### **MINUTES**

# Meeting of the KHHR Communities Network Committee (CNC) 1/21/2021 Virtual Meeting

### **Board Members:**

Present: Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne Councilmember), Donny Sandusky (Jet Center/Advanced Air/Hawthorne Airport LLC), Robert E. Smith (Hawthorne Planning & Zoning Commission), Melvin Wagner (Holly Park Neighborhood Association), Laurelia Walker (North Hawthorne Community Association), Julie DeCoste (Hollyglen Neighborhood Association), Bob Hawks (Wiseburn Watch), Kathleen Teal (Gardena), Pamela Thornton (Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council), Laura Emdee (Redondo Beach Councilmember), Stacey Armato (Hermosa Beach Councilmember), and Richard Montgomery (Manhattan Beach Councilmember).

Quorum present? Yes

Others Present: Guido Fernandez (Secretary)

### **Proceedings:**

Meeting called to order by Donny Sandusky at 6:02 pm.

Pledge of Allegiance led by Olivia Valentine.

The minutes of the October 15, 2020 meeting were approved.

### **Oral Communications:**

The guidelines for oral communications from the public were read by Guido Fernandez.

There were no comments from the public.

### Agenda Item #3: Review of Response from FAA regarding Suggestion for Change in Flight Procedures for Noise Reduction

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> right now the instrument departure of Hawthorne which is what most turbine aircraft use with few exceptions, 99% of them use the instrument departure and have you flying to an initial altitude of 3,000 feet and the problem with climbing only 3,000 feet is kind of getting in the freeway and you are supposed to accelerate to 65 mph but you only accelerate to 30 mph so you let off the gas pretty quick and most cars these days can accelerate very quickly but you would be accelerating and slamming the brakes so it is kind of the same thing in an airplane. A lot of these jets aircraft that can climb really fast but when you are only going to

3,000 feet you start letting off the throttle at 1,500 feet to bring a smooth transition to 3,000 feet. So we asked to change that to 5,000 feet so that we can get further away from all the homes in the ground but the response from the FAA was basically no we cannot adjust it because there are too many overlying routes and procedures that are tied to it and it is a spider web of departures and arrivals and it is a complex airspace. There was a redesign of airspace called the Metroplex redesign which has created more noise for some folks and less for others. Every 5 years the FAA does review airspace design and there is input from airspace users and communities. Even though they said no at this time we can bring this up to the Airspace Users Group which I have a contact and if we start bringing up now there is chance that there could be change in the future. I cannot guarantee it. It is a complex airspace with LAX being next door. I expected them to say no because of the complexity of it. This is normal for a big government agency. We can continue to work with folks that really know the airspace and potentially get a better outcome.

<u>Olivia Valentine</u> I agree with you. I think that you should push it. I think that the initial answer is what we would probably expect as an initial answer. How much power doe the Airspace Users have?

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> They do give a lot of input. They have some weight but I don't think they have that much authority but I think that we need to stay consistent with it.

Olivia Valentine Do you know if they would support your position?

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> I have reached out to them. I think they will. You are familiar with the FAA. To make these changes would take quite a bit of work just because of what is overlying the Hawthorne airspace.

<u>Olivia Valentine</u> I think that you are right. I think these decisions are made very politically and I think that the initial letter is just that, an initial letter, but we might prevail. I think that the Airspace Users is one thing but letters from our constituents is something else again. We might consider pushing that and asking our constituents to write letters to support that position.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> I think that the Airspace Users group is a good one because they can help design it and come up with a solution. So not only do we have a complaint but come up with a solution. I just reached to them to the head of the Airspace Users group.

Richard Montgomery Olivia said what is important to all of us. We play the courtesy role first. We sent a nice note that said here's our concern. That's ok. We expected a no at first. I have a question. Let us know who you want our constituents and other councils in other cities to send emails to, you give us that address and we will take care of step 2 and we will push it to the next round. Those of us that don't understand the special flights rule area can you help us understand that. I'm not the expert like you guys. We were always taught that in the Special Flights Rule area that the smaller private jets were encouraged to fly along Imperial Hwy out to the ocean and then bank south to the left. They can't bank right because of LAX and they can't

go right, it makes sense to go left. But they obviously are not flying down Imperial Hwy, that's concern one. I love the maps that we got from the FAA. Raquel did a great job. I thought it would be 6 or 7 lines a day. If you look at the colored maps and look at the flights going right out of the airport lines buzzing over me and Stacy in Hermosa and some over Laura and your city as well. I thought it was 6 or 10 flights a day. I was wrong. I had no idea. I was way off. Forget SpaceX. Look at the lines between June and July in 19 and 20. I was way off. It adds more support to our comments that when the FAA reorganized in 2017, not because of Hawthorne Airport, they had no idea the impact it would have on the cities on the flight path. So number 1, is Imperial Hwy really a required or encouraged route for planes flying out of Hawthorne? That is question 1. Question 2. Now we have factual data that flights are not 1 or 2. This is not even with Sofi stadium using the flights which will double or triple next year. The questions is has anyone brought up the idea as a compromise to the airport operators, Guido, we are willing out of good faith, to shut down operations from midnight to 6 am. No one is saying don't fly out of Hawthorne Airport. We are saying out of the cities affected, have they ever talked about a voluntary 12 am to 6 am no flight zone. That's my 2 questions.

Donny Sandusky Number 1, Imperial Hwy question. Number 2, voluntary curfew. Let me add 1 more. You were asking about the Special Flights Rule. Imperial Hwy, so all these aircraft that we are talking about departing. No one is following Imperial Hwy because of LAX's airspace. It would be actually a loss of separation. Meaning there is supposed to be so much space between departing and arriving aircraft at LAX. Hawthorne is so close to LAX that there is a waiver to reduce those minimums but they do have to follow that certain criteria or else there is a loss of separation which is a big issue to those controllers controlling the airspace. It would never work to follow Imperial Hwy. because you would have a loss of separation. All those tracks and departures, not only the SpaceX departure but also pre-SpaceX2 departure, those are not just turbine aircraft, they are also piston aircraft like your smaller 4 seat privately owned piston aircraft like a Cessna or Cirrus that are flying IFR flight plan and are all issued the same departure. ATC tells you, this is what you fly, do not deviate, if you deviate, from what they told you to fly, then you get a violation, if you get enough violations, then you lose your pilot's license. We can always talk to folks at the Airport about being a good neighbor and not flying at night and we can pitch that to everyone. Guido has said this multiple times. We can't impose a curfew that is actually enforceable, it is voluntary. Burbank has a voluntary one and so does Van Nuys. If someone decides to go to Hawthorne at 2 am, you can't stop them. Just like if if we say please stay off the road at night with your loud car there is still a chance that someone will say I don't care I'm still going to drive down your street. So we can talk about that and as much as possible.

Richard Montgomery Didn't Santa Monica have a no fly zone? After a certain time period.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> Anyone who had a curfew up until 1991 and prior had it grandfathered in but anyone who tried to come up with a curfew after that was not allowed. I forget the name of the Act.

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> The Act was the ANCA act which stands for the Airport Noise and Compatibility Act.

**Donny Sandusky** They will not allow any new curfews to be put in place in Airports.

**<u>Bob Hawks</u>** These rules were in place. Change is inevitable. Can we try?

**Donny Sandusky** No.

<u>Olivia Valentine</u> Yes. You can change the statute. Your legislators can do that. That's a big heavy lift getting your legislators to do that. It can be done.

