

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

## **SUMMARY OF MEETING – 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2022**

**Virtual Meeting**

**July 27, 2022, 6:00PM**

### **ATTENDANCE**

Maria S. Sheridan, (TANAAC Co-Chair) Manager, Teterboro Airport	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
James Gill, General Manager, NJ Airports	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Jane Herndon, Manager, Aviation Environmental	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Doug Stearns, Aviation Operations Officer	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Ralph Tamburro, Program Manager	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Tina Lado, Intergovernmental Affairs	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Gabriel Andino, Manager Noise Abatement	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Michael Fiscus, Asst Manager Noise Abatement	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Matthew Reese, Noise Abatement Specialist	Teterboro Airport/Avports
John Kastens, Manager Airport Services	Teterboro Airport/Avports
John Panarello, Vice President, Airport Operations & Technology	Avports
Jason Beim, FAA TEB ATCT Manager	FAA
Mary McCarthy, FAA NYAPIO Director	FAA
James Schultz, FAA General Manager NY District	FAA
David Siewert, FAA FENNAVNY	FAA
Veda L Simmons, Community Engagement Officer	FAA
Paul Griffo (TANAAC Co-Chair)	Borough of Rutherford
Deputy Mayor Kathy Canestrino	City of Hackensack
Councilmember Ron Kistner	Borough of Hasbrouck Heights
Councilmember Louis Roer	Borough of Maywood
Councilmember Sam Conoscenti	Borough of Maywood
David Kingma	Township of Rochelle Park
Roy Luyster	Township of Rochelle Park
Mayor John Ruocco	Borough of Hillsdale
Mayor Carlos Rendo	Borough of Woodcliff Lake
Councilmember Jacquie Gadaleta	Borough of Woodcliff Lake
Peter Kortright	Bergen County Div of Community Development
David Belastock	Teterboro Users Group
Joseph Dickinson	Teterboro Users Group
John Brown	Guest - Maywood
Diana Castino	Guest - Hackensack
Joshua Cohen	Guest - Hackensack
Vicki Cohen	Guest - Hackensack
Lois Ditommaso	Guest - Rutherford
Warren Feldman	Guest – Woodcliff Lake
Diane Frankel	Guest – Upper Saddle River
Nancy Gross	Guest – Woodcliff Lake
Mike Kazigian	Guest
Batia Lampert	Guest - Teaneck
Phil Selby	Guest – Township of Washington
Mary Ellen Stickel	Guest – Township of Washington
A. Tohme	Guest – Hackensack

**TANAAC – 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2022**  
**Teterboro Airport**  
**July 27, 2022 – 6PM**  
**Virtual Meeting**  
**Minutes Summary**

Maria Sheridan & Paul Griffo TANAAC Co-Chairpersons welcomed the committee members and guests to the meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Maria Sheridan welcomed everyone and introduced Matthew Reese the new Noise and Environmental Office Specialist. She then turned the meeting over to Scott Marsh for an update on construction projects at Teterboro Airport.

Scott Marsh provided the following summary of construction at the airport:

- Runway 6/24 Rehabilitation project started in April. Work is in progress and is scheduled to continue from April 2022 to April 2023. The scope of work for this project includes resurfacing the runway and upgrading the lighting to LED lights.
  - Work is taking place at night and on weekends as follows:
    - Runway 6/24 Overnight Closures – April 2022 through April 2023
      - Sunday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday 10:30PM to 6:30AM
      - Monday 10:30PM to 8:30AM Tuesday
    - Runway 6/24 Weekend Closures – May 2, 2022 through August 31, 2022
      - Total of seven 38-hour closures from Friday 10:00PM to noon on Sunday
    - Runway 6/24 Weekend Closure from October 1, 2022 through November 30, 2022
      - Total of six 12-hour closures from Sunday 12:01AM to noon on Sunday
    - Airport Weekend Closures from July 1, 2022 through August 31, 2022
      - Total of six 38-hour closures from Friday 10:00PM to noon on Sunday
    - Airport Weekend Closures from October 1, 2022 through November 30, 2022
      - Total of two 12-hour closures from Sunday 12:01AM to noon on Sunday
- Construction of the new Air Traffic Control Tower continues and is moving ahead on schedule.

Scott Marsh then turned the meeting back over to Maria Sheridan.

Maria Sheridan turned the meeting over to Gabe Andino to provide a report on Airport Statistics.

Gabe Andino provided a statistical report on Teterboro Airport activity for the period of January to June 2022 as summarized here:

Aircraft Movements:

The airport had a total of 82,814 movements during the period of January to June 2022. This was a 40.48% increase in movements over last year and puts us on par with our 2019 traffic numbers. 4,282 of these movements were between the hours of 11:00PM and 6:00AM. Nighttime flights made up 5.17% of total movements.

Noise Violations:

During this same period, the airport had a total of 22 first time violations and 1 second time violation. Most violations came from aircraft departing Runway 24. Noise violations were lower than average. This reduction in violations can mostly be attributed to construction currently taking place on Runway 6/24 and to newer quieter aircraft being flown.

