress, and they hope to have results in the not so distant future.

Ms. DiTommaso thanked Mr. Andino for his response and expressed her concerns for the older people in her neighborhood, some who were in their 90's, who were being affected because they could not get back to sleep after the planes went overhead. She also wondered about a program/plan that was mentioned to her by Mr. Reese that would potentially provide relieve for some of the air traffic over Rutherford. She wondered what this was about and if someone could provide the details.

Mr. Andino turned the question over to Mr. Reese for response.

Mr. Reese replied that he was referring to the initiative, as detailed by Mr. Griffo earlier in the meeting, of an offset route involving the circle to land to Runway 1 approach over the Meadowlands. Mr. Reese further observed that the Noise Office was continuing in its efforts to contact operators and request that they voluntarily consider using the Route 17 Offset Approach for Runway 19 and the Runway 1 circle to land approach over the Meadowlands as options when available.

Ms. DiTommaso thanked Mr. Reese and asked him about runway use. She wanted to know who determined what runway was used at any given time during the day/night. She noticed that during a recent St. Patrick's Day parade in Rutherford planes were using a Runway 6 approach in the morning and then switched over to Runway 1 in the afternoon during the event and then switched back to Runway 6 after the event was over in the late afternoon. She wondered if the flight pattern was altered because of that Rutherford event.

Mr. Andino replied that he would have to determine the actual reason why the flights were directed to those specific runways on that day, however, he could tell her for a fact that flights were not altered because of the St. Patrick's day event in Rutherford. Local events and celebrations would have no impact on runway usage. The only time an event would impact flights would be if we had a Presidential Temporary Flight Restriction (TFR) or a flight restriction for an event at MetLife Stadium.

Mr. Reese added that he had responded to Ms. DiTommaso about this question in earlier correspondence to her. The airport was on both a north flow and a south flow at different times that day. Runway usage was more to do with TRACON and the ATCT making determinations on usage based on wind direction and had nothing to do with the St. Patrick's Day parade in Rutherford. Generally, it would have to be the President of the United States coming into the area or a large event like the Superbowl which would have the FAA impose a flight restriction such as a no-fly-zone. The FAA would not do this for a small town parade.

Ms. DiTommaso thanked everyone for their responses, she thanked Mr. Griffo for the letter he was going to send and Ms. Canestrino for the suggestions she made during tonight's meeting. She appreciated the efforts being made and was hopeful that they would be able to reduce the volume and noise over Rutherford for the benefit of herself and her neighbors.

At this point Ms. Sheridan took questions from guests representing non-member towns as summarized below:

Ms. Andrea Slowikowski from Demarest observed that she noticed an increase in the number of complaints from her area and asked what constituted a voting member of TANAAC.

Ms. Sheridan explained that per the TANAAC by-laws member towns fall within a five mile radius of Teterboro Airport.

Ms. Slowikowski went on to ask what she could do, as an elected official from Demarest, to assist people in her community who have complaints about aircraft noise and volume.

Ms. Sheridan explained that attending the TANAAC meeting tonight and having her voice heard was a major way towns such as hers are represented. During the meeting representatives from Teterboro Airport and the FAA attend and listen to the issues and concerns being brought up by residents. Statistics on these issues go to the FAA which hopefully drives some of their policy. In its role as an advisory board TANAAC cannot make any changes, but they can have a dialogue with the FAA to see what opportunities are available for the FAA to take a look at issues and perhaps make life a little better for residents. Change does not happen overnight, but any community representative is open and eligible to write a letter to the FAA on the communities behalf. The letter should go to the FAA Regional Administrator Marie Kennington-Gardener. Her information is on the FAA website. All requests involving airspace would start by writing to her. That would be the first step. The second step would be to attend the TANAAC meetings and follow up in person on any letter and request an update on progress being made since a representative from the FAA is normally present during the TANAAC meetings. Change can take a very long time and not everything we request can be done, but through the TANAAC meetings and letters sent by elected officials to the FAA, changes can sometimes be made.

Ms. Slowikowski thanked Ms. Sheridan for her response. She went on to ask if it would be helpful if she got her residents together to obtain the details of their complaints,.

Ms. Sheridan turned the question over to Mr. Andino for response.

