

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

## **SUMMARY OF MEETING – 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2022**

**Virtual Meeting**

**October 26, 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
Ralph Tamburro, Program Manager	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Juan Rojas, Government and Community Relations Representative	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
Mary M. McCarthy, FAA NYAPIO Director	FAA
Veda L Simmons, Community Engagement Officer	FAA
Paul Griffo - TANAAC Co-Chair	Borough of Rutherford
Deputy Mayor Kathy Canestrino	City of Hackensack
Ron Kistner, Councilperson	Borough of Hasbrouck Heights
Mayor John Ruocco	Borough of Hillsdale
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 Carlos Rendo	Borough of Woodcliff Lake
Councilmember Jacquie Gadaleta	Borough of Woodcliff Lake
Peter Kortright III	Bergen County Government
David Belastock	Teterboro Users Group
Joseph Dickinson	Teterboro Users Group
Alex Gertsen	NBAA
Shay Battle (Congressman Josh Gottheimer)	NJ 5 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District
Janet Aponte-Page	Guest
Marylou Bongiorno	Guest
John Brown	Guest - Maywood
Byron Clark	Guest – Newark Happenings
Mario Cotumaccio	Guest – North Haledon
Michelle Covello	Guest
Kelly Epstein	Guest
Warren Feldman	Guest – Woodcliff Lake
Gregory Gasperino	Guest
Neil Giovanniello	Guest
Kerry Goldsack	Guest
Audrey Herget	Guest
Steve Hinden	Guest
Mario Kotchimoto	Guest
Don Lakin	Guest
Tina Latronico	Guest - Hilldale

Calvin Martin  
Andriette Mathews  
Chris McDermott  
Orlando Mikell  
Liz Mikre  
Charles Montefusco  
Ray Montanero  
Jeff Morgan  
George Muller  
Lori O'Donnell  
Pascack Press  
Pat Pes  
Diane Picyk  
Edward Pikulski  
Benjamin Pollack  
Richard Prashad  
Chuck Pugz  
Marc Schneider  
Don Sheridan  
Mary Ellen Stickel  
H. Barnett  
K. Surak  
Prof. Tony  
Leo  
Leslie  
LN  
Rick N  
Jamie  
Christina  
Frank Decandia  
201-694-7638  
201-647-1367  
201-913-3022  
732-593-9402

Guest  
Guest - Hillsdale  
Guest  
Guest - Emerson  
Guest – FHCA  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest – FHCA/EAC  
Guest – Little Ferry  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest – Beanstalk New York  
Guest - Emerson  
Guest – Township of Washington  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest – Borough of Rutherford  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest  
Guest

**TANAAC – 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2022**  
**Teterboro Airport**  
**October 26, 2022 – 6PM**  
**Virtual Meeting**  
**Minutes Summary**

Maria Sheridan, Manager, Teterboro Airport and TANAAC Co-Chairperson, welcomed the committee members and guests to the meeting. She reviewed some meeting housekeeping protocols prior to the start of the meeting.

Maria Sheridan turned the meeting over to Paul Griffo, TANAAC Chairperson & Representative from the Borough of Rutherford. Paul Griffo welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for coming.

**NEW BUSINESS**

At this point Gabe Andino, Manager, Teterboro Airport Noise Abatement & Environmental Compliance Office, brought up the slide presentation and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

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

Scott Marsh provided the following operations report for the airport:

- Runway 6/24 Rehabilitation - The scope of work for this project included resurfacing the runway and upgrading the lighting system to LED lights.
  - Hours of Work/Staging are as follows:
    - Runway 6/24 Overnight Closures
      - Sunday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday 10:30PM to 6:30AM the following morning
      - Monday 10:30PM to 8:30AM Tuesday
    - Runway 6/24 Weekend closures
      - Saturday and Sunday 10:00PM the night before to 12:00Noon

These closures will be finishing soon since the project is nearing completion.
- FAA Construction ATCT – The FAA is in the process of constructing a new Air Traffic Control Tower at the airport.
  - Construction continues and is moving ahead on schedule. The new ATCT should be fully operational by the Fall of 2024.

Scott Marsh then turned the meeting back over to Gabe Andino.

Gabe Andino introduced Veda Simmons, FAA Community Engagement Officer for an FAA report.

Veda Simmons introduced Mary McCarthy, FAA acting Director of the New York Area Program Integration Office (NYAPIO), who provided a briefing on the FAA Airport Noise & Capacity Act.

Mary McCarthy provided some history on the FAA Airport Noise & Capacity Act – Title 14 CFR – Part 161- Notice of Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions as summarized here:

- In 1969 the FAA began regulating aircraft noise by establishing design standards for new civil aircraft. Later they applied those standards to all newly manufactured aircraft.
- In 1979 Congress passed the *Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act* which established the *FAA Part 150 Program* and required the FAA to establish a single system for measuring noise:
  - The system was required to have a single process for determining exposure of people to noise resulting from airport operations and to identify land uses normally compatible with various levels of noise exposure.
- By January 1, 1985 only Stage 2 aircraft were allowed to fly in US airspace. The loudest aircraft, Stage 1 or un-staged aircraft, were all phased out by January 1<sup>st</sup> of 1985.
- In 1990 *The Airport Noise & Capacity Act (ANCA)* was passed by Congress:
  - ANCA applies to all public airports, regardless of their grant status, and provides for a national noise policy that takes into account local concerns with a two-part approach to noise.
  - Part One provided for the phase-out of larger Stage 2 aircraft by January 1, 2000. Stage 2 aircraft weighing less than 75,000 lbs. were still allowed to operate.
    - Phase out of all Stage 2 aircraft was completed by December 31, 2015 under the *FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012*.
  - Part Two established guidelines to prevent the development of a patchwork of regulations relating to airport access. It created a process that airports had to follow in order to impose access restrictions. These guidelines allowed for different provisions based on Stage 2 or Stage 3 or greater aircraft.
    - Restrictions on Stage 2 aircraft were allowed to be imposed by the airport after publishing the proposed restriction(s) and supporting documentation for 180 days and taking in and resolving comments on the proposed restriction(s). *After December 2015 this provision became obsolete due to the phase out (with limited exceptions) of all Stage 2 aircraft in US airspace.*
    - Restrictions on Stage 3 or greater aircraft were broken into two types. (1) *Restriction by voluntary agreement* and (2) *Restriction by approval of the FAA*.
    - Restrictions that were in effect prior to October 1, 1990 were grandfathered and any amendments to these grandfathered restrictions (that would reduce or limit airport operations) are subject to ANCA.
      - The following restrictions are covered by ANCA:
        - Any restriction on noise levels either single event or cumulative.
        - A noise budget for the airport.
        - Any limit on the total number of operations.
        - Any restrictions on the hours of operation for an airport.
        - Any airport use charges that have the effect of controlling airport noise.
        - Any other restrictions such as local ordinances or lease restrictions.

- The following areas are **not** subject to ANCA:
  - Operational procedures that have to be submitted to the FAA for adoption.
  - Types of noise abatement procedures.
  - Preferential runway use programs.
  - Procedures such as taxiing/engine run up restrictions unless they impact the total number of operations at the airport.
  
- If airport operators propose restrictions, the proposed restriction must meet all of the following criteria:
  - *Restrictions by Voluntary Agreement:*
    - The restriction(s) have to be in writing.
    - The restriction(s) must be agreed to by the airport proprietor and **all** operators at the airport including any announced new entrants to the facility.
    - The restriction(s) must include a statement of the need for and the goal of the restriction.
    - The FAA must be informed of the agreement.
    - An opportunity to comment must be giving to the airport operator, announced to new entrants, to the public, and to local governments.
    - A voluntary agreement can only be implemented for the signatories to that agreement.
    - Voluntary agreements are not well suited to General Aviation (GA) airports due to the itinerant nature of operators at GA airports.
  
  - *Restrictions by Approval of the FAA* - If a voluntary agreement cannot be reached, the airport operator can submit a request for the restriction(s) to be approved by the FAA. In order for a request for restriction(s) to be approval by the FAA **all** of the following criteria must be met and accepted by the FAA:
    - The airport operator must provide notice of the restriction and give an opportunity to comment to all airport users and the public.
    - The airport operator must provide an analysis that demonstrates compliance with **all** of the FAA's six statutory conditions for approval. The analysis must use sound and noise in accordance with 14 CFR- Part 150 and identify compatible and non-compatible areas.
      - The six FAA statutory conditions are as follows:
        - 1. The proposed restriction must be reasonable, not arbitrary, and not discriminatory. In order to show this, the airport operator must provide evidence that the current problem exists at the airport and that the proposed action could relieve that issue and be cost effective. It must provide evidence that the noise or access standards are the same for all aviation users and classes and/or that the differences are justified.