Runway Utilization:

The most utilized runway for arrivals was Runway 19 with 52.67% of arriving flights using this runway. The most utilized runway for departures was Runway 24 with 58.24% of departing flights using this runway.

Helicopter Routes

The southern route to and from Manhattan was the primary helicopter route used for over 76.37% of arrivals and over 80.21% of departures.

RNAV (GPS) X Runway 19 Offset Approach

*Runway 19 Arrivals: 24 Hours* – During the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter of 2022 we had a total of 11,486 arrivals. 193 utilized the offset approach. This reflects usage of 1.68%. This is an .80% increase in overall utilization from the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2022.

*Runway 19 Arrivals: 10:00PM – 9:00AM* – During the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter of 2022 we had 1,203 arrivals during the nighttime hours. 181 utilized the offset approach. This reflects usage of 15.05% during nighttime hours. This is an 5.14% increase in nighttime utilization from the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2022.

We are seeing a gradual increase in usage of the offset approach. Availability of the RNAV (GPS) X Runway 19 approach is dependent on several factors including weather, visibility, and air traffic volume.

Day/Night Aircraft Noise Average – LDN(A):

- RMS 101 – (7<sup>th</sup> & Berry Street in Carlstadt) – 57.2 decibels (+0.6)
- RMS 102 – (Hamilton Street in Hasbrouck Heights) – 35.4 decibels (-1.9)
- RMS 103 – (Prospect Ave – Hackensack) – 60.7 decibels (+1.3)
- RMS 104 – (Park Street – Hackensack) – 52.0 decibels (-0.3)
- RMS 105 – (Bogota High School) – 47.7 decibels (+0.4)
- RMS 106 – (Joseph Street – Moonachie) – 51.8 decibels (+0.9)

Noise levels were average in comparison to 2019 levels.

Noise Complaints:

The airport received 45,022 total noise complaints during the period of January to June 2022 from 836 complainants. The number of complaints continue to be high compared to prior years.

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

Maywood had the highest number with 17,470 complaints from 8 complainants. (One Maywood resident registered 17,309 complaints using a third-party application.) Hackensack had the next highest with 3,908

complaints from 55 complainants. This was followed by Rutherford with 691 from 31 complainants, Teaneck with 514 complaints from 16 complainants, and South Hackensack with 242 complaints from 3 complainants.

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

Washington Township had the highest number of complaints with 7,343 complaints from 40 complainants. Newark was the next highest with 5,981 complaints from 4 complainants. Upper Saddle River had 1,542 complaints from 61 complainants, Woodcliff Lake had 1,167 complaints from 40 complainants and Mahwah had 832 complaints from 36 complainants.

Noise Complaints – Nature of Disturbance:

The reason given for the great majority of complaints was *Too Loud & Low* with 36,612. The second highest reason was *General Complaint/All Inclusive* with 4,352, *Too Loud* with 2,097, *Too Low* with 838, *Too Frequent* with 783 and *Too Early or Late* with 268.

Noise Complaints – Regional Complaints:

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. The reason for the uptick in these areas was arriving traffic using Runway 19 and Runway 24.

At this point Gabe opened the floor up for questions on the airport statistics. With no comments or questions forthcoming the meeting progressed to the next topic.

Gabe provided an update on the **14 CFR Part 150 Study** as follows:

The Port Authority has submitted their *Teterboro Airport Final Noise Compatibility Program* (NCP) report to the FAA for their review and approval. The 14 CFR Part 150 studies aircraft noise exposure at the airport for area and land uses that are compatible and not compatible with aircraft operations. The NCP includes the completed aircraft noise exposure maps for the airport as well as proposed measures to mitigate those impacts in areas identified as non-compatible with aircraft operations. The FAA NCP review process takes 180 days. It should conclude on or before January 11, 2023. In addition, there is a 60-day public comment period for those interested in reviewing the plan and submitting comments directly to the FAA. The public comment period concludes on September 13, 2022.

Materials for the *Teterboro Airport Final Noise Compatibility Program* (NCP) are available for viewing in hard copy form at the Teterboro Airport Manager's Office – 90 Moonachie Avenue, Teterboro. The report can also be found online at [http://panynjpart150.com/TEB\\_FNCP.asp](http://panynjpart150.com/TEB_FNCP.asp).

Gabe provided an update on the **Woodcliff Lake Portable Noise Monitor** as summarized below:

A portable noise monitor was stationed at the Woodcliff Lake Municipal Building in June. Unfortunately, due to technical difficulties data was not able to be generated for that month. In addition, the location of the monitor was determined to be detrimental to an accurate reading due to ambient noise from nearby rooftop HVAC units which interfere with accurate data collection. As a result, the monitor will need to be moved to another nearby location. The Teterboro Airport Noise Office staff is working with Woodcliff Lake Officials to determine a new location for the monitor. This will not affect the 3 months monitoring period.

## COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

At this point Gabe Andino opened the floor to questions/comments.