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> There have been a few Airports that have attempted to change it. LAX attempted it and spend a couple of million dollars and were unsuccessful. To my knowledge no Airport since 1990 has successfully been able to impose it since ANCA. The Airport Noise and Compatibility Act. I do want to add to address what Mr. Montgomery had mentioned that on October 9, 2018 the city council of the City of Hawthorne did pass a Resolution which stated that the City of Hawthorne strongly encourages pilots to restrict their flight operations to avoid flying between the hours of 10 pm and 6 am but it's on a voluntary basis of course.

Richard Montgomery I appreciate that. I thought that had come up before and I remember that Donny had told me that it was a voluntary function to the Tower and if they are not operating no one's there but the guy can take off on his own anyway. That's his or her option. If you want to fly at midnight. Remind me to get the address that you are talking about to register comments to the FAA. How many have flight radar on your phone? I've caught many planes, I have proof and data, if you believe this thing (holding phone), that tells you coming out of Hawthorne, that there are at 2,500 feet, 3,500 feet is much different than 2,500 feet. So when the FAA says Richard give us the data we start piling on the screen shots of the planes buzzing. Most of them say N/A. Some do tell you. Most pilots are following the height. It's the ones that low buzz you, the screamers, that are coming out early and low. Those are the ones that I screen catch and get. That's my other concern Donny. It's not so much the number of flights, that's a separate issue, it's the low screamers that come out at all hours of the day and night that we try to capture. Here's our issue, we don't have a problem with private flights, most pilots comply, it's the ones that buzz you for no apparent reason, the sky is perfectly sunny and clear, and they are buzzing the low altitude, that's what gets everyone all upset, that's what we are looking for some kind of relief, not from Guido, not from the Airport, whether Raquel and the FAA says right Richard we see the screen shots, we what's going on, we are investigating. They told me originally that they are 6 months behind in complaints, I think in one of the meetings, she said we are 6 months behind in dealing with emails and complaints. That's amazing to me. We are not going to get immediate relief for our residents and our neighborhoods and for anyone that cares about it but the fact that we are seeing what Donny is talking about. I'm going to share this. They love the fact that we even asked the FAA out of courtesy and wanted to know what the status is. The next part is to show them the flight tracks. They had no idea that the numbers are that high. But I agree with Olivia. We did the courtesy

part. Now we have to muscle up and when 2022 comes around, that Donny is talking about, we have to talk to them about possibly redrawing what they are doing around here and how it is going to affect all of us and find a solution that works. We are not talking about shutting down flight operations. We are talking about how can we make it better and easier for all residents, all of our cities at the same time, play nice with each other, and not stifle business to the Airport, that's all we are looking for. There has to be a mid point there somewhere. Thank you.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> There is one more thing. To explain what is Special Flight Rules. I have a big giant airspace like an upside down wedding cake out to 10,000 feet for LAX and they have transition routes for pilots flying small piston planes and they are called Special Flight Rules and you don't need to be IFR to fly through class Bravo airspace as long as you comply with all the requirements to follow this special kind of road right through the middle of the airspace. With Special Flight Rules it takes you south down to 3,500 feet crossing from Santa Monica and popping out over the 405 between Hawthorne and Manhattan Beach and going northbound at 4,500 feet. So it transitions the LAX airspace. The LAX airspace starts just south of the 105 and it goes up to Santa Monica. That is the Special Flights Rule. That is overlaying the Hawthorne Airspace and they have to have cooperation between the aircraft departing Hawthorne and that route. There are departures and arrivals at LAX and stuff that comes out of LAX that is intertwined in all of this.

**Richard Montgomery** Can I ask one more question. If we see a screen catch of a repeated same flight every Sunday morning at 7:30 am screaming over your head and the FAA gets to it, what are the possible sanctions the FAA does to someone going below 2,000 feet every Sunday morning? Do they every say hey we have repeated screen captures of the same flight, the same time, every Sunday for 6, 8 Sundays in a row. Do they write him a letter and say dear pilot you can't do this anymore and if you do we are going to fine you.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> No. Below 2,000 feet there is no violation. It's below 1,000 feet above a congested area which would be anywhere in the city, unless you are landing or taking off, would be a violation which would be considered careless or reckless. So if they found someone flying over Redondo Beach below 1,000 feet above the ground, so whatever the elevation is of the ground, let's say you are 100 feet where you live, and they are pulling 900 feet above you, then that's when they can issue a violation or warning. But if you are 1,200 feet as far as the altitude the aircraft is reading and you are 100 feet then technically they are still more than 1,000 feet above a congested area.

<u>Richard Montgomery</u> Is that a national ordinance/rule? Is that everywhere in the country? Or is that just us?

**Donny Sandusky** That's everywhere. That's the US airspace system.

<u>Richard Montgomery</u> Wow. 1,000 feet over your head. I can almost reach up and touch it. Thank you for your answer. I appreciate it.

**Donny Sandusky** For landing and taking off that is not there. As long as they are actually landing and taking off they can be below that altitude.

Laura Emdee To follow up on that. I knew about the 1,000 rule and flight radar is great but unless you are going to be somebody who is going to be on this constantly doing this it's really onerous on everyone to be doing this tracking. So for example yesterday there was someone who was way under 1,000 feet heading over my house and I happen to be on my phone, to be able to switch, get the tail number and put it in, it's very onerous, but we've had several complaints of people that are under 1,000 feet that have the noise issue and I've seen the emails from my residents going in as a complaint and you've seen them too Guido and Debbie Jakubowski have seen them. I guess there is no follow up on those. We show that they are a problem, we sent the email, we sent the flight radar and then what. I guess it just goes into a circulation file that was never seen. Can we get more communication on follow up which is why in the beginning of these meetings we were trying to get noise monitoring systems because sometimes the planes are under 1,000 feet but they are not making any noise or they are at 1,500 feet and the noise is completely out of hand. There has to be something wrong with that plane or the equipment or maybe it's just the weather that day. How can we get a real solution to the problem we are having because we are not going to get them to stop? You are constantly playing a game of got you. How do we fix this?

**Bob Hawks** After your comment Laura I would say, with nothing being done, what is the purpose of these meetings?

<u>Laura Emdee</u> That's just it. I don't know. We've been doing these meetings for a year and I get why we are doing them but I'm don't see the solution. I've been getting told that answer that I you gave Richard is the same answer I heard a year ago It has to be 1,000 feet. You have to do a complaint. For example, last week, Nick Biro who is the husband of Roxanne Ferebee who used to be in this committee sent 2 screen shots from flight radar about planes that were violating the rules and were causing lots of noise, what happened to them? What happens to them when they violate the rules? Are there any kind of consequences whatsoever?

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> There should be consequences. When they get the complaint and when it is turned over to the Flight Standards District Office (FSDO) and then they turn it over to one of the inspectors in that office to reach out to that pilot and investigate but I don't know what their backlog is and with COVID there are restrictions. We deal with the FAA on a regular basis with inspectors and with folks who look over operations and even with that it's sometimes tough to get answers back. To be just a citizen to be complaining about noise it is really frustrating and there is not really much transparency about what goes on and I don't know about how long it takes to get an answer or if you ever do get an answer. But if they are shown that this same pilot keeps operating and buzzing Manhattan Beach or Redondo Beach at 700 feet and you have multiple screen shots, then at that point they should be issued a violation. A violation will not revoke their license but it depends on the severity of the violation, so they can get their license revoke but in a case it is more like a slap on the hand.

<u>Julie DeCoste</u> I have a question. To further clarify and this is a question that came from a resident in Hollyglen, who actually gives the fines and who is monitoring these pilots, is it Hawthorne or is it the FAA?

**Donny Sandusky** It's all the FAA.

<u>Julie DeCoste</u> They also wanted to know how many fines do they need to get before they lose their license?