- 2. Not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce.
  - 3. Maintain safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace.
  - 4. Not conflict with any existing Federal statute or regulation.
  - 5. Provide adequate opportunity for public comment of at least 45 days.
  - 6. Not create an undue burden on the national aviation system.
- The burden of proof for the FAA statutory conditions is on the airport operator and has to be approved by the FAA.
  - Additional details regarding information required to demonstrate how each FAA statutory condition is met as required under FAA -14 CFR -161.05 can be found at the following link:

[https://www.faa.gov/airports/environment/airport\\_noise/part\\_161](https://www.faa.gov/airports/environment/airport_noise/part_161)

- All of these conditions must be met, or the restriction will not be approved by the FAA.
- In addition, the FAA has provisions in place to revisit and reconsider any previously approved restrictions based on changed circumstances.
- Sponsors imposing any restriction(s) not approved by the FAA or imposing a provision of an existing agreement on a non-signatory to that agreement, become ineligible for airport improvement, project funds and passenger facility charges.

At this point Mary McCarthy opened up the floor for follow up questions on the Part 161 briefing she just gave.

Don Sheridan, a resident of the Borough of Emerson, asked about what methods were being used to measure aircraft noise. Specifically, he wanted to know how to determine if the pilots were following flight plans, and how success was measured.

Ms. McCarthy responded that pilots do not always have to strictly follow a flight plan. In some cases, for example, a pilot may be instructed to deviate from a flight plan by Air Traffic Control.

Mr. Sheridan followed up by saying that he felt that something had changed in his area over the last 3 years. He went on to say that he has lived in his house for over 30 years, and it is only in the last few years that he has experienced an increase in issues and that it had gotten to the point where his “windows rattled”. He wanted to know if pilots were deviating from flight paths more now than in the past or if anything had changed with regard to flight paths.

Mary McCarthy responded that if Mr. Sheridan felt that the pilots were deviating from FAA regulations then he should be speaking with the *Flight Standards District Office*, and they would investigate the issue.

Veda Simmons, FAA Engagement Officer, put the following links into the chat:

[https://www.faa.gov/about/office\\_org/headquarters\\_offices/ara/eastern/noise\\_complaint](https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ara/eastern/noise_complaint)  
Eastern Region Aircraft Noise and Community Engagement Information

[https://www.faa.gov/about/office\\_org/field\\_offices/fsdo/](https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/field_offices/fsdo/)  
Flight Standards District Offices (FSDO)

Mario Cotumaccio, a resident of the Borough of North Haledon, followed-up by saying that he also was experiencing an increase in aircraft related issues in his community. He wanted to know who he could contact to file a complaint.

Ms. McCarthy advised that if it is a safety issue, he should contact the *Flight Standards District Offices (FSDO)*, if it is a noise issue then he should contact the *Port Authority*.

Mr. Andino explained that the Teterboro Noise Abatement Office would follow up with Mr. Cotumaccio to assist him with his concerns.

Cathy Canestrino, Deputy Mayor of Hackensack, observed that the data she had available seemed to indicate that the same type of aircraft were responsible for the majority of the noise complaints. She floated the idea of analyzing the data to see which aircraft were generating the most noise and then working with operators to limit flights for those type of aircraft into Teterboro. She also requested that the Airport commit to performing a data analysis to determine the noisiest type of aircraft coming into Teterboro Airport

Ms. McCarthy observed that aircraft operators would have to agree to restrict aircraft voluntarily. Any type of enforcement by the airport would have to go through the ANCA process.

Mr. Andino explained that they already track data comparing type of aircraft to the number of complaints received. The data shows a slight correlation between some aircraft type and noise complaints. Fortunately, overall aircraft are quieter today especially since Stage 2 aircraft were eliminated in US airspace. To try to seek voluntary restriction based on aircraft type at Teterboro would not be feasible especially since all aircraft flying in to Teterboro meet the FAA's criteria for noise for Stage 3 and Stage 4 aircraft. In addition, these type of aircraft fly to airports all over the country not just to Teterboro. He explained that other measures to mitigate noise might be more productive such as mitigation measures proposed in the Part 150 Study Plan that is currently pending final approval with the FAA

Kerry Goldsack, an upper Bergen County resident, said she had filed multiple complaints to her community leaders about aircraft noise and volume. She was concerned about the increase in the number of aircraft over her community and she felt that "something needed to be done about it".

Audrey Herget, an upper Bergen County resident, agreed with the statements made by Ms. Goldsack. She added that "people in the planes should not be a priority over people on the ground". She asked if the "Route 17 corridor route" could eliminate some of this and she questioned why it was not being enforced.

Ms. McCarthy clarified that Ms. Herget was speaking about the Runway 19 Offset Approach (referred to as the Alternate Approach) and responded that the issue with the use of this approach is that pilots are not necessarily comfortable with flying close to the WABC radio tower that is along the route. She went on to say that the FAA cannot mandate that a pilot use a particular procedure. If they don't feel comfortable flying a particular procedure, they are free to request a different procedure.

Ms. Herget went on to question why the FAA would approve a route that pilots did not consider safe to use.

Ms. McCarthy countered that the route is safe, and its use is based on a risk assessment judgement by the pilot.

Maria Sheridan, Airport Manager for Teterboro Airport, explained that at the last TANAAC meeting Jim Shultz of the FAA, described all the complexity involved with the routes in this area. It was made clear at that meeting that the volume of aircraft, especially during the daytime hours, was not conducive to the use of that offset approach. Safety is always the top priority and ATC has to keep aircraft on the straight in approach to Runway 19 during the day due to traffic volume, air space complexity, and ATC workload during those times. These issues of complexity are the biggest obstacles to the use of the Runway 19 Alternate Approach during daytime hours. More so than a pilot's desire not to use it.

At this point Mr. Andino reminded everyone that they had a time constraint and needed to keep the meeting moving. He advised everyone to hold off on questions about use of the Runway 19 Alternate Approach since they would be addressed later in the meeting. He then proceeded to request that the rest of the questions for this part of the meeting focus on those about The Airport Noise & Capacity Act (ANCA) presentation.

The meeting continued with questions from the public.

John Brown, resident of Maywood, questioned if it were possible to use economic restrictions, such as increased landing fees, to reduce traffic to Teterboro.

Ms. McCarthy replied that if fees are used, they must go through the ANCA process.

Antoinette Matthews, a local resident, questioned what the ANCA application process consisted of and asked if a template could be obtained.

Ms. McCarthy explained that there is no template and no application process is involved. She clarified that the ANCA process is more of an analysis of data. She advised Ms. Matthews to go to the FAA website under *14 CFR Part 161* to find additional information on the process.

At this point Mr. Andino ended the public question and answer period and showed a brief FAA informational video which explained how the airspace around the Northern New Jersey area, especially Teterboro Airport worked.

Veda Simmons further added that the video was part of a New York/New Jersey airspace series created by the FAA to provide a simple explanation of the complexity of the air space around Teterboro Airport and the surrounding area.

The video can be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aABkyisIONU>

Following the video Mr. Andino continued the meeting by provided a Statistical Report for January 2022 to September 2022 as summarized below:

Aircraft Movements:

The airport had a total of 120,897 movements during the period of January to September 2022. This reflected a 25.77% increase in movements over last year. Traffic movements are now more in-line with pre-pandemic numbers. 6,096 of these movements were between the hours of 11:00PM and 6:00AM. Nighttime flights made up 5.04% of total movements.



### Runway Utilization:

The most utilized runway for arrivals was Runway 19 with 56.77% of arriving flights using this runway. The most utilized runway for departures was Runway 24 with 59.99% of departing flights using this runway.

### Helicopter Routes

The southern route to and from Manhattan was the primary helicopter route used for 76.12% of arrivals and 81.12% of departures. The remaining 3 routes accounted for less than 25% of arrivals and 22% of departures combined.

### RNAV (GPS) X Runway 19 Offset Approach

*Runway 19 Arrivals: 24 Hours* – During the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter of 2022 we had a total of 11,686 total arrivals. 443 of them utilized the offset approach. This was an overall usage of 3.79%, which was a 2.11% increase in utilization over a 24-hour period from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter of 2022.