Several elected officials and community members spoke as summarized here:

Jacquie Gadaleta, Councilmember from Woodcliff Lake, questioned whether or not viable options for the relocation of the portable noise monitor were available.

Gabe Andino replied that they were working with Woodcliff Lake Officials on options for the relocation of the noise monitor and that they had several areas that they would be looking at. A location on the grounds of the Municipal Building and an area down the road from the Municipal Building were being considered.

Jacquie Gadaleta suggested that the area of the Woodcliff Lake municipal pool might be a good site since this area has a lot of flights that pass overhead.

Gabe Andino said they did consider the area near the municipal pool however the issue is not only finding a good location but also finding a location without ambient noise and that had a readily available power source as well.

Nancy Gross, a resident of Woodcliff Lake, questioned the current location of the monitor and whether the location of the monitor would pick-up the majority of air traffic. She was concerned that the monitoring was taking place to far east for an accurate reading of aircraft noise in the area and that planes were going more to the west over the area near the municipal pool.

Gabe Andino explained that the area near the municipal pool may have too much ambient noise and the monitor would need a power source. The location near the municipal building was an ideal area for monitoring traffic since this location is near a navigational waypoint for the approach to Runway 19.

Warren Feldman, a resident of Woodcliff Lake, commented that most air traffic comes over Woodcliff Lake from the south and the west and is not near the waypoint by the municipal building. The area of the municipal pool sees more significant air traffic overhead. There is an historic house site in Woodcliff Lake called the "Westervelt-Lydecker House" that is near the municipal pool area and would provide a better location for the monitor and it also would be able to provide a power source as well.

Gabe Andino thanked Warren for his suggestion and said that the area near the municipal building appears to be a good site but that they will continue looking for the best spot in conjunction with suggestions made by town officials.

Sam Conoscenti, a councilmember of Maywood, asked if they had considered putting a portable noise monitor in Maywood or in the near vicinity of Maywood.

Gabe Andino responded that they have not received an official request for a monitor from Maywood Borough officials or any homeowners. If they are interested in a portable monitor, he would help them to do that once an official request has been submitted.

## **FAA Discussion of Airspace Restrictions and Air Traffic Complexities**

At this point Gabe turned the meeting over to the FAA.

Veda Simmons, FAA Community Engagement Officer introduced James Schultz, FAA General Manager NY District and Mary McCarthy, FAA NYAPIO Director who presented a slide presentation on the RNAV (GPS) X Runway 19 Offset Approach Procedure.

James provided a brief overview of air traffic operations including those that applied to Runway 19 approaches at Teterboro. The highlights of that briefing are as follows:

Air traffic control uses several criteria when determining runway usage. These criteria are (1) runway availability, (2) operational efficiency, (3) noise considerations, and especially, (3) weather and wind conditions. Traffic volume and proximity at surrounding airports also play a role in determining the runway usage and approaches.

The FAA developed the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach based upon a request by the Port Authority and the Teterboro Aircraft Noise Abatement Advisory Committee to provide an alternative offset approach to Runway 19 that would assist in reducing the number of aircraft flying over Hackensack University Medical Center and nearby residential areas. This approach is an alternate approach and does not replace the existing conventional instrument approach which is the preferred approach to Runway 19. The RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach is available for use upon pilot request at any time.

Flight complexity plays an important role in Air Traffic Control monitoring of the airspace in this area of the Northeast corridor. The airspace in use near Teterboro is highly complex and dependent on flights coming into Caldwell Airport, Newark Airport and Teterboro Airport. The complexity of this airspace has an impact on determining approach paths in use to Teterboro. Air traffic controllers need 3 miles of separation in between aircraft that are at the same altitude. The use of the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach allows flights arriving to Teterboro less than 3 miles of separation against flights to Caldwell airport. Use of the conventional instrument approach (which is the more straight-in approach to Runway 19) gives them 5 miles of separation. Normally Air Traffic Control would try to place the aircraft using the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach into Teterboro at a higher altitude to avoid conflicts with Caldwell aircraft. Unfortunately, the added complexity of the flights going into Newark airport (which come at a constant rate during the day) makes maintaining a higher altitude for planes coming into Teterboro impossible. The necessary 3-mile separation of aircraft cannot be maintained when Teterboro flights are on the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach and would need to be carefully tracked. The conventional instrument approach into Teterboro allows for a 5-mile separation between flights.

Air Traffic cannot have one controller monitoring both the conventional approach and the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach during busy times. With most flights using the conventional approach and only a few using the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach the complexity would increase, and safety levels would decrease during busy times. The ATC controller has to maintain a safe environment at all times, so they have to assign the more popular conventional approach during times of moderate to high air traffic. One of the ways to change this is to work to get 100% compliance in use of the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach from the pilot community.

In April 2022, the FAA conducted an audit of the utilization of the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach and found that 28% of pilots declined to utilize the approach when it was offered or assigned.

## COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

At this point Veda Simmons opened the meeting to questions/comments.