Mr. Andino explained that there were two ways to go about registering complaints. One way would be for Ms. Slowikowski to compile the information from residents who were contacting her. Another way would be for residents to contact the Teterboro Airport Noise Abatement Office directly to register their complaint. The Noise Abatement Office can obtain their location, assess what is impacting them, times, and days when they are being impacted and how often it is happening. Mr. Andino went on to say that Demarest can be affected by arriving traffic to a runway that does not get used every day, but when it does get used it would be noticeable to residents in that area under the flight path. Use of this runway is dependent on wind direction and on the availability of the other runway. An impact can last a day or two or less depending on the situation causing it. He provided the contact information for the Teterboro Airport Noise Abatement Office as follows:

*The Teterboro Airport Noise Abatement Office can be reached by calling the Noise Complaint Hot Line at 201-288-8828 or on the website at <https://aircraftnoise.panynj.gov/>*

Ms. Slowikowski thanked Ms. Sheridan and Mr. Andino for their responses.

Ms. Nancy Gross, a Resident of Woodcliff Lake, was concerned about air traffic and the changes they have experienced in her town over the last few years. She observed that things had gotten significantly worse, and she felt it began when GPS started being used. She was appreciative of the outreach efforts taking place and

agreed with Ms. Canestrino that the committee should continue to push for the increased use of the Route 17 Offset Approach. In addition, she wondered if the altitude of planes over Woodcliff Lake could be increased 500 or 1000 feet which would help the problem. She commented that the size of planes at Teterboro seemed to have gotten larger over the years and she felt that enterprises such as NetJets (which offer charter services) were contributing to larger charter flights arriving at Teterboro instead of smaller business/private planes. In addition, she observed that there was also an environmental impact from planes on the climate and that planes were some of the worst users of petroleum. She thanked TANAAC and everyone present for working together with the FAA to come up with solutions that will work for everyone.

Ms. Sheridan thanked Ms. Gross for her comments and observed that the waypoint UNVIL is located within Woodcliff Lake so TANAAC could ask the FAA to raise the altitude at that waypoint, which used for both the GPS and ILS approach for Runway 19. This could benefit the Woodcliff Lake area by increasing the altitude of flights passing over that community. Ms. Sheridan felt that since they had spoken about this issue several times before (at prior TANAAC meetings) they could add a request to raise that waypoint 500 feet in the letter they were preparing to send to the FAA.

Mr. Griffo was amenable to the idea of adding this request to the letter. He felt it was a good idea to include as much as they could in the letter they were going to send to the FAA.

Ms. Sheridan mentioned that these were all very specific things that they were asking the FAA to look into, and each could be followed up on in the future.

John Brown a resident of Maywood asked that consideration be given to congestion pricing at the airport. He went on to explain that it is common in industry to use different price points to spread out demand. He wondered if it was possible to change the structure of landing fees to incentivize the traveler via different price points to spread their travel out over different time periods. He speculated that if there was a legal way to change landing fees so that fees were priced to encourage landing at less busy times the demand would be spread out over a longer period of time. He compared this to the planned congestion pricing in New York City during certain busy times and days.

Ms. Sheridan responded that it was her understanding that according to FAA regulations we were not allowed to participate in changing of landing fee rates throughout the day. Current landing fee rates are primarily based on weight as it relates to the use and wear and tear on the runway and taxiway pavement. She asked Mr. Andino to provide more insight into Mr. Browns proposal.

Mr. Andino responded that the FAA is very vigilant against any targeted pricing which could deter or limit flights. The FAA is very stern about avoiding any discriminatory practices or even those practices that could be perceived as discriminatory.

Mr. Brown observed that he meant that this would be done in an unbiased way. He clarified that he was talking about raising rates so that it would be economically not feasible for some of the flights to land at Teterboro and would encourage flights to land someplace else.

Ms. Sheridan and Mr. Andino both agreed that what he described would be discriminatory pricing and would not be allowed under FAA regulations.

Mr. Brown said that he would like to hear this answer directly from the FAA. He went on to say that several (TANAAC) meetings ago he asked the same question and was told that economic means could be used to restrict flights under certain circumstances.

Mr. Andino said that since the FAA representative had left tonight's meeting earlier he would forward Mr. Brown's question to the FAA for response.

