



The Save Our Skies Response to the FAA Feasibility Study 5-25-16

Members of the Select Committee and the community--thank you for inviting us to speak tonight.

I won't remind you of the pain and grief my friends and neighbors have endured over the past 14 months--

However I will ask that you help insure that Santa Cruz will *never* become the doormat for San Francisco International Airport!

I'm here to outline the response that Save Our Skies Santa Cruz County has developed. The Initiative and Feasibility study are products of a series of meetings Save Our Skies and the FAA have had over the last year. SOSSC working in collaboration with other community groups, throughout the Bay Area, has continued to refine our asks of the FAA.

A thorough technical response to the FAA's Phase One initiative is not possible given the time allotted both this evening and since the release of the phase one report, so we will keep our responses at 15'000ft., surely a relief to everyone that's here tonight.

The Regional Solution is the result of our collaboration with other communities and we ask that you give this your full attention and support.

The Feasibility Study contains many suggestions that did not come from SOSSC or the regional group collaboration. Here I will address the points we feel are relevant to correcting the NextGen issues.

In reviewing this Feasibility study we urge the Select Committee to consider solutions for immediate relief and long-range solutions to address the cumulative impacts that have occurred in other communities, highlighted by the oppressive conditions from multiple-converging procedures over Palo Alto. We strongly recommend that the Select Committee instruct the FAA to restore the historical flight path to a pre-NextGen environment.

We call on the FAA to address both near term impacts that were a direct result of NextGen changes made on Mar 5th, 2015, such as the SERFR flight procedure, and those on-going longer term - cumulative impacts that have occurred in other communities, highlighted by the oppressive conditions from multiple-converging procedures over the Summit area and Palo Alto.

We also believe given how sophisticated and advanced the FAA is and what flight procedures are capable of performing these days, that an approach *can* be developed that is quieter than the original "BIGSUR" procedure that SERFR replaced on Mar 5th, in fact we **UNEQUIVOCALLY DEMAND** it!

With select committee guidance, the FAA seems to be willing to make this happen.

We further recommend that the historical flight path, **pre-NextGen**, be reinstated not only to respect an over 35 year old avigation easement (where the flight path always was), but in particular to give relief to the most significantly impacted communities at the summit. There the SERFR procedure simply makes a strafing run up Summit/Skyline roads often crossing at 3,500' AGL, right over many homes. Improved flight procedures will provide some relief, but at the summit, diminishing returns are more pronounced. The FAA's careless actions have pitted members of our community against each other, and we find this shameful!

Let's optimize SERFR not to shave a few seconds off SFO arrival times, but to respect the many communities that SERFR impacts along its route.

Our Responses to the Feasibility Study

First: A. **Page 11 PBN Procedures f.i** Transitioning SERFR to an improved Big Sur flight path is a solution that is much better for all parties concerned. We believe that this will restore our skies to the Pre-NextGen environment for Santa Cruz County.

HOWEVER, the altitude MUST be raised.

The last item on page 11 states: "It was instead suggested that these altitudes be adjusted in order to allow for OPD or Optimized Profile Descent."

Please ask the FAA what those altitudes are –please define this.

We would like the FAA's definition of OPD, what does it mean to them in engineering terms?

This restoration will have a domino effect on flