



**AVIATION DEPARTMENT - Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport**  
320 Terminal Drive, Suite 200 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33315 • 954-359-6100

February 25, 2022

**SUBJECT: THE BROWARD COUNTY AVIATION DEPARTMENT  
AIRPORT NOISE ABATEMENT COMMITTEE (ANAC) MEETING**

Dear County Commissioners / City Officials / ANAC Members / Airport Community,

Enclosed please find a copy of the meeting minutes from the last ANAC meeting held on December 13, 2021, along with an agenda for the next ANAC meeting scheduled for **March 14, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.**

Due to continued concerns related to social distancing and public interaction surrounding COVID-19, the Broward County Aviation Department will be hosting the March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting via the Webex Conference System. Meeting details are as follows:

**VIA WEBEX**

Click [here](#) to join the meeting

**Meeting number (access code): 2634 521 1510**

**Meeting password: 8anVcuSZF36 (82682879 from phones and video systems)**

**Or join by phone:**

**1-650-479-3208, Access code: 2634 521 1510**

Please feel free to contact me at (954) 359-6181 or at [wcannicle@broward.org](mailto:wcannicle@broward.org) should you have any questions, or visit the Aviation Department's website at [www.fll.net](http://www.fll.net) for more information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W. Cannicle", is written over a light blue circular stamp.

annicle

Environmental Program Manager  
Broward County Aviation Department



**AVIATION DEPARTMENT - Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport**  
320 Terminal Drive, Suite 200 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33315 • 954-359-6100

## **A G E N D A**

### **FORT LAUDERDALE - HOLLYWOOD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIRPORT NOISE ABATEMENT COMMITTEE**

**March 14, 2022**

**6:00 p.m.**

#### **VIA WEBEX**

**Click [here](#) to join the meeting**

**Meeting number (access code): 2634 521 1510**

**Meeting password: 8anVcuSZF36 (82682879 from phones and video systems)**

**Or join by phone:**

**1-650-479-3208, Access code: 2634 521 1510**

1. Welcome  
BCAD Staff
2. Approval of Minutes – December 13, 2021, Meeting  
ANAC Chairperson
3. Noise Office & ANAC Update  
BCAD Staff
4. Updates on the 2018 Reauthorization Act  
HMMH
5. Committee /Citizen Comments
6. Next meeting – Monday, June 13, 2022

**Please contact Quest Marketing and Communications (954) 699-3556 to RSVP**

Fort Lauderdale – Hollywood International Airport  
 Airport Noise Abatement Committee  
 December 13, 2021, Meeting Minutes

**DATE:** Monday, December 13, 2021, 6:00 p.m.

**LOCATION:** Via Webex

**Cumulative Meeting Attendance (10/01/2008 – 12/13/2021)**

<b>Committee Member (Organization Represented):</b>	<b>Present/Absent:</b>	<b>Present:</b>	<b>Absent:</b>
Carlos Jose (RMT#1)	A	1	2
Gary Luedtke (RMT#2)	P	47	4
Randy Wright (RMT#2 Alt.) Appointed December 2013	A	16	15
Patricia Wright (RMT#3) Appointed December 2013	A	16	15
Micheline Peacock (RMT#4) Appointed June 2015	A	13	12
Rae Sandler (RMT#5)	A	32	18
Dean Harley (RMT#5 Alt.) Appointed September 2019	A	1	7
Tom Gongola (RMT#6) Appointed Mar 2017	A	3	15
Alan Scharf (RMT#6 Alt.) Appointed December 2016	A	2	17
Richard “Dick” Cahoon (RMT #8) Appointed June 2017	P	15	3
Terry Richter (RMT #8 Alt.) Appointed June 2017	P	3	4
Geoff Rames (RMT#8 Alt.) Appointed June 2019	P	10	0
Arthur Joseph (RMT#9)	A	0	3
Debra Van Valkenburgh (RMT#10)	A	28	22
Richard Reasoner (RMT#10 Alt.)	A	45	5
Eric Ram (RMT#11) Appointed Mar 2017	P	15	4
Frank Derisi (RMT#11 Alt.) Appointed March 2015	A	12	14
Jet Blue Representative (*Michael Miles, 9/18)	A	9	41
US Airways Representative	A	3	48
Spirit Airlines Representative (*Matt Nelson, 12/13)	A	12	38
FBO Representative	A	3	47
Southwest Airlines Representative	A	1	49
Delta Airlines Representative	A	5	45
FAA ATCT Representative (Luis R. Colon)	P	9	45
<i>Ernie Siegrist (RMT#1) Resigned September 2019</i>	-	-	-
<i>Duncan Bossle (RMT#9) Resigned June 2019</i>	-	-	-

