December 5, 2016

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

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

Enclosed is a copy of the meeting minutes for the ANAC Meeting held on September 19, 2016, along with an Agenda for the next ANAC meeting to be held on December 12, 2016, at 6:00 p.m.

The meeting will be held in Conference Room “D” located in the BCAD Offices at the Airport Commerce Park (Suite 404) - 4101 Ravenswood Road, Fort Lauderdale FL, 33312.

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

Sincerely,

Winston B. Cannicle
BCAD Noise Information Officer

WBC/mbs
AGENDA

FORT LAUDERDALE - HOLLYWOOD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
AIRPORT NOISE ABATEMENT COMMITTEE

December 12, 2016
6:00 p.m.
BCAD Conference Room “D”
Suite 404
4101 Ravenswood Road, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

1. Welcome
   BCAD Staff

2. Approval of Minutes – September 19, 2016 Meeting
   ANAC Chairperson

3. Old Business –
   ANAC Chairperson

4. Noise Office Update
   BCAD Staff

5. Part 150 Update Briefing

6. Committee Member Comments

7. Citizen Comments

8. Next meeting – March 13, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

Please contact Dickey Consulting - (954)467-6822 to RSVP
DATE: Monday, September 19, 2016 6:00 P.M.
LOCATION: Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport
BCAD Administrative Offices
Airport Commerce Park - Conference Room D
4101 Ravenswood Road, Suite 404
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

Committee Member
(Organization Represented) Present/Absent

Dr. Michael Richmond (Chair) A 28 4
Ernie Siegrist (RMT#1) A 25 7
Gary Luedtke (RMT#2) A 29 3
Randy Wright (RMT#2 Alt.) A 12 2
Patricia Wright (RMT#3) A 11 3
Chris Johnston (RMT#4) P 9 1
Micheline Peacock (RMT#4 Alt.) A 3 4
Rae Sandler (RMT#5) P 24 8
Vacant (RMT#6) A 0 32
Dave Reich (RMT#7) A 12 20
Angelina Pluzhnyk (RMT#8)* P 5 1
Joseph M. Gizzo (RMT#8 Alt.) A 13 15
John More (RMT#8 Alt.)* A 3 3
Duncan Bossle (RMT#9) P 30 2
Debra Van Valkenburgh (RMT#10) P 23 9
Richard Reasoner (RMT#10 Alt.) P 30 2
John Passalacqua (RMT#11) A 3 6
Frank Derisi P 8 1
Jet Blue Representative A 7 25
US Airways Representative A 3 29
Spirit Airlines Representative A 6 26
FBO Representative A 2 30
Southwest Airlines Representative A 1 31
Delta Airlines Representative A 5 3
FAA ATCT Representative A 2 3

Cumulative Attendance
(10/01/2008 – 9/19/2016)

Present Absent

Dr. Michael Richmond (Chair) 28 4
Ernie Siegrist (RMT#1) 25 7
Gary Luedtke (RMT#2) 29 3
Randy Wright (RMT#2 Alt.) 12 2
Patricia Wright (RMT#3) 11 3
Chris Johnston (RMT#4) 9 1
Micheline Peacock (RMT#4 Alt.) 3 4
Rae Sandler (RMT#5) 24 8
Vacant (RMT#6) 0 32
Dave Reich (RMT#7) 12 20
Angelina Pluzhnyk (RMT#8)* 5 1
Joseph M. Gizzo (RMT#8 Alt.) 13 15
John More (RMT#8 Alt.)* 3 3
Duncan Bossle (RMT#9) 30 2
Debra Van Valkenburgh (RMT#10) 23 9
Richard Reasoner (RMT#10 Alt.) 30 2
John Passalacqua (RMT#11) 3 6
Frank Derisi 8 1
Jet Blue Representative 7 25
US Airways Representative 3 29
Spirit Airlines Representative 6 26
FBO Representative 2 30
Southwest Airlines Representative 1 31
Delta Airlines Representative 5 3
FAA ATCT Representative 2 3

RMT = Representative for neighborhood containing the identified Remote Monitoring Terminal
Alt. = Alternate RMT representative
*Designates newly appointed representative

Airport/County Staff

Winston Cannicle – BCAD, Mark Gale – BCAD, William Castillo – BCAD

Acoustical Consulting Team Members

Ted Baldwin – HMMH; Justina Hicklyn & Shanice Williams – DCS.

Visitors

Part 150 Consulting Team: Michael Arnold, ESA PM


Florence Straugh – FXE, Kristin Carter – Commissioner Ryan’s Office
1. WELCOME
Mr. Bossle opened the meeting by introducing himself and asking each attendee to do the same.

2. APPROVAL OF MARCH 2016 MINUTES
Mr. Pfenniger, who attended on behalf of Mr. Luedtke, indicated that Mr. Luedtke wanted proposed amendments to page 4, section 6.7, and parenthesis #3. The minutes read: “He requested that the residents join him in supporting a runway use program that would limit use of the south runway to landings in west flow and takeoffs in east flow.” He requested the following correction: …“limit usual east flow to takeoffs only, no change to west flow. Resend the usual eastern flow on Runway 10R to departures, 10L can handle all the landings to the west. The descent for north landings can be in either direction and for south in either direction.” Mr. Bossle made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, Ms. Van Valkenburgh seconded the motion, and the September 19, 2016 minutes as amended were passed unanimously.

3. OLD BUSINESS
Mr. Cannicle began his presentation by defining his role as the Noise Information Officer of the airport. He also provided a description of the roles of the FAA and the Noise Mitigation Program. Mr. Cannicle will be playing an active role with developments related to the current Part 150 study. Mr. Cannicle stated that a rubber removal took place on September 12, 2016 to September 16, 2016 affecting runway closures on the North and South runways.

Issue #1: Lauderdale Isles Proposed Relocation of RMT #8

Question #1.1: Mr. Cannicle reported that the Lauderdale Isles Community submitted a letter to the BCAD requesting relocation for RMT #8. Ms. Pluzhnyk explained the reason for the proposed relocation. She stated that the RMT was stationed at its current location to accommodate noise from the diagonal runway (which no longer exists). She further explained that the current location does not provide a true depiction of the current noise levels experienced by residents in this community since the south runway has been operable. Ms. Pluzhnyk proposed that the RMT be moved closer to the center of the community where heightened noise levels are experienced by west departures on the south runway.

Response 1.1: Mr. Cannicle stated that formal procedures to relocate an RMT do not currently exist. He said that the BCAD will work toward accessing this request. He also noted that concerns such as this one will be addressed during the Part 150, to determine the validity of current locations and the possible need for additional locations.

Question 1.2: If data from RMT #8 is used in the Part 150 Study, why would it be used at its current location?

Response 1.2: The previous 150 study provided data that determined the current location of the existing RMTs. The purpose of the Part 150 is to analyze traffic patterns that are current in comparison to when the runway was originally built. During the study it may be found that RMTs may need to be relocated or added based on the existing traffic patterns.

Question/Comment 1.3: We (Lauderdale Isles) would like to have additional RMTs because there is not an accurate representation of the aircraft noise with the current noise monitor.

Response 1.3: A monitor cannot be moved without study and research that warrant the validity of doing so.

Question 1.4: Is data from the noise monitors used in the Part 150 Study?

Response 1.4: No. FAA does not permit use of noise measurements.

Question 1.5: Can we have temporary Noise Monitors placed to give a more accurate depiction of the aircraft noise being experienced by Lauderdale Isles residents?

Response 1.5: Mr. Cannicle said he would look into the possibility of temporary monitors in Lauderdale Isles.

Question 1.6: The monitors were installed before I moved into the Malleuca Gardens community, what was the basis for determining the need for RMTs?

Response 1.6: The Part 150 Study recommended that the BCAD monitor noise and establish the Noise Office.

Question 1.7: Who or what body determined the latitude/longitude for where the monitors were placed?

Response 1.7: HMMH conducted a site evaluation.
Question 1.8: If the FAA or the Part 150 Study does not take into consideration the reading of the noise monitors, why is it so hard to relocate them?

Response 1.8: The relocation of a RMT can be done but, it has to be projected and also included in the budget. Relocating a RMT also requires approval from the land owner, which can be a lengthy process. If relocation or addition of an RMT is a recommendation as a result of the Part 150 Study, there is the possibility that such changes may be funded by the FAA.

Issue #2: Inoperable equipment at RMT #5

When the RMT equipment is sent to the vendor for repair or calibration, spare equipment is used. The original equipment in RMT #5 is malfunctioning and the spare equipment is beyond repair. The BCAD is going through the process of purchasing a new spare, when it becomes available the original equipment for RMT #5 will be submitted to the vendor for repair.

Question 2.1: What is the cost of an RMT monitor?

Response 2.1: Approximately $35,000.00

4. PART 150 UPDATE/PRESENTATION:

Mr. Mike Arnold, Project Manager from Environmental Science Associates (ESA), noted that ESA specializes in environment and noise studies for airports. Mr. Arnold provided a PowerPoint Presentation of what to expect of the consultant for the Part 150 Study. The presentation gave an overview of the goals and objectives of the study, the years of analysis that will be reviewed, how the Part 150 relates to the current ongoing Master Plan, Data collection and the public and stakeholder involvement and a tentative schedule. The three primary elements of a Part 150: (1) Noise Exposure Map Report (2) Noise Compatibility Program and (3) Stakeholder Outreach Component. The presentation can be found on the airport website at: http://www.broward.org/Airport/noiseInformation/Pages/ANACCommittee.aspx

Question 3.1: Are the two public workshops required by the FAA?

Response 3.1: The Public Hearing is required by the FAA.

Comment 3.2: Ms. Pluzhnyk stated that she would go if the committee agreed.

Response 3.2: Mr. Bossle requested that all interested parties contact Mr. Cannicle to indicate their interest.

Question 3.3: Will the alternate have the ability to participate like the representative?

Response 3.3: The alternate should attend in order to be able to participate in the absence of the appointed representative.

Question 3.4: Will the meetings be recorded or webcasted?

Response 3.4: This is not typically done. The presentation information and the meeting minutes will be provided.

Mr. Cannicle concluded by noting that information regarding the ANAC representative will be provided via an email blast as progress is expected to be made prior to the December 2016 meeting.

5. INTRODUCTION OF NEW AIRPORT DIRECTOR

Mr. Gale introduced himself. He noted he understands the concerns of residents regarding the Part 150 and the direction of the airport as a whole. It was his position that there wasn’t much that could be done regarding the level of traffic at the airport but, he would work with staff as best as possible to better manage traffic concerns. His experience encompasses various areas of airport issues including but not limited to past Part 150 studies, a sound insulation programs, etc. Mr. Gale shared that he is aware of the concerns of the Lauderdale Isles community and is currently investigating the situation but not ready to provide firm answers to the community thus far. Mr. Gale gave his commitment to working with the airport neighbors to provide as much relief as possible and acknowledged that there may not be changes that meet everyone’s approval.
Question 4.1: There is a proposed reconstruction of the north runway; can you provide any updates on this operation?

Response 4.1: Over the years the north runway has continuously been renovated with a mill and overlay as far back as the 1940s. After an extended period of time the various layers of asphalt can become unstable. The Director is currently reviewing the runway with engineering to access the best tactic for renovating the runway. The tentative schedule for construction will be in two to three years. Mr. Gale is working toward the most effective plan, utilizing core samples of the runway coupled with his runway construction and maintenance experience. Once a decision is made the Director will work to expedite the process as much as possible with the use of crews around the clock.

Question 4.2: Will the North runway project be occurring simultaneously with the Part 150 study?

Response 4.2: The Part 150 Study should be completed and possibly be awaiting the final FAA record of approval before the reconstruction starts. The design phase for the runway will take approximately twelve months.

Question 4.3: If items regarding noise abatement procedures are proposed before the completion of the Part 150 Study, how will the overall recommendations of the Part 150 be affected?

Response 4.3: The Part 150 will include anything that the project team determines could reasonably be expected to be implemented. Modeling assumptions would address how much something would be utilized. If issues arise after the Noise Exposure Maps are established it will be included in Noise Compatibility Program analysis.

Response 4.3: The Noise Compatibility Program goes through a process of approval or no approval from the FAA. If the voluntarily noise measures are proposed the FAA may decide that there already are noise abatement procedures and the approval would be made.

Question 4.4: How long would it take for proposed close in departure (rapid climb out) procedures to be implemented?

Response 4.4: A rapid climb out involving the separation of two runways such as FLL would require a 15 degree divergent angle, required by the FAA. The only way to bring it in on the 28R side would be to eliminate operations on 28L or the FAA could explore new technology options.

Question 4.5: What is being done to put these procedures in place?

Response 4.5: An answer cannot be provided at this time because several factors have to be considered.

Question 4.6: It is my understanding that 15 degree separation is required for simultaneous take offs. Currently air traffic that takes place to the NE is placed on a 290 heading when there are no operations on 28L. Could our community provide a document depicting these flight patterns for your review?

Response 4.7: Mr. Gale stated he would take a look at it and also have Winston share the flight tracking data.

Question 4.9: When the new noise contours are published will the participants in the noise mitigation program be protected?

Response 4.9: Residents in the program should not be at risk but, confirmation from the FAA will be solicited.

One of the Lauderdale Isles residents thanked the Mr. Gale for taking the time to attend the ANAC meeting.

6. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: None other than those summarized in preceding items.

7. CITIZEN COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Question 5.1: Can the Part 150 Study presentation be emailed to everyone?

Response 5.1: The presentation would be uploaded to the airport website for review.

Question 5.2: Is a committee is being formed for the Part 150 that will include participants from the nine surrounding cities?

Response 5.2: Yes, this would be the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) separate from Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The study is making every effort to involve the community and provide vehicles for disseminating study information to the community.

Question 5.3: Are all the meetings going to be open to the public?
Response 5.3: That is yet to be determined.

Question 5.4: What measures are being utilized to gather the noise information?

Response 5.4: The FAA noise model includes aircraft noise data. ANOMS data will be used for operational inputs.

Questions 5.5: Doe the 30,000 foot radius (5 nautical mile) study area leave out some affected residents?

Response 5.5: This is the area the FAA requires the Part 150 study address.

Comment 5.6: Communities that are west in areas such as Davie are experiencing aircraft noise.

Comment 5.6: A Part 150 Study focuses on areas close to the airport. A Metroplex Study would focus on a larger area.

Comment 5.7: It appears that a large part of the area that is mapped is over water.

Response 5.7: The requirement to look out 30,000 feet from each runway end is a federal regulation regardless of land use.

Question 5.8: Is the study going to take into account the noise complaints?

Response 5.8: The study will consider the types of issues that are causing the complaints. The noise complaints will not affect the contours but, they will provide insight into why complaints are occurring and some cases extensive complaints will lead to additional research of a specific area.

Question 5.9: Can the required noise complaint form be simplified?

Response 5.9: BCAD will look into seeing if it can be modified.

Comment 5.10: Although the Part 150 and the Master Plan are separate, aren’t there issues that could be addressed in the Master Plan that may affect the outcome of the Part 150 study with regard to noise?

Response 5.10: The Part 150 forecast case will be for 2022 conditions; any proposed projects in the Master Plan that could alter the way that aircraft are operating in that year will be considered.

Question 5.11: What is the South Florida Metroplex?

Response 5.11: FAA is conducting studies around the country where conflicts among operations from multiple airports (a “Metroplex”) are leading to congestion and excessive delay. The purpose of a Metroplex study is to “deconflict” operations to reduce congestion and associated delay. One such study is being conducted for in south and central Florida, which includes several major airports – such as Tampa, Orlando, FLL, MIA, etc., and many secondary airports. The FAA will conduct an environmental analysis of any proposals, and make the results available for public review and comment.

Comment 5.12: Mr. Pfenniger shared Mr. Luedtke’s complaint about a Jet Blue aircraft, Flight #6551, which occurred on August 14, 2016. Why did the pilot land on the south runway as opposed to the north?

Response 5.12: Mr. Cannicle stated that he has already responded to Mr. Luedtke’s inquiry and that the flight had an emergency landing due to smoke in the cockpit.

Comment 5.12: Mr. Johnston (retired Jet Blue pilot) - stated that a pilot has to use his discretion on how best to land a plane in an emergency situation, as safely as possible.

Comment 5.13: There has not been any representative from the ATC in months; he is required to be here.

Response 5.13: The ATC tower manager had an emergency during the June meeting. Mr. Cannicle stated he would do his best to ensure that he is at the next meeting. His attendance at the ANAC is voluntary. He is not required to be here.

Question 5.14: If the ATC manager cannot be available can he send someone in his place?

Response 5.14: Mr. Cannicle said that he would follow up with the manager to see if an alternate is an option.

Question 5.15: Has Dr. Richmond met with Mr. Mark Gale yet?

Response 5.15: Mr. Gale chose to meet with the full committee today.

8. ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned with no further comments. The next meeting is December 12, 2016