Several elected officials and community members spoke as summarized here:

A. Tohme, resident of Hackensack, questioned, if 28% of the pilots declined to use the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach, why can't the other 72% be routed to the approach.

James Schultz responded by clarifying the FAA audit results. The audit was done during a time when Air Traffic Control could use the alternate offset approach. As a result of the complexity, as explained earlier in the meeting, whenever there is moderate to slightly moderate traffic to Newark, Caldwell or Teterboro airports, it would not be possible to use the offset approach during those times. The FAA has made a commitment that when traffic volume and complexity allow, they will utilize the alternate offset approach to Runway 19 for noise abatement purposes. Currently Air Traffic Control are trying to use the approach between the hours of 10PM to 6AM all the time, however, even during those times Air Traffic Control is having problems with 28% of aircraft not accepting the approach. This causes complexity for the air traffic controller's ability to monitor arriving flights safely. The other 72% did land using the alternate approach during those times.

Kathy Canestrino, Deputy Mayor of Hackensack, questioned why the 28% of pilots mentioned during the FAA audit declined the use of the approach.

James Schultz responded that this is something they would have to look into.

Veda Simmons further clarified that they do not keep records on the reasons why a pilot might decline a particular approach. Pilots are allowed to decline a clearance and do something that they are more comfortable with. The pilot is in charge of the safety of the flight, and they have a much better idea of their capabilities and the aircraft capabilities when it comes to determining which available approach to use.

Kathy Canestrino replied that she felt it was important to find out the reasons pilots were declining the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach.

Kathy Canestrino questioned if the requirement for the 3-mile distance between aircraft as reflected in the approach slide presented during the FAA presentation applied to all three airports, Teterboro, Newark and Caldwell equally.

James Schultz explained that our area has the most complex airspace in the northeast. Air traffic control carefully plot out each aircraft on its approach to Caldwell, Teterboro and Newark airports. There are times when they cannot maintain the 3-mile/1000 feet altitude limits, but air traffic control tries to keep them to a "cardinal altitude" (500 feet) as these flights make their final approaches to Caldwell, Teterboro and Newark airports. This complexity requires constant coordination, monitoring and adjusting of altitude as these flights come in for final approach and landing.

Kathy Canestrino commented that she appreciated the difficulty of the air traffic controller's job. She further went on to say that the real problems are the flights during the day and not at night. Use of the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach needs to be communicated to the owners and operators of these aircraft to encourage the safe use of the approach.

Kathy went on to thank the NBAA for the assistance they provided to herself and Woodcliff Lake Councilmember Jacquie Gadaleta in allowing them to make a video that was put up on their website along with an article encouraging use of the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach at Teterboro.

The link to the NBAA article and video is below:

[Local Officials Urge Pilots to Use Community Friendly Alternate TEB Approach | NBAA – National Business Aviation Association](#)

Kathy questioned why, when the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach was being designed, didn't anyone analyze the plan for these 3-mile complexity issues and recognize that the approach would not meet the 3-mile criteria for daytime use? She went on to ask, if an alternative Plan B, was being considered because something has to be done. She suggested that perhaps certain types of aircraft models, those that are known to be noisier type aircraft, be restricted from landing at Teterboro Airport?

Maria Sheridan explained that Federal law does not allow airports to discriminate against or restrict certain types of aircraft from landing. Stage 3 jets cannot be restricted at Teterboro airport. The current 100,000lb weight limit at Teterboro was grandfathered in for Teterboro Airport in 1967. If we make changes at this point, we risk losing our entire noise program as it stands. Currently Teterboro Airport's noise program is one of the strictest in the country.

Kathy Canestrino replied that everyone should be looking into what can be done to make this work and she was disappointed that this was not happening.

Maria Sheridan explained that the changes Kathy was talking about involved changes to Federal law and was not something that could be done out of the Airport Manager's Office.

Jacquie Gadaleta commented that she was happy to be part of the video with Kathy Canestrino and wanted to also thank the FAA and NBAA for making it happen. She went on to say that the issue of noise has been going on for several years and that they are really not seeing any relief to it. The level of aircraft traffic and noise is affecting the quality of residents lives in the upper Bergen County area. Residents pay high taxes, yet their quality of life is being adversely affected due to the airplanes coming into Teterboro Airport. Something has to be done to mitigate the effect of this air traffic in the upper Bergen County area. She questioned what suggestions the professionals at the TANAAC meeting have in the works to mitigate this issue. They need officials to come up with some ideas to provide relief to residents of upper Bergen County.

Carlos Rendo, Mayor of Woodcliff Lake, thanked Jacquie for her comments and went on to say that he was a member of the Pascack Valley Mayors Association, which is comprised of ten municipalities and ten mayors in the upper Bergen County area. They represent about one hundred thousand residents. They are all concerned about this issue. He commented that his house was at "ground zero" of the area where the planes make the turn to head down over the reservoir and down to Teterboro Airport. On most Sunday's he sees massive amounts of planes flying over his house on the way to Teterboro. He questioned if there was some relief that could be provided to the residents on the weekends. Was there a way to use the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach more on the weekends to give some relief to residents. He further asked what the density of traffic on approach to Teterboro was on the weekdays versus the weekends.