RMT = Representative for neighborhood containing the identified Remote Monitoring Terminal

Alt. = Alternate RMT representative

\*Designates newly appointed representative

**Airport/County Staff**

Winston Cannicle – BCAD, Mishka Binns – BCAD

Fort Lauderdale – Hollywood International Airport  
Airport Noise Abatement Committee  
December 13, 2021, Meeting Minutes

**Visitors**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency/Affiliation</b>
Michael O’Harra	FAA Regional Administrator
Pearlis Johnson	FAA Deputy Administrator
Don Ellington	FAA
Jim Arrighi	Metroplex National Projects Manager
Christian Karns	Florida Metroplex Co-Lead
Vicki Turner	Florida Metroplex Co-Lead
Brian Crow	Florida Metroplex Support
John Bacavis	Florida Metroplex Support
Rick Reed	Florida Metroplex Support
Matt Felton	Community Engagement Officer
Rhea Hanrahan	HMMH
Luis Colon	MIA/ATCT
Rick	MIA/ATCT
Rafael Vega	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport (FLL)
Earl Prizlee	Public
Jason Franzel	Public
Jay	Public
Leona	Public
Martin Pilote	Public
Carol Dunning	Public

**1. WELCOME**

Winston Cannicle called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 13, 2021, MEETING**

Eric Ram requested a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting. Geoff Rames made the motion to approve; Richard Cahoon seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

**3. FAA METROPLEX UPDATE**

Michael O’Harra introduced the other FAA team members. He acknowledged that Mr. Cannicle provided a list of questions in November, per the request of the FAA. Mr. O’Harra used the following questions to address community concerns and guide the discussion:

- **What percentage of the FLL fleet is RNAV equipped (GA and Commercial aircraft)?**

Mr. O’Harra answered that after reviewing data, he believed that RNAV equipped aircraft make up 80 to 90 percent of the FLL fleet and closer to 99 percent for commercial aircraft. He noted that RNAV procedures at MIA and FLL are designed for jet aircraft. Propellor or turbo propellor aircraft will not use the RNAV procedures assigned from those airports.

- **Now that Metroplex is implemented, will there be any changes to adjust procedures due to unforeseen circumstances/outcomes for FLL? If something changes, what is the process for letting the airport and the community know about it in advance?**

Mr. O’Harra answered that the FAA does not have any plans for procedural changes to shift ground tracks. He stated they are in the post-implementation phase, and there may be amendments to the procedures. However, the amendments are limited to speed adjustments, holding pattern changes, renamed or removed waypoints, adding terminus altitudes on stars, satellite airports or transitions and other minor modifications. If there were new procedures in the future, those would be subject to similar National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reviews, environmental reviews and community engagement as appropriate.

Mr. Cannicle asked if there would be any adjustments for the FLL RNAV procedures during the post-implementation phase. Mr. Karns confirmed there were no changes to the ground tracks, only minor changes to correct misspellings, name changes and updating human graphical errors.

Martin Pilote, Southwest Ranches, asked if there would be any change to the altitudes. Mr. Cannicle clarified that Mr. Pilote lives west of FLL, and his question may be about arrivals. Mr. Pilote stated that arriving aircraft were flying much lower after Metroplex implementation, affecting the quality of life. Mr. Cannicle noted that there were specific procedures for arrivals. At certain distances from the airport, aircraft will be at certain altitudes along the arrival path. Luis Colon, FAA, stated that as far as the Metroplex project, there were no changes that would affect the altitude of arrivals coming into FLL.

Jason Franzel inquired about accountability in terms of departing aircraft flying to the DREADS waypoint before they start making their turn north. He stated that he lives in the City of Plantation and observed departing flights making turns short of the waypoint at low altitudes. Mr. Cannicle stated Mr. Franzel’s comments would be addressed in an upcoming question.

- **Why do some aircraft when on the RNAV procedures not fly to all the waypoints for the procedure? It seems some aircraft fly to the first few waypoints and then are given another vector heading (both to the east and to the west)**

Mr. O’Harra stated there would be times departing aircraft would diverge from the RNAV procedures out of FLL. He explained that some departures will be assigned vector headings due to local or national situations, such as weather and local flow requirements. When Air Traffic Controllers are faced with these situations, the controllers use radar vectors that are issued to the aircraft to help mitigate for these issues. Mr. O’Harra further explained that there are also times when departing aircraft are vectored off the RNAV procedure to allow for a more expedited climb for those aircraft. This also reduces the ground areas affected by low altitude aircraft noise.

- **We would like to get a better understanding of the communication between FLL and MIA TRACON, for example:**
  - **How do they communicate on what runways are used at FLL?**
  - **How and when do they make the decisions to “switch around” airport operation based on changes with wind direction?**
  - **After takeoffs using RNAV to DREDS or to LLBOW, the tower tells the pilot to contact Miami Departure. For flights heading to northeast destinations, what instructions does Miami Departure then give?**
  - **When is the decision made to issue departures to use RNAV or “assigned heading” throughout the day-is it the controllers in the FLL tower or is it “Miami”, and what criteria are used?**
  - **We would like to have a Senior Representative from MIA TRACON at the meeting to explain their communication.**

Mr. O’Harra explained that the Air Traffic Controllers for both Miami and Fort Lauderdale Airports maintain continuous coordination and communication. Both airports work closely to reduce the complexity of the airspace by maintaining similar airport configurations that the winds support. He added that the wind direction experienced in the South Florida region dictates the runway configuration. The decision to change direction/flow is made by the air traffic control towers at both airports.

Mr. Cannicle asked if the decision to change direction/flow was a coordinated effort. Mr. O’Harra responded that they are typically the same but do not have to be. Rick Martinez, MIA Air Traffic Control Facility, reiterated that the wind direction dictates the airport's configuration. Generally, the wind direction at both airports are the same, so this keeps the airports in the same configuration. He also added that there are times when the changes in airport configuration do not occur simultaneously. Typically, FLL may change its configuration sooner because the airport is closer to the ocean. Mr. O’Harra added that Air Traffic Controllers also consider the inbound aircraft during these changes, which takes time to coordinate with the pilots.

As it relates to who make the decision to vector of the RNAV procedures, Mr. O’Harra stated that the Air Traffic Controllers make the decision based on requirements from surrounding sectors, constraints on those sectors, national programs and local flow control. He added that there could be flow control restrictions to a procedure or a destination airport that comes out of the FAA Command Center. In addition, FAA Air Traffic will assign headings off the RNAV procedures to avoid propeller-driven aircraft departures. Ultimately, vectors could be given in place of RNAV procedures to avoid weather, busy air traffic sectors or airspace avoidances.

Don Ellington, FAA, added that departure procedures are given to the aircraft pilot before leaving the gate. Mr. Colon shared the only way an aircraft pilot can vector off RNAV procedure is if they are given the instructions from the FAA Air Traffic Control.

Mr. Ram asked that the FAA Controllers at TRACON keep in mind the impacts on the community below the flight path when making decisions to assign vector headings. Mr. Colon stated that his team remains conscious of their neighbors and reiterated that when vector headings are issued it is for a significant reason. Mr. Karns added that an air traffic controller would only take an aircraft off the RNAV procedure when it is necessary. He also stated that another contributing factor influencing the decision to vector a departure operation is the utilization of the airspace by the Kennedy Space Center and Space X. Mr. Ellington added that from the Air Traffic Control Tower perspective, using the RNAV procedure has increased airspace efficiency and feels it will continue to be a benefit everyone.

- **Provide additional explanation for the use of “RNAV vs 290 headings” and “RNAV vs 080 headings”, here are a few examples:**
  - **On Sunday Nov 7, early afternoon, tower issued RNAV departures, then at 2:34pm tower issued (290 & 275) heading departures until approx. 2:58pm. Why does this occur? (Radar showed no weather out west during those times)**
  - **On Monday Nov 1: Morning, RNAV departures given. Then at 11:14 (or earlier) tower started issuing 290 heading and continued with 290’s until approx. 12:30pm. No weather out west. Why does this happen?**
  - **On Saturday, Oct 31: Seemed like all afternoon, 290’s were issued and no RNAV’s. Why? There was no weather out west.**

Mr. O’Harra responded that when radar vectors are issued instead of RNAV procedures, ATCT controllers would coordinate between the local tower, TRACON, end route center in Miami or points north. If a request involves several aircraft, there is added coordination between everyone to get back onto the RNAV as soon as possible. Circumstances that would require radar vectors can include weather, propeller departures and airspace avoidances.

- **During what kind of weather – thunderstorms, lightening, rainstorms without lightning, storms at a certain height, etc. are RNAV headings discontinued? Are aircraft using RNAV not permitted to divert around bad weather? How close to FLL do thunderstorms need to be to result in the use of assigned headings (both to the east or to the west) instead of RNAV procedures?**

Mr. O’Harra explained that aircraft departure routings could be affected by weather close to the airport, at the destination airport or due to busy aircraft sectors. He added that there also could be national flow control programs out of the FAA’s Command Center that can affect aircraft en-route.

Thierry Richter asked for clarification and noted that as a pilot, he was given an assigned heading departing from FLL when there were no weather-related issues. He also asked why there were “pockets” of time during a day when assigned headings are issued. Mr. Ellington indicated that the two main factors at FLL that could result in non-RNAV departures is weather and/or the departure of propeller driven aircraft from the runways. Typically, when non-RNAV heading are issued, this is done to separate jet departures from the propeller departures.

Mr. Richter stated that he had only departed behind a propeller once and probably never landed behind one. Mr. Ellington noted that there are numerous propeller driven operations from FLL on a daily basis, these include operations for Silver Airways, Tropic Ocean Airways, GAMAjet, Wheels Up Aviation and other GA aircraft.

Mr. Cannicle asked for an explanation on how the FAA ATC handles jet departures from the north runway after propeller aircraft departures from the south runway. Mr. Ellington responded that when a propeller aircraft departs from the south runway this aircraft might cross over the departure path for the north runway. A jet aircraft departing from the north would need to maintain separation behind the propeller aircraft departure. As a result, FAA ATC would issue vector headings for separation.

Mr. Richter indicated that he was once assigned a vector heading due to weather, but there were no issues with the weather conditions. Mr. Colon stated that there are times severe weather avoidance programs are issued for South Florida area, this could be another reason for receiving a vector heading for weather. Additionally, there are times weather issues at different airports can affect and change the routings for departing aircraft.

- **During the Metroplex workshops and virtual presentation, we were told that Metroplex was a modernization of airspace to make it more efficient, allow planes to fly closer together, etc. but when it gets busy with lots of traffic, why is the use of RNAV discontinued and “heading” departures used instead? Isn’t the new procedures supposed to be more efficient, meaning it is more effective to use during busy times than the old procedures? If so, why do they revert to the old procedures during busy times. Case in point: Sept 8, we were told “saturation in Miami airspace” was the reason that RNAVs were not being used that evening.**

Mr. O’Harra indicated that while he did not have specific details on the operations for the Sept. 8, 2021, scenario mentioned above, he advised that there is not a direct correlation between volume and RNAV compliance. He advised that FAA Air Traffic Controllers transition to vectors depending on the immediate circumstances and variety of other factors within the airspace. The return to the RNAV procedure would be dependent on resolving the elements that were creating the issues in the first place.

Mr. Cannicle asked who decides to “come off” the RNAV during this scenario. Mr. Colon stated that it could be based on request from the pilot in command or the FAA Air Traffic Control.

Mr. Cahoon asked about the total number of daily propeller departures from FLL, and whether they could depart from the north runway only. Mr. Ellington indicated that the departure path for propeller aircraft from the north or south runway would be the same and would not affect jet departures being on the RNAV procedure. Mr. Karns further clarified that keeping jet departure on the RNAV procedure would not allow for the separation with the propeller departure. The FAA does not decide the fleet mix for the airports, the main goal of the FAA is separate aircraft operations efficiently and safely.



Geoff Rames asked the FAA team to address the examples provided where it seems an aircraft was issued an east heading during west operations. Mr. Colon stated that the heading issued on the west operation was 080 heading and this not the correct to issue for this operation. He explained that while the operations in South Florida during this time was West Operations, it appears that FAA was going into a weather swap program and the controller mistakenly gave the 080 heading.

Mr. Rames asked why propeller departures were an issue if the RNAV procedures were designed to keep aircraft separated. Rafael Vega answered that when the propeller departures make their turns after departure, they lose the separation between the jets' departures. To keep the required separation, FAA ATC would issue 290 and 305 headings to the west. Mr. Rames asked how many propeller departures occur on a typical morning. Mr. Ellington believes the totals fluctuate between 20 – 50 operations daily.

Mr. Rames asked about the percentage of the departures from FLL on the RNAV procedures and those on vectored headings for an average day. Rhea Hanrahan, HMMH, advised she was working with Mr. Cannicle on a tracking report which would provide this information. When the report is completed, it will be provided to the ANAC. Mr. Vega responded that around 75% to 85% of the departures from FLL are on the RNAV procedures, depending on the day.