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> It all depends on the severity. I don't have the exact answer for you. If you are putting lives at risk and you are being careless/reckless you could have it revoked instantly as soon as they find out. But if it is noise complaints then I don't know what it takes. If it is shown that you are not responsible and keep doing the same thing then at some point you have your license revoked.

<u>Olivia Valentine</u> Donny it's probably a good idea if we have someone from the FAA come, maybe someone from the FSDO come and talk about how they, what their enforcement process is, so that the residents understand what has to happen or what happens to a pilot when a pilot violates the airspace rules.

**Donny Sandusky** I agree. Yes, that would be great idea.

**Julie DeCoste** That would be helpful and we can give them some feedback.

<u>Olivia Valentine</u> I mean someone from the FSDO. Not someone from the Regional Office. Because the FSDO they are the ones in the ground and they are the ones actually issuing the enforcement.

**Donny Sandusky** Yes, I agree.

<u>Laura Emdee</u> I don't expect a lot from that. We should have FSDO come out. I already know, based on what we have been doing for a while, the rules and what we have. What might be helpful is communication back, somehow. Isn't there some kind of case number. For example, last week when Nick Biro sent the email out and we got it. Is there some kind of case number that be followed up with. I'm trying to figure out how to alleviate the frustrations of some of the residents that are truly following up and making these complaints over and over again.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> That's a question for the FSDO as well. I think we should motion that he FSDO come to the next meeting.

Olivia Valentine I make that motion.

**Laura Emdee** Do we need a vote?

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> We need to make a motion to contact the User's Group.

**Laurelia Walker** All in favor. First we need to make a vote.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> Olivia do you want to make a motion for that as well for me to contact the User's Group?

Laurelia Walker Take a vote.

Julie DeCoste Take a vote.

**<u>Donny Sandusky</u>** Everyone can vote.

**Guido Fernandez** All members stated that they are in favor. Ms. Smith did not vote.

<u>Olivia Valentine</u> You can also do a reverse roll call to save time. You can just ask once you have the motion in second if anyone is opposed. You can get the opposition. The assumption is that everyone who doesn't say that they are opposed, is in favor.

## Agenda Item #4: Review of Response from FAA regarding Increased Noise Complaints from Del Aire Neighborhood

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> this was as a result of getting repeated complaints from the Del Aire neighborhood something that we didn't experience until about February or March of 2020. It was really unusual. We didn't understand why the residents of that area were complaining. I spoke to Donny and Mike Wooton and other pilots and we began to suspect that it was because of the new SID, standard instrument departure procedure, called SPACEX2 I believe, and it has nothing to do with SpaceX, it was just a name the FAA chose. Because of our suspicion, Donny sent that letter to the FAA requesting a comparison of the flight tracks from 2 years ago to last year to try to see if the SID was actually causing airplanes or aircraft to fly over Del Aire and I believe everyone has a copy of that report. I can screen share it.

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> That's the cover page. That first page basically shows the departures from June 28<sup>th</sup> to July 4<sup>th</sup> 2019 and then we are going to flip and that's a year later. The blue lines are from 2019 and the magenta lines are from June 28<sup>th</sup> to July 4<sup>th</sup> of a year later in 2020. You can see how they are further north and further west. Can you see that? And that's the SPACX Two departures. You can clearly see that they are further west which explains why Del Aire began to experience so many flights over them. Would you agree with that Donny?

### **Donny Sandusky** Yes.

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> Here's a comparison of both of them combined. Overlapping. It was bad for the Del Aire neighborhood and I'm sure it alleviated over other neighborhoods that were further east and that's one thing when the FAA came and spoke to us and they were speaking about the reasons why they were doing this. That it was going to be more efficient, it was going to be directed by GPS, but one concern a lot of people had was that was is going to happen is that it is going to increase the frequency over a particular area over and over again and basically what happened. It goes to that comment that the FAA will sometimes make that it helps one neighborhood but it affects another, in one way someone is going to be affected in a negative way. Donny do you want to comment on these slides?