Ms. Sheridan then recognized Councilmember Jackie Gadaleta from Woodcliff Lake.

Ms. Gadaleta started by thanking everyone for their efforts. She was appreciative that residents' concerns were being heard and felt that this was "half the battle" in moving forward towards progress. She was optimistic about the letter being sent to the FAA and happy that it would include concerns of northern Bergen County residents. In addition, she was pleased to hear about the agreement with Flight Safety for the training of operators on approaches at Teterboro such as the Route 17 Offset approach. She commented that this was truly a team effort and offered her assistance in future endeavors.

Ms. Mary Ellen Stickel a resident from Washington Township also wanted to thank the committee for their efforts and for listening to the concerns of residents. She felt this was an effective meeting tonight and she specifically wanted to thank Mr. Reese for his assistance to her. She was very pleased with the idea of raising the altitude of flights, however, she was under the impression, (from information presented at a prior TANAAC meeting), that this would not be possible due to the complexity of the airspace. She also wanted to know what is meant that Teterboro was a "fixed based operation". She felt this was a fancy term for a "gas station for private jets". She wondered if private jets could come to Teterboro and fill up in the middle of the night. She asked if the airport fuel operation was open 24 hours a day and if this could be curbed in any way. She mentioned that she was happy that four jet companies were contacted as part of the current noise abatement outreach efforts and wondered if all the other companies at the airport would be contacted as well. She thanked everyone for the information presented.

Ms. Sheridan replied that fixed based operators provide fuel along with many other services to customers of the airport. By federal law we are a 24 hour facility, which means that if someone were to land at the airport and require fuel during nighttime hours it would be provided to them. However, she reminded Ms. Stickel that Teterboro's voluntary noise curfew program applied to all nighttime flights so total volume of traffic during nighttime hours was at a minimum compared to daytime operations. Nighttime flights averaged 5% of daytime volume. Ms. Sheridan added that in our role as a reliever airport, we are required to take general aviation aircraft 24 hours a day. A reliever airport's main role is to take general aviation aircraft away from commercial service airports to give commercial airports more room for commercial airlines.

Ms. Sheridan then turned to Mr. Andino to explain about the noise abatement outreach portion of Ms. Stickel's question.

Mr. Andino replied that under current noise abatement outreach efforts they were in contact with (or had scheduled meetings with) four of the top five operators at Teterboro Airport. The fifth operator will be scheduled shortly. The goal is to reach out to at least 10 to 15 operators in a "one on one" fashion. The idea is to provide information on noise abatement and flight routes and to provide opportunities for training that the Noise Office can help with. In addition, the Noise Office will obtain feedback from pilots and operators about operational challenges faced by them. The ultimate goal is to establish an open dialogue with operators, the Noise Office, and the FAA to find solutions to the impacts of noise on local communities.

Mr. Reese added that Noise Office staff was reaching out to the operators one by one to try to establish a dialogue that would benefit everyone. These operators are the people that actually fly the aircraft. He also observed that the FBO's are each individual business operators, that handle multiple smaller businesses at the airport. These businesses support aircraft operations and do things such as clean aircraft, provide mechanic service and car service for clients among other things. Raising landing fees and trying to encourage airplanes to go to other airports would have an impact on these companies and on the many people from the local community that work for them. Mr. Reese summarized things by saying that it was the

Noise Office goal to be able to meet with aircraft operators, to find out their concerns and to share these concerns with the FAA to encourage further discussion, and to also establish a relationship with businesses like Flight Safety, which could include this information in training activities for pilots.

Ms. Stickel stated that she wanted to support airport businesses but not when it was completely disruptive to so many towns around the airport. She also repeated her question about altitude of flights since it had not been addressed yet.

Ms. Sheridan acknowledged that although it would be a challenge she felt that there was a possibility that the FAA could explore the issue of altitude further on everyone's behalf to perhaps find an opportunity where changes could be made.

Mr. Andino agreed and added that there may be an opportunity to do something in that area. He went on to say that we all have been to (TANAAC) meetings in the past in which the FAA has done a very good job at explaining the complexity of the airspace in this area but there may be some room for slight adjustments that could be made. He observed that "we are going to ask and see what happens."