James Schultz explained that traffic density on the weekends was still busy enough to prevent Air Traffic Control from having the ability to do mixed approaches into Teterboro even on the weekends. They are looking at options. This is very complex region.



Mayor Rendo observed that it seemed to him that the traffic on approach to Teterboro increased on Sundays, probably as businesspeople arrive in anticipation for returning to work on Monday, and that someone needs to speak with the pilots so see if they can be encouraged to use the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach, especially on the weekends.

Sam Conoscenti, Councilmember from Maywood, requested data showing quarter-by-quarter comparison of the percentage of flights using the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach.

Gabe Andino pointed out that one of the slides shown earlier during the statistical portion of today's presentation provided data for the use of the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach broken down by quarters. The data indicated that while the overall usage numbers are still small, they are gradually increasing.

Josh Cohen, resident of Hackensack, commented that while he appreciates the complexity of the air space presented today, no solutions have been provided by either the airport or the FAA to resolve the current problem. He further commented that the only possible solutions proposed tonight have been from citizens effected by this issue and that the presentation did not make any mention of the quality-of-life issues faced by citizens or the issues faced by the schools without air conditioning that have to keep their windows open and need to stop teaching every time a plane goes overhead. He questioned if anyone had solutions, a plan of action or any path forward in this?

Mary McCarthy responded that there was no easy solution, and they don't have next steps at this point. They continue to look at what can be done but with Hackensack as close to the airport as it is, it is difficult to ensure safety and create noise abatement routes.

Josh Cohen found this response unacceptable and felt it did not address the quality-of-life issues and safety concerns being expressed by the residents. He wanted to know what next steps could be taken to change laws to address this. He asked if the FAA would work with the residents to change these laws?

Mary McCarthy explained that there is an FAA process for enacting noise restrictions at an airport. It is *FAA 14 CFR Part 161 – Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions*.

John Brown, a resident of Maywood, commented that he has been following this issue for some time and in his opinion the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach is a failure. He is afraid that the FAA may not have realized this yet because they keep pushing the approach and have not begun to look into an alternate Plan B. He asked if the FAA has done anything else to address these issues. He expressed frustration with the lack of response and commented that at this point continually pushing the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach was just "riding the wrong train".

A. Tohme commented that even though it appeared that there was no easy solution, and no next steps were in the works at present, he wondered if there was a way to mitigate the problem. He went on to say that Summit and Prospect Avenues in Hackensack sit on a hill with high-rise apartment buildings on top. This is also the highest area in Hackensack and these buildings are very close to aircraft passing overhead. He wanted to know if it was possible to move the flight path a few meters west or northwest. He observed that the current flight path for flights arriving to Teterboro pass directly over the highest point in Hackensack which is also the most densely populated area of the city.

Maria Sheridan replied that upon final approach the aircraft have to line up with the runway and offsetting it may not be possible so close to the airport.

James Schultz confirmed that the approach for landing is a critical phase of the flight and there is limited flexibility the closer you get to the airport.

Mary Ellen Stickle, resident from Washington Township, commented that her house is directly under the flight path for jets going into Teterboro and the noise was constant. She wanted to know what year TANAAC was established. She also asked about what she needed to do to get a portable noise monitor set up at her house. In addition, she requested more information of how Caldwell Airport traffic was affecting traffic in her area and if it was expanding. She expressed disappointment that nothing was getting done about air traffic and noise.

James Schultz responded that arriving flights to Caldwell, Teterboro and Newark airports all come in from the west on the same flight path. They are required to stay on this path for safety reasons since they have to stay out of the flight path designated for LaGuardia Airport traffic. This means that the flights to Caldwell, Teterboro and Newark Airports are traveling at different altitudes in the same airspace. Caldwell aircraft approach at a lower altitude, Teterboro flights are on top of them and then Newark flights above Teterboro. As they approach their designated airport, they are gradually allowed to reduce altitude in coordination with each other while maintaining a minimal 3-mile separation. This is a very precise and complex situation.

Maria Sheridan confirmed that according to the bylaws TANAAC was established in February 1987. To inquire about the possibility of obtaining a portable noise monitor she should contact the Teterboro Airport Noise Office for information as follows:

**Teterboro Airport Noise Office**  
**(201) 393-0399**  
[noiseoffice@teb.com](mailto:noiseoffice@teb.com)

Nancy Gross, local resident, commented on her surprise that three airports were in such close proximity and causing such complexity over this area. She requested clarification on the noise restriction program at Teterboro Airport and how these could be jeopardized if changes to the program were made.