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> These are IFR departures. These are mostly turbine but there are some small pistons in there. Then you got all the flight school stuff. Small pistons are not flying these departure procedures. The magenta line that's the new departure procedure SPACX2 which has nothing to do with the actual SpaceX. They just name these things after something close to the Airport. The new departure procedures are GPS course. A global positioning system. The departure part of that was based on a heading, a magnetic course based on a compass, which is not that accurate but the GPS is very accurate within a few feet. So that's why you see all the blue scattered about, that's the previous departure procedure, and then you have the magenta which is pretty much overlapping on one main roadway.

**Bob Hawks** Question. Am I missing it but I don't see all the touch and go on the flight path.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> Right. That's because this is IFR departures. Instrument Flight Procedure departure. Touch and go that's the flight schools. They are going to be doing Visual Flight Rules, VFR. Flying around without a flight plan. They wouldn't show on any of this.

<u>Julie DeCoste</u> Why are there lines going in every direction?

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> The ones to the east don't really make sense to me. I think it was Roxanne that was the one on the beach that would talk about how airplanes would circle over her house. This picture doesn't really show you the full flight path. You would depart Hawthorne on the departure procedure and then Air Traffic Control gives you almost a left turn. A 270 degree turn. All of these are making a left turn and they circle back and head towards the north west if you are departing the area to the north and they take you over the top of LAX. They have you circle back around and cross over LAX. You can't see the bottom of the screen of the flight path seeing them make that full loop. That's because you have departures coming out of LAX, you have departures coming out of Long Beach, arrivals going to Long Beach, and that' why they keep us confined coming out of Hawthorne where you see those flight paths to keep us away from other Airport arrivals and departures.

Julie DeCoste Ok. I think I'm under the new thick magenta line. Why did they change that?

**Donny Sandusky** For more positive control of air traffic. So they can actually identify if you are on the departure or if you are actually diverging and tell if they have a problem more quickly.

Pretty much all Airports are moving towards GPS arrivals and departures. Where it used to be more of a heading. You turn to a heading and fly this and eventually ATC would tell where to go. Where now they have you on a course and they can tell if you are deviating or not.

<u>Julie DeCoste</u> Just to clarify from what you show on those 2 graphs back and forth. Now they are a little further north and that's why Del Aire is getting more noise.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> It used to be that coming of Hawthorne where the blue lines are at 400 feet altitude above the Airport you would start your turn to southwest. Now you continue climbing until you intercept the course kind of like getting on a freeway and you have an onramp and you get on the freeway but you follow it. Whereas before it was all based on as soon as you get to 400 feet you start your turn so regardless of where you were you might have been further away if your climbing slow or your plane doesn't climb very well. Where now you are following an actual course that is carved in the sky via GPS and you follow it.

<u>Bob Hawks</u> So the FAA just comes in and decides we have to make these changes and then the residents recognize it and we get back together and try to complain or try to get something done and nothing happens? Am I wrong?

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> No. The FAA designs it. The FAA has a meeting. They use their noise committee to tell us what is going to be coming but it's already done at that point. That's the way airspace design works. They have a criteria for safety. There are safety requirements that are part of the design criteria that they have to comply with. Number one is safety and I guess number two is noise. Over a congested area I don't know what the consideration is for noise.

Richard Montgomery One question. I wonder if anybody here, raise your hands. How many of you have contacted your congress member about this and let his office know you are unhappy with had happened. I like Donny's idea that we go to 2022. I like Olivia's idea, you're right. Have someone from the FAA come here and talk to us face to face again and let us know what is going on. For us it's Ted Lieu. We can get Ted Lieu's attention and say we have a problem here Ted. Can you help us on it? I don't know who your congress members are but it's one guy to start with. We can get them line up with Donny's solution at looking at 2022 as the next chance to make any impact to the FAA. We say look, we've had 4 years to study this, this didn't happen overnight. But 2017 was one thing, now we are seeing proven data. We can show Ted's office. Here's the data tracks from 2019 and 2020. Here's the proof we have and show them what we want to do. We are not being unreasonable, we are trying to find a solution. Can you help us? If 2022 is the best way to get it done, then that's where I want to focus my attention. I'm not looking for Ted's office to help me today, that's impossible. But In 2022 can you make an effort to help all of us and find a solution. I like Donny's idea, 2022 is the next review period. I don't know when that starts in 2022. Donny, does it start in January 2022 or in some random date in 2022?