*Runway 19 Arrivals: 10:00PM – 9:00AM* – We had 1,146 arrivals during the nighttime hours. 433 of them utilized the offset approach. This reflects a usage of 37.78% during nighttime hours. This is a 22.73% increase in nighttime utilization from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter of 2022.

The Runway 19 Offset approach has been seeing a steady increasing in usage during nighttime hours over the past quarter.

### Noise Violations:

The airport had a total of 39 first time violations and 3 second time violation. Aircraft with three violations have the potential to be banned from landing at Teterboro Airport.

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

RMS 101 – (7<sup>th</sup> & Berry Street in Carlstadt) – 57.1 decibels (-0.1)  
RMS 102 – (Hamilton Street in Hasbrouck Heights) – 35.9 decibels (-0.6)  
RMS 103 – (Prospect Ave – Hackensack) – 61.1 decibels (+0.8)  
RMS 104 – (Park Street – Hackensack) – 51.9 decibels (+0.3)  
RMS 105 – (Bogota High School) – 47.1 decibels (-0.3)  
RMS 106 – (Joseph Street – Moonachie) – 51.6 decibels (+1.0)  
RMS 109 – (Pascack Road – Woodcliff Lake) – 45.9 decibels

Noise levels were average in comparison to 2019 levels.

### Noise Complaints:

The airport received 60,872 total noise complaints during the period of January to September 2022 from 1,062 complainants. Third party applications logged 27,912 complaints from 55 callers.

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

Maywood had 23,781 complaints from 15 residents. (1 Maywood resident registered 23,567 of those complaints.) Hackensack had 5,622 complaints from 75 residents, Rutherford had 1,667 complaints from 46 residents, Teaneck had 600 complaints from 23 residents, and South Hackensack had 332 complaints from 6 residents.

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

Newark had 8,901 complaints from 9 residents. Washington Township had 7,386 complaints from 59 residents. Lyndhurst had 1,837 complaints from 15 residents. Upper Saddle River had 1,757 complaints from 69 residents, Woodcliff Lake had 1,378 complaints from 44 residents, Cresskill had 1,165 complaints from 36 residents and Mahwah had 1,145 complaints from 63 residents.

Noise Complaints – Nature of Disturbance:

The reason given for the majority of complaints was *Too Loud & Low* with 48,227. The second highest reason was *General Complaint/All Inclusive* with 5,995, *Too Loud* with 4,124, *Too Frequent* with 1,213, *Too Low* with 891, *Too Early or Late* with 373, and *Change in Flight Pattern* with 61.

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.

At this point Gabe opened the floor up for questions on airport statistics.

Mary Ellen Stickel, a resident of Washington Township, asked what the policy was for placement of a temporary noise monitor in residential areas.

Mr. Andino replied that they have a procedure for placement of a temporary portable noise monitor in areas not currently monitored by permanent monitors. Requests can be submitted to the Teterboro Airport Noise Abatement Office in writing by a town official.

Ms. Stickel went on to request an explanation on the meaning of “layering” of aircraft in the area. She was specifically interested with the layering of planes over the Washington Township area. She was concerned about the increase in the amount of aircraft in that area and the potential for more problems and worsening conditions in the future as airports expand to handle greater demand.

Mr. Andino explained that there are multiple layers of aircraft flying at different altitude in the airspace over the area for Teterboro, Newark, La Guardia, JFK, and Essex County airports. Currently flight procedures in place are primarily concerned with keeping these aircraft safe and separated because this is a very complex and busy airspace.

Don Sheridan asked about Teterboro Airport’s current capacity for aircraft volume and questioned if Teterboro was running at capacity at the moment. He also wondered if complaints were increasing because aircraft volume was going up.

Ms. Sheridan explained that Teterboro airport was currently well below capacity for what the Airport was designed to handle. Traffic volume is typically based on what air traffic control can handle at any given time. Holiday times will always see a bit more air traffic.

Mr. Andino explained that the mechanisms for filing noise complaints had gotten easier and were more readily available and in different forms than in the past. The increased number of complaints does not necessarily correlate to increased traffic volume. Currently, Teterboro Airport traffic volume was on-par with prior (pre-pandemic) years.