Gabe Andino replied that Teterboro had the most restrictive noise mitigation program in the area. Teterboro has noise restriction that were set back in the 1980's and govern departing aircraft. Aircraft departing Teterboro cannot exceed certain noise levels. Violators are notified and repeat violations have the potential for the aircraft to be banned from landing at Teterboro Airport. Since the 1980's Federal Regulations on noise have changed and airports cannot implement such restrictions to airfield access based on noise or other factors. The older more restrictive regulations from the 1980's were grandfathered in for Teterboro Airport and are allowed to remain in effect for us. Unfortunately, grandfather status means that these older requirements have to remain static and cannot be changed or modified. To do so will cause us to lose our grandfather status and we would then have to follow the current less restrictive requirements. With regard to weight, the 100,000-weight limit restriction is in effect at Teterboro due to runway design and congressional mandate. In all other instances the FAA does not allow for restricting aircraft access due to noise or other related items.

Nancy Gross wondered if it were correct to assume that the FAA would not restrict things any further.

Gabe Andino responded that yes, she was correct at this point, however the FAA Part 150 Program does oversee noise compatibility and determines what areas are compatible with noise and which areas are not compatible based on established criteria/guidelines provided by the FAA. These criteria involve average annual noise levels. If noise levels close to the airport are 65-DNL or above these areas can be addressed to mitigate the impacts of aircraft noise. The means that the primarily focus would be on areas close into the airport that meet the noise criteria. Outside of this, noise factors would be considered annoyance factors but there is nothing from a regulation standpoint that would lead to mitigation or restrictions. At least not very

easily, there are other methods, but they would be a long shot to achieve especially at a busy airport like Teterboro or any of the others along the east coast.

Mary McCarthy added that it was not that the FAA “won’t” but by statute they “cannot” make these changes.

Nancy Gross asked who mandated the statute?

Mary McCarthy responded that it was the Airport Noise and Capacity Act.

Maria Sheridan added that this was an act set by the U.S. Congress.

Nancy Gross further questioned if records were kept on the size, capacity, and number of passengers on the aircraft when the pilot submits a flight plan at Teterboro.

Maria Sheridan responded that not every aircraft is on an “instrument” flight plan, which means they would be required to file a plan with the FAA. Teterboro can accept visual arrivals, which means that pilots would not be required to file a flight plan. Teterboro Airport is a “general aviation” airport, which means we don’t have the same requirements that a commercial service airports with commercial aircraft would have to follow and we are not required to maintain passenger lists for flights.

Nancy Gross commented that this means that basically anyone could land if they call ahead and obtain clearance and no body checks who is coming off the aircraft. She observed that it was “like driving a car”.

Maria Sheridan responded that yes, this was correct. General Aviation flights can be like driving your car the only difference is that international arrivals would have to be cleared by Customs and Border Protection as they would for any international arrival at any other airport.

Nancy Gross then asked if moving the runway would have any impact? She realized that this would be an impossible expense but wondered if this were possible to do would it make a difference to the approach path.

Maria Sheridan commented that the runway alignment was based on prevailing winds.

James Schultz added that, as mentioned earlier in his presentation, the runway usage was based on three factors which are (1) runway availability, (2) wind and weather, and (3) operational efficiency and then noise considerations. The main factor is the flow. All the runways for the different airports have to line up because of how close they are to each other, and they all have to be on the same flow.

James Schultz thanked everyone for their time and advised the group that he had to leave the meeting at this point but that David Siewert, FAA Air Traffic Manager of JFK Airport, would be available to answer any further questions from the group.

Maria Sheridan thanked James Schultz for attending tonight.

John Ruocco, Mayor of Hillsdale, commented that he understood the complexity of the issue and appreciated the fact that we live in a dense area and that we cannot compromise safety, but he observed that the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach was not working. He wanted to know if the FAA could explore creating one or two other approaches to the airport, or perhaps look into rotating the approaches of planes as they come in from the north so that one town is not hit with the volume constantly but only for a little while, such as for a month, then a different approach would be taken the next month, and the traffic volume would be move to a nearby town. He wanted to know if there could be a more equitable sharing of the problem.

Dave Siewert responded by reiterating the information presented earlier in the meeting by James Schultz when he described the basis for runway selection and how runways are utilized. Wind and weather are the primary safety consideration, along with the runway in use, and the approaches which line the aircraft up to the runway. The aircraft have to be aligned with the runway in use as they approach the airport. With regard to the use of the RNAV RWY 19 Offset approach, the complexity during times of mild to moderate traffic are busier so this approach would not be a viable option. Another thing that was discussed earlier was that pilots are reluctant to accept a different approach other than the approach that brings them straight in to the ILS for Runway 19. While sharing and dispersing aircraft and approaches and runway selection is a very good theory, the runway selection criteria as mentioned during James Schultz presentation will determine how the operation is going to go.

Mayor Ruocco questioned if it were possible for the bulk of the planes to follow a broader approach and then as they get closer to the airport to combine into a more common stream, but at least for the towns north of Hackensack, to allowing wider dispersion of the approach route to share the problem more broadly and eliminates some of the complaints.