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> I don't know the exact procedure for it all but I will have some more details the next time around.

<u>Richard Montgomery</u> When the FAA comes, Olivia, and visits at your request, and we all sign up behind you. Someone there will tell us, fill in the blank, and say we are going to have a review period on March 2022. You guys should really be ready for that and have your data sign in so you we can all start pumping data to them. See if we can get any attention. Otherwise, that's how I felt in dealing with the Federal government at that level. Get their attention early because it takes a long time for them to pay attention to you.

<u>Olivia Valentine</u> Yes, you have to persistent. There's a noise roundtable at LAX and they have been working for years trying to make changes and it takes a long time and it takes persistence and you just can't give up and you have to keep moving on it.

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> I remember one time in a few meetings ago in which Ms. Teal made a comment I think in which she was requesting examples from the FAA in which specific instances in which changes were made in an area to reduce noise. I don't know what the answer would be from the FAA regarding that.

**Richard Montgomery** Great question.

**Bob Hawks** That was a good question because that was one of my questions. What results for the residents have we seen? Show some us results that have been improvements.

<u>Olivia Valentine</u> In the future, let me suggest Donny that we invite Denny Schneider to come and be a guest speaker. I think he would be very informative. He is the head of the LAX noise roundtable. In response to your question Bob, they have had success but it's been slow and uneven. They've been working for years trying to make changes. It's a long, slow process. He would be interested in coming and speaking with us. You let me know and we can set that up.

**Donny Sandusky** I make a motion for Olivia to invite Denny Schneider to a future meeting.

**<u>Laura Emdee</u>** I second.

**Donny Sandusky** Ok, any objections? Ok, no objections.

<u>Laura Emdee</u> Question on the graphs. On the pink blue magenta graphs, when I saw the differences. Were there less flights because of Covid? Was there a Covid effect? When you look at the raw data was there a similar amount of flights?

**Donny Sandusky** They did not give us any raw data as far as the numbers but I can tell you that it's been down with Covid.

**Laura Emdee** That's what I thought.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> Except for July for Advanced Air. That was the busiest July we've had because they were losing up. Otherwise it's been a slow year.

### **Laura Emdee** Ok, thanks.

<u>Richard Montgomery</u> Olivia, just to let you know. I'm on the LAWA roundtable on my spare time. I got put into the second Vice-President job who makes all the notes happen. It is 22 people and it is a massive undertaking but to their credit the FAA has shown up until one of the cities sued them and they stopped showing up. LA is there and everyone around there is there. We get a pretty good turn out and great discussion. Unfortunately, when the FAA was sued they pulled out of the meeting. They have made changes, small incremental changes over time. I was one of those in guys in 2006. When I was a rookie I joined them. That's 14 years of watching them make small incremental changes. Persistence does pay off.

<u>Laura Emdee</u> I would be interested in hearing about the projects. Isn't that next on the agenda?

**Donny Sandusky** Guido can you share any current city projects?

### Agenda Item #5: Status of City's current projects:

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> We are supposed to be having our next Noise Study meeting with the PAC, the Planning Advisory Committee, and public workshops in February. It wasn't until December that we finally got a response from the FAA in which they made comments to the narrative of the noise study that we presented to them. I think it was 3 chapters that we sent to them. We responded to them in January and they responded back saying that we could proceed to schedule the PAC, the Planning Advisory Committee meeting. I believe some of you are in that committee, and also the public workshops. We are hoping the second or third week in February. We still have to work that out with our consultant but it should be next month that we have those meetings. We are going to present the new noise contours that have been generated as we follow the protocols of the FAA, their guidelines. We discuss what the new noise contours are and how we take that for a future grant whether it is voluntary property acquisition or noise insulation. That's where were at with the noise study.