Ms. Sheridan went on to explain that Teterboro Airport is designed for the type of aircraft the airport is currently taking in. Teterboro Airport is federally obligated to accept these type of aircraft. In addition, as a General Aviation reliever airport, Teterboro is designed to accept General Aviation “*at will*” flights in order to reduce the number of these type of flights arriving to the commercial service airports in the area. In a free-market society, General Aviation pilots have the right to fly to any airport of their choice. Commercial service airports limit the amount of General Aviation flights coming into their airports thereby requiring an airport like Teterboro to accept the difference. Over the past 100 years of its operation Teterboro Airport’s job as a General Aviation reliever airport has been to take these flights away from the commercial service airports to help make those airports more efficient for the commercial airlines that cater to the general public.

From the time of its initial operations and to today, Teterboro airport continues to provide for the general aviation activity to and from this region. It is a vital part of the Federal Aviation System. Teterboro is fulfilling its obligation as a General Aviation reliever airport.

Ms. Stickel asked if Teterboro Airport was still the original size and shape that it was when it was first created.

Ms. Sheridan explained that Teterboro Airport originally had three runways and was reduced to two runways several decades ago. Teterboro Airport (along with all the airports in the area) changed their runway length when jet aircraft were developed in the 60’s and 70’s. The current configuration at Teterboro Airport has remained unchanged since then. Changes to the airspace in the area have been made, and continue to be made, by the FAA. The FAA is in charge of all airspace. Airspace means everything that takes place above the ground. The FAA regulate the operation of flight routes in to and out of all the airports in the region. The Port Authority and Teterboro Airport are limited and can only control what happens on the ground. This means making sure that grass is mowed, the runway and taxiway lights work, pavement markings and signs are clear and compliant with FAA standards. We also make sure that runway and taxiway pavement is in good condition. Teterboro Airport strives to maintain a safe takeoff and landing environment for all aircraft that utilize our airport.

With regard to current airport maintenance, Teterboro just concluded a project to rehabilitate one of our runways. This project did not alter the length of the runway in any way. It simply refreshed the pavement on that runway surface for a smooth and safe landing and take-off environment for aircraft and upgraded some of the lighting to LED.

Ms. Stickel followed up with one final question asking if the Port Authority has had to improve Teterboro airport to accept additional air traffic.

Ms. Sheridan explained that Teterboro is currently not experiencing any additional air traffic. Our operations are stable at around 170,000 per year. Overall operations were actually higher in the past when the FAA allowed for the operation of flight schools out of Teterboro Airport and training flights were flown in the area. When flight schools were removed from Teterboro Airport, overall operations actually went down. Traffic at Teterboro has basically remained consistent with the exception of the pandemic years when air traffic was greatly reduced.

Ms. Stickel asked what would Ms. Sheridan do if she was in the shoes of the residents of Bergen County who expressed their concerns at tonight’s meeting. What steps can they take as a community to help solve the problem and address quality of life concerns.

Ms. Sheridan responded that when it comes to volume of aircraft and use of the airport above the ground level, it really is in the hands of the FAA. Having the FAA at these TANAAC meetings is part of the

process to address issues. The current Part 150 study is an opportunity, taken by Teterboro Airport and the Port Authority, to communicate with the FAA about quality-of-life issues experienced by communities in the vicinity of Teterboro Airport and to provide opportunities to improve them. The FAA is set to finalize Teterboro Airport's noise compatibility plan early in 2023. The results will be presented at a future TANAAC meeting.

Ms. Sheridan went on to say that "The Port Authority and Teterboro Airport have to meet federal obligations to be a safe and secure facility. As part of this, the airport is in constant communication with the FAA on flight routes, on noise, on efficiency, on all the things that are concerning to our neighbors. Teterboro understands its role as the recipient of resident concerns and complaints. Even though we don't operate the airspace, we are the middle person along with TANAAC to bring these concerns to the attention of the FAA. We have staff that work with the FAA on these concerns, to look at routes and look at opportunities that may be out there for enhancements. There are no guarantees that changes can be made but we will keep having these conversations with the FAA. The video shown by Veda Simmons earlier in the meeting does a good job of explaining the complexity of the airspace in this region of the country."

At this point Mr. Andino opened the floor for questions.