Dave Siewert responded that the flight paths were based on wind and weather which change constantly and does not allow for a predictable pattern. Just a line of thunderstorms, for instance, can change a runway selection based on the wind and weather and the operational efficiency considerations. Those are the driving factors of where the airplanes have to be. In addition, when aircraft are coming in to land, they have to line up to the runway visually as soon as they can. As far as dispersing, as Mr. Schultz explained, we have three airports all attempting to arrive aircraft into their airports at the same time and in the same air space.

Mayor Ruocco responded that he does not see the complexity of the issue. To him it seems like there are limited runways and we have the options of a multitude of approaches and if we could settle on a couple of other approaches to those runways and rotate them so that in any given month the majority of planes are going to go on a particular approach then switch to another approach the next month. This was his take on things.

Dave Siewert sympathized and wished it was that easy and that simple. If it were, all the major airports would be doing it. Unfortunately, things are not that simple and again the determining factors start with wind and weather and then go through efficiency. It is the science of aerodynamics and flying and how airplanes have to be lined up and the ATC separation criteria. ATC radar controllers work very hard to maintain a safe separation standard and apply it for the safety of everyone in the skies. If something as easily as what Mayor Ruocco suggests could be done it would have been done by now.

Vicki Cohen, a Hackensack resident, commented that she lives on Summit Avenue and observed that on a Sunday afternoon, as she stood outside her home, loud planes fly past overhead just about every two minutes. She described this as an “environmental justice” issue since it was causing both noise and air pollution for residents. She wanted to know who was in charge who would be able to make changes. She further asked if it was necessary to get politicians involved to lobby for legislative change. She observed that there were always ways to get around something and that change was needed to address these serious environmental justice issues. She further questioned whether or not a task force made of up residents had been established to address this situation and propose solutions.

Mary McCarthy responded that the FAA Administrator was in charge of air space and that the community-based task force was the purpose of the TANAAC committee.

Vicki Cohen further observed then it would have to be politicians, such as the Governor Murphy’s office, who would then deal with the FAA. She felt that there needs to be community activism and involvement by politicians at this point in time since the quality of life in her area was not good.

Kathy Canestrino observed that when she looked at Gabe Andino's presentation of airport statistics from tonight's slide presentation there were almost 83,000 movements coming out of Teterboro from January to June. The number of jets was 72,000 or 87% of flights coming out of Teterboro was jet traffic. She observed that she has lived in her house for almost 50 years and Teterboro was never originally designed to handle this amount of traffic volume. She wanted to know how they work to keep a better control over smaller airports like Teterboro so that they keep to the original intended use of the airport. She questioned if someone at the FAA could reach out to those above them and find out who could make these changes being requested. She observed that in 1999 when the FAA first implemented the ILS into Teterboro there were only 100,000 movements a year of jet traffic. Now it is up to 144,000 movements which is a 40% increase over those years, which is a huge difference. She further observed that if there cannot be an alternate approach because of the air traffic complexity in the area, then we have to look at limitations and if it is the law that is preventing it then we have to look at how to change the law. As TANAAC members she felt they should look to the FAA to help them. She felt that there were health implications to the high daily decibel levels being experienced by residents. She appealed to the FAA for help in providing information on who they have to appeal to so that they can get the rules changed and to help get the bigger, noisier aircraft out of Teterboro and diverted to larger airports like Newark. We cannot leave this with no next steps and nothing else to be done.

Mary McCarthy responded that the Airport Noise and Capacity Act implemented regulations and provide for some ability to create noise restrictions at an airport. If the airport sponsor, which would be the Port Authority, undertakes that kind of an analysis there is a possibility that restrictions could be imposed.

Kathy Canestrino thanked her and requested that Teterboro Airport figure out how to do this. To use the data that is being collected by the Teterboro Noise Office and analyze it to figure out what has to be done to make this happen. She stressed that Hackensack residents cannot live under these conditions any longer and anything that can be done to give them a chance of a successful solution they would like to pursue, especially since the alternate approach which was supposed to help is obviously not working. She sincerely thanked everyone for their help.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **TANAAC Membership Request**

Maria introduced the final agenda item for the night which was the membership request that was before the committee. She passed the meeting over to Co-Chairperson from Rutherford, Paul Griffo to address the request.

Paul Griffo observed that they had a couple of requests to increase the number of towns allowed as members in TANAAC. The answer has to come from the mayors since they make-up the voting members of TANAAC and this change would involve altering the TANAAC bylaws which would require a majority vote. Paul explained that in order to get an idea of where the town Mayors stood on this issue, he sent out a invitation to the mayors of TANAAC requesting a meeting. Unfortunately, he had no response to his request. Knowing that Mayors of towns are normally very busy people he followed this up with an email to town administrators requesting that they contact their mayors about a meeting, and he provided a date and time for the meeting. He had a response from 5 towns. Paul set up a meeting with these 5 towns to discuss the request and get an idea of where the mayors of these towns stood on the issue. Unfortunately, only Rochelle Park showed up to the meeting. He did receive an email from Little Ferry who provided their opinion which was, "that at this time they would not recommend changing the membership of the TANAAC committee".