Laura Emdee What about the helicopter, the electric helicopter company.

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> I can give you an update on that. After we got that presentation from them, I want to say maybe 2 or 3 months after that, we got an email saying that at this point they were not going to pursue the project but they might at a future date. We don't know why but that's all we heard.

### Agenda Item #6: Comments/Discussion:

<u>Richard Montgomery</u> I appreciate Donny's efforts. The letters do help us. I can speak for my residents who want to know what is going on. The fact that we have all the cities here. The FAA knows we are here. They are answering Donny's questions which is what we want. Someone to

answer us. It's a slow process. Your good information I will take back, what you showed them Donny, the letters and the charts. Those of you who are really impacted, really feel impacted, your letters to the FAA, your comments, don't stop. They are behind but don't stop. Focus on 2022 to make your changes. Don't hesitate to contact your congress members. Email those people whoever they are in congress and say this is the difference and it affects my daily, we need your help. And stick with it.

**<u>Bob Hawks</u>** I second that Donny. I appreciate the efforts. I'm actually very surprised that there were not calls or emails from Del Aire because on the website Next Door they are up on arms.

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> As we get noise complaints from them we respond and explain to them that we sent letters out to the FAA waiting for a response so now we will be able to follow through with them as well let them know that we have data showing that we believe it's the new SPACEX SID that is causing noise over their neighborhood.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> Be careful about how and saying SpaceX because it has nothing to do with the company SpaceX. The Standard Instrument Approach procedure. You don't want them to catch flack for something that they are no means connected with.

### Guido Fernandez I understand.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> My comment is that it's a slow process. We deal with the FAA all the time. When we have issues even at the Hawthorne Airport for approaches. It's not I can fix it for you. It's not me, it's that committee or that committee. It takes a lot to get an answer even when it is very urgent and this is not typically urgent on their list. As Oliva and Richard said too, it's a long process. So one year or a year and a half worth of meetings is just starting to get on the radar of the FAA for the roundtable or noise committee and it's just a very super small time for them and it takes a super long time to get something out of them. You have to be persistent to make a change.

<u>Richard Montgomery</u> I will make sure to tell everyone that it is not SpaceX. It is not SpaceX the company. Don't call SpaceX to complaint. It's not them. Of all the names you pick why would you pick SpaceX route. Call it Tesla, call it something else.

<u>Donny Sandusky</u> They give individual names. There's an airport which is where Charles Schultz use to live, the creator of the Peanuts, and going to Albuquerque is Breaking Bad. They get creative with some these names and it just happened to be SpaceX.

<u>Julie DeCoste</u> I have a question for Guido. If someone wants to listen to our meeting next time and wants to join in. I'm not sure if they are allowed to join in. How do we go about that?

<u>Guido Fernandez</u> When we post the Agenda and it's supposed to be posted 72 hours ahead but we do it almost 1 week in advanced, and in the agenda, we put it in front of city hall and put it in the city website. What they are supposed to do and there are 2 ways, they can either for the

oral comments section they can send me an email and just like I read the comment last time I will read it or they can make arrangements to call in during the public comments section and I will put them on speaker and they will speak and everyone will hear it. The one thing we are not allowing is for people to join live for security reasons during the Zoom meeting. That's why I'm record it and within a few days we will post it on the website.

**Donny Sandusky** Any further comments? I called this meeting adjourned at 7:01 pm on the 21st.

- Meeting was adjourned at 7:01 pm.
- Minutes were recorded by City of Hawthorne via Zoom.
- Minutes were reviewed and submitted by the Secretary, Guido Fernandez.