George Muller, a Little Ferry resident, asked if there were any noise rules for helicopters. He was also concerned for safety as these helicopters appeared to fly low over people's houses at times.

Mr. Andino replied that helicopters are subject to the same noise rules as fixed wing aircraft. If they are above the decibel level limits allowed or flying too low, they are subject to violation. If a noise complaint is called in to the Teterboro Airport Noise Office, staff will look into it. The FAA – Flight Standards District Offices (FSDO) should be contacted if safety is involved.

Ms. Canestrino recalled that in 1999 the ILS was installed for Runway 19 at Teterboro Airport. It was her opinion that since then the amount of traffic at Teterboro Airport has increased dramatically. Her numbers showed that in 1999 Teterboro had 103,000 jet movements a year. Currently, total aircraft movements, including jet movements are approximately 170,000. She believes that pilots do not want to use the Alternate Flight path because it does not line up with the ILS approach. Her opinion is that there was a direct correlation between the increase in jet traffic and the installation of the ILS.

Ms. Canestrino went on to say that she was happy to see the 38% usage of the Alternate Approach at night but more needs to be done. She mentioned that the assistance of the NBAA over the past few months was helpful in advertising the Alternate Approach. In addition, she requested any data available as to the reasons why pilots chose to use the Alternate Approach over the past few months. She requested that the airport community and FAA try to help come up with a way to use the Alternate Approach during the day time hours as well.

Mr. Andino replied that he was also pleased with the increased nighttime usage of the approach. The Noise and Environmental Office has been doing a lot of outreach to the pilot community to encourage the use of the Alternate Approach. The approach is currently advertised on the airport's Automatic Terminal Information Service (ATIS) frequency by the FAA during night hours and is available for use upon request during the day. Presently airspace complexity prevents frequent use of this Alternative Approach during the day time hours.

Councilwoman Jackie Gadaleta, a resident of Woodcliff Lake, supported the comments made by residents during tonight's meeting and was happy about the increased usage of the Alternate Route at night and reiterated Ms. Canestrino comments.

## NEW BUSINESS

At this point Mr. Andino closed the floor to questions in order to present the next three discussion items on the agenda.

Mr. Andino provided a *14 CFR Part 150 Study* update as summarized here:

The 14 CFR Part 150 Study is currently with the FAA pending a final decision on approval/acceptance. The Teterboro Airport Noise Compatibility Plan portion of this study contains measures the FAA would need to take to address noise compatibility issues and noise exposure in areas outlined in the study. A decision by the FAA is expected to be released on or before January 2023. One element of the Noise Compatibility Plan that is being rolled out now is the Fly Quiet Program. This program involves the three major commercial airports (Newark, LaGuardia, Kennedy) in our area plus Teterboro Airport. Teterboro already has a Fly Quiet Program in place, therefore Teterboro's program will be enhanced under the new roll out plan. The other three airports will be rolling out the program for the first time. Implementation of this program is expected to commence on or about November 2023 or early 2024.

Mr. Andino continued with the discussion items by providing an update on the *Woodcliff Lake Portable Noise Monitor* results as follows:

A temporary portable noise monitor was set up in Woodcliff Lake (in an area approximately 11 miles from Teterboro Airport) to collect data on air traffic that passed over the Woodcliff Lake area on arrival to Teterboro Airport. This was done in response to noise complaints from residents of Woodcliff Lake and neighboring communities. The 1<sup>st</sup> month's data was presented as follows:

- The noise monitor tracked data on aircraft LDN - day/night - noise level. It was presented as two sources. Community Noise, which is any non-aircraft noise source such as vehicles, trains, lawn mowers etc., and Aircraft Noise. The data for the Woodcliff Lake noise monitor showed 45.4 DNL for Aircraft Noise. This is in contrast to the typical levels of 50 to 60 DNL which are picked up routinely by the permanent noise monitors located around Teterboro Airport. The FAA considers anything above 65 DNL to be non-compatible with airport operations.
- The data was further broken out by Single Events. Single Events are how loud each individual aircraft is as it flies over the monitored area. The measurement for this is called the LMAX (Maximum Sound Level) and is the highest sound level measured during a single noise event and is measured in decibels. Overall, during its 1st month of operation, the LMAX range went from 63 decibels to 76 decibels. The average was in the mid to high 60 decibel range as the plane flew over. (To put this in perspective the average lawn mower is 95 decibels, a washing machine or dishwasher is typically 70 decibels and normal conversational speaking is around 70 decibels.)
- Flights were also tracked to determine how busy the area was over the noise monitor during a typical single day. A sample day of September 13<sup>th</sup> was chosen to report on. During this day 315 departures and 311 arrivals pass over the monitor.
- Altitude was also tracked and the data shows that aircraft flew over the monitor area at 2,000 feet above ground level. This is consistent with the instrument procedure typically used for approaches and well within FAA acceptable altitude limits.