Carol Dunning asked about flight path changes that go over her property and whether the FAA considered the noise impacts. Mr. O'Harra advised that through the FAA's Metroplex Project, the FAA is in the process of modernizing the airspace around the country to meet the safety and efficiency demands of the national airspace system. He shared that there have been 30 public meetings for the public to share any concerns for the Central-South Florida Metroplex Project. He added that his team considered all public comments when completing the noise analysis and designing the RNAV procedures for the Fort Lauderdale area.

Mr. Ram asked if the FAA Air Traffic Controllers would approve a deviation from RNAV procedures if the pilot requests it for a preferential or convenient reason. Mr. Colon answered that typically the controllers would grant any requests from the pilot. However, both controllers and pilots would rather stay on the RNAV procedures because it creates less workload. He further clarified that it is unlikely that a pilot would deviate for convenience. Mr. Ram asked if that could be formalized and added to the handbook or governing document. Mr. O'Harra advised that Mr. Ram's request would be taken into consideration.

Gary Luedtke stated that he has pictures of Air Force 1 and a Chartered B-747 for the Dolphins Football Team landing on the south runway; these are examples of 747 aircraft landing on the shorter slope runway.

Mr. Ram clarified that he was trying to get a better understanding on the discretion the FAA Air Traffic Controllers have to deviate from the designated flight paths. He asked if consideration would be given to "flipping" the flow of operations when there was a significant amount of time and directions of the winds did not dictate an east flow. He also asked if the TRACON had final authority to doing this. Mr. Vega responded that they have weather stations on the field that provide wind

reports and weather forecast. Changing the runway configuration requires thorough coordination and constant monitoring within the agency. Mr. Vega confirmed that the local tower would have the ultimate say for the airport's runway configuration. Mr. Martinez added that the FAA Air Traffic Control prefers to keep all airports in the same configuration for safety reasons.

Mr. Franzel stated that if west departing aircraft fly further before turning north that could alleviate some of the noise in communities west of FLL. Mr. O'Harra answered that part of the design criteria during the Metroplex Project was to minimize shifting aircraft tracks and to focus on understanding the community's concerns. During the process, the FAA conducted noise modeling and analysis to avoid shifting noise from community A to community B in any significant manner. He asked Mr. Franzel to submit additional details through the FAA's Noise Complaint Portal including his address, so his team can investigate the issue. Mr. Cannicle clarified that the portal that Mr. O'Harra was referring to is on the FAA's Southern Regional website. He advised that the noise comments previously submitted by Mr. Franzel were submitted to the Broward County Aviation Department via the Aviation Department's Noise Comment system, a different system from the FAA's Noise Complaint Portal.

Mr. Pilote indicated he lives 11 miles west of the airport and asked if any changes could be made to reduce the noise. Mr. Cannicle indicated that while the Aviation Department communicates with the FAA, the Aviation Department does not have the authority to make airspace changes. He further explained that the aircraft arrivals observed by Mr. Pilote were associated with the arrivals for the south runway. As a result, arriving aircraft will be at certain altitude at certain distances while on approach to the runway. Mr. Richter expressed that he believed aircraft should be around 4,000 feet 11 miles from the airport.<sup>1</sup> Mr. O'Harra added that several factors might contribute to arriving aircraft being observed at lower altitude while on approach to the respective runways. Mr. Cannicle stated that he would pass along Mr. Pilote's concerns to the FAA.

Mr. Rames shared his concerns about receiving a response through the noise complaint portal on the FAA website. Mr. O'Hara clarified that responses might take longer because of the volume of complaints received and research required to provide a response.

#### **4. NOISE OFFICE & ANAC UPDATE**

Not held.

#### **5. UPDATES ON THE 2018 REAUTHORIZATION ACT**

Deferred to next meeting.

#### **6. COMMITTEE/CITIZEN COMMENTS**

---

<sup>1</sup> For the record, the FAA's approach plate for Runway 10R at FLL indicates that at 9.3 NM (equivalent to 10.7 statute miles) aircraft are descending out of an altitude of 3000' and must be at 1800' for approach to the next fix.

Mr. Cannicle thanked Mr. O’Harra and his team for the open dialogue and listening to the public concerns. Mr. Ram expressed gratitude to Mr. O’Harra and his team on behalf of the ANAC.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Rames made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Luedtke. The next meeting is on March 14, 2022.