Mr. Luyster wanted to thank the Noise Office staff for their assistance to his town of Rochelle Park. He observed that Runway 6 had an ILS approach and Runway 1 did not and mentioned that weather could impact runway use. He thanked Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Andino, and everyone for their efforts tonight.

Mr. Brown clarified his earlier comments about predatory pricing by providing a quote from the *Federal Register* under the section for *FAA Regulations* as follows: "*a properly structured peak pricing system that allocates limited resources using price during periods of congestion will not be considered to be unjustly discriminatory.*" Mr. Brown said he would email the article to Mr. Andino for his consideration. Mr. Brown went on to say that pricing would have to be structured so that it was revenue neutral, and the airport would not lose any business since people who wanted to fly in to Teterboro would cover the cost or decide to fly commercial airlines instead. He continued by observing that he was glad to see that people were finally starting to realize that the real problem was never the noise but the volume and frequency of flights that was the main problem. He stressed that the idea of congestion pricing was not being discriminatory and that he felt that the airport should seriously consider this option. He went on to say that the only downside he could see would be the impact to local businesses such as mechanics and people working at the airport if flight volume should go down.

Ms. Sheridan continued the meeting by recognizing Christine Currens of Woodcliff Lake.

Ms. Currens mentioned that she found the meeting very informative and asked if the increase in air traffic meant less safety for residential neighborhoods under the flight paths of aircraft. She wanted to know if there was any type of plan in case something did happen.

Ms. Sheridan explained that the entire purpose of Air Traffic Control was to work with aircraft for safe and efficient arrivals and departures. The air routes are vetted specifically for safety. Communications between pilots and Air Traffic Control are continuous and are all based on safety.

Ms. Currens asked Mr. Andino if there was any plan to increase the use of Runway 19.

Mr. Andino replied that increasing use of Runway 19 was not something that they were pursuing. He said she may have been thinking of the use of a flight path for Runway 1 over the Meadowlands that they were promoting.

Ms. Sheridan added that runway use was dictated by wind direction and also by traffic from Newark Airport which drives the direction of Teterboro traffic.

Ms. Currens went on to say that she understood the pilots had the option to use the Route 17 approach if they chose and she wondered if the airport could strongly suggest to them that they use the Route 17 approach since the air traffic that they were getting over Woodcliff Lake was substantial and was impacting their quality of life especially on the weekend and in the evenings. She felt that if the decision was left to pilots that they would not take the residents' concerns into consideration.

Ms. Sheridan responded that flight paths in use at Teterboro are primary directed by wind direction and Newark airport flight paths. When Runway 19 is in use there are limitations to using the Route 17 approach, which is dependent on traffic volume during certain times of day, and weather. However, when volume is lower, such as during the night, the FAA does currently advertise the Route 17 Offset Approach to pilots. This is why the TANAAC committee, via a letter, is going to ask the FAA to consider advertising the Route 17 Offset Approach during a portion of the weekend when traffic volume is lower, and if weather conditions are favorable.

Mr. Andino concurred with what Maria said and observed that there were a number of factors that could affect landing aircraft and what route they could utilize. The Route 17 Offset Approach can be requested at any time and pilots will sometimes ask for it during daytime hours. The pilot community will normally use the approach that is designated by Air Traffic Control. Right now, the Route 17 Offset Approach is used mostly at night because that is when Air Traffic Control will advertise the approach to pilots. This is something that the airport wants to see expanded upon. In addition, the Noise Office will continue working with pilots to encourage them to fly it.

Ms. Currens wanted to know if pilots supplied feedback on why they chose not to use the Route 17 Offset Approach.

Mr. Andino replied that reasons have varied, some will fly what the air traffic control tower advertises to them as the primary route to use, some are concerned with obstructions, such as a radio tower, that the Route 17 Offset Approach is close to and some just prefer a straight in approach because they feel it is more stable. It is an ongoing process to advise the pilot community and encourage increased use of this alternate approach.

## **CLOSING REMARKS**

Ms. Sheridan thanked everyone for attending tonight's meeting and expressed her appreciation for the varied ideas presented. Mr. Griffo also thanked everyone for attending.

The next TANAAC meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, July 26, 2023**.

With no further business to come before the committee the meeting was closed by Ms. Sheridan at 7:48PM.