At this point Gabe passed the meeting over to Paul Griffo, TANAAC Co-Chair, to discuss the results of the vote on the membership request that was put before the TANAAC committee. The results are summarized as follows:

On October 19<sup>th</sup> mayors from ten TANAAC towns met at the Teterboro Airport Manager's Office conference room to consider a request brought before the TANAAC committee by the Pascack Valley Mayor's Association requesting that TANAAC alter its bylaws to allow membership to those communities outside of the 5-mile radius of Teterboro Airport. During this meeting the members voted unanimously to make *no changes* to the TANAAC bylaws and for TANAAC membership to remain limited to those communities within a 5-mile radius of Teterboro Airport. Paul went on to remind everyone that the TANAAC committee treats all towns with the same courtesy and level of concern that they treat towns that are voting members of TANAAC. All towns continue to be welcome to attend meetings and express their concerns.

At this point Mr. Andino opened the meeting to questions/comments:

Mayor Carlos Rendo of Woodcliff Lake expressed his disappointment with the decision on behalf of the Pascack Valley Mayors Association. He further went on to request data on traffic at Teterboro broken out to reflect totals for arrivals during the work week and for the weekend.

Mr. Andino replied that they would provide that data to Mayor Rendo.

Mayor Rendo thanked Mr. Andino and asked him to continue to push for the increased use of the Alternate Approach.

Frank Decandia, a resident from Rutherford, asked how they determined the placement of the permanent noise monitors.

Mr. Andino explained that sites were selected in the 80's. The monitors were very expensive so only six were placed. Four permanent monitors were placed off the runway ends. These serve a dual purpose which is to measure noise levels and report data and to enforce the noise violation program for departing traffic. Of the remaining two permanent monitors, one was placed in Hasbrouck Heights and the other was placed in Moonachie to capture data on arriving traffic at that time. Under the grandfather clause allowed to us by the FAA those permanent monitors must stay in their original locations. The airport can, and does, deploy temporary portable noise monitors to other locations upon request.

Mr. Griffo went on to request that a portable noise monitor be placed in Rutherford since they have received a larger number of noise complaints recently.

Mayor John Ruocco thanked Mr. Andino for the statistics and for the presentation. He also expressed disappointed in the decision by the TANAAC committee regarding the membership vote and asked the Noise Office to continue to push for the use of the Alternate Approach.

Mario Cotumaccio, a resident of North Haledon, asked if Newark airport offered a forum for residents to voice their complaints similar to the TANAAC at Teterboro. He also wanted to know how violation fines were issued. He asked if the Alternate Approach being discussed was the RNAV route over Route 17 and if noise would then be pushed over to other areas and towns.

Mr. Andino said he was not aware if Newark Airport had any program similar to TANAAC, but he would look into this and let Mr. Cotumaccio know. Mr. Andino explained that fines are not issued, however, if an

aircraft departs Teterboro and exceeds the noise limits for that time of day and runway location they would receive a written violation notice. Any aircraft that receives three violations notices has the potential to be permanently banned from landing at Teterboro Airport. Mr. Andino explained that yes, if a flight route is moved (such as for the Alternate Approach) then the area impacted would be shifted as well. He stipulated that before a path is determined a study is done on the impact of aircraft noise in an area.

## **CLOSING REMARKS**

Ms. Sheridan thanked everyone for attending tonight's meeting and expressed her appreciation for the varied ideas discussed. Mr. Griffo also thanked everyone present and expressed his opinion that there was a lot of work to be done.

The next TANAAC meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, January 25, 2023**.

With no further business to come before the committee the meeting was closed by Ms. Sheridan at 8:11PM.