Rochelle Park felt the same way, that “we would change the very nature of TANAAC to have other towns represented”. As the representative for Rutherford, Paul said he feels the same way. The committee hasn’t received enough of a response from the mayors of the other towns to get a sense of where they stand on the idea. For the time being it is an issue that cannot be addressed until more TANAAC members respond.

Mayor Carlos Rendo requested a list of towns that participate in TANAAC so that they can contact these mayors themselves. The Pascack Valley Mayors Association would reach out to those mayors and get them on board with this issue.

Paul Griffo was concerned about the benefits of contacting the mayor until the committee could meet in an open discussion about this issue.

Mayor Rendo insisted that they could contact those mayors and lobby them on this issue of membership.

Paul Griffo said he already did that and received no response.

Mayor Rendo replied that he could get a response. He requested a way to obtain this list.

Paul Griffo explained that it was public knowledge who the mayors are.

Mayor Rendo again requested to be provided with a list of the towns and mayors who make up the TANAAC committee and said he would contact the mayors themselves.

Maria Sheridan explained that the bylaws state that “any municipality within a five-mile radius of the airport are eligible to be members.” Not all of these municipalities have taken up the opportunity to do so. That is the jurisdiction of the current bylaws.

Mayor Rendo explained that they will find on the bylaws who the active member of TANAAC are.

Maria Sheridan explained that Gabe Andino would put the link to the TANAAC bylaws in the chat and that the bylaws state who the member towns are. It is information in the public domain and can be found under a search for TANAAC bylaws.

The links are listed here:

<https://aircraftnoise.panynj.gov/tanaac-membership/>

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

Mayor Rendo asked Gabe Andino to email him the links.

Gabe Andino replied that he would post it in the chat and also email the information to Mayor Rendo.

Paul Griffo reiterated that any changes to the bylaws would have to be discussed among the mayors of the TANAAC committee first and then a vote would be made. They would still have to have another meeting of the mayors of TANAAC committee towns to discussion this issue and to vote.

Mayor John Ruocco mentioned that the names of the member towns were on the TANAAC website.

Mayor Rendo mentioned that the next time that they had a meeting of the Pascack Valley Mayors association they would plan among themselves on how to contact the TANAAC towns and lobby them on the issue of membership. They would request that the member towns of TANAAC get together on their own for a special meeting of the TANAAC mayors and vote on the issue.

Paul Griffo commented that he was sympathetic to the problem, but he fears that if we allow this group of mayors from the north to send a representative to TANAAC there will be another set of towns requesting the same thing perhaps from south of the airport. Then we will have lots of extra towns, which may not be bad, but it could lead to a problem of “I don’t want it over my house I want it over your house” kind of thing. The whole nature of TANAAC itself will be changed and probably not for the best. It is a regional problem. People in Rutherford have the same quality of life issues that other towns have except that the planes are much lower over towns in this area nearer to the airport. Paul further stated that he is trying to understand the magnitude of the problem because TANAAC does not have the ability to do much of anything except stop a louder airplane from coming into the airport and they do this by using the noise monitors that were set up by Senator Torricelli when he was running for his first house seat and Representative Rothman. Without the noise monitoring there would be no TANAAC at all. Paul went on to say he feels we should be very careful in understanding these issues before making any changes to the structure of TANAAC.

Roy Luyster, representative from Rochelle Park, commented that they should set up the meeting as soon as possible to get this resolved. He requested that they try to make it as an in-person meeting. He commented that he has Newark flights going over his house, Teterboro flights coming over and helicopters coming over from the nearby HUMC hospital. He went on to say that the people up north only have arrival traffic which was higher up in their area. He feels the air space is being managed perfectly and that we don’t need any change in complexity or safety at the moment. Aircraft noise is going down because of better engines on aircraft. The height and spacing of aircraft is important. He went on to say that what the representative from air traffic control said earlier was correct. Everyone has been doing a good job and Rochelle Park has seen changes being done. He indicated that he is willing to help in any way he can.

Kathy Canestrino observed as Deputy Mayor of Hackensack she normally stands in for the mayor and asked if Paul Griffo was okay with her standing in for the Mayor of Hackensack for the vote or if it had to be the mayor himself.

Paul Griffo said it had to be a vote from the Mayor of Hackensack himself.

Kathy Canestrino said she would make sure he received the information and attended the meeting.

Warren Feldman stated that he had the pleasure and the honor to work with Kathy Canestrino on this committee. He appreciated her reasonable and business-like approach to the problems that affect everyone including the interest of those in the air as well as those on the ground. He expressed his condolences to Kathy on the loss of her mother who passed yesterday just a few days prior to her 104<sup>th</sup> birthday.

Maria Sheridan also expressed her condolences.

## **CLOSING REMARKS**

Maria Sheridan thanked everyone for attending tonight’s meeting. With no other business to come before the committee, Maria Sheridan adjourned the meeting at 8:02PM. The next TANAAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 26<sup>th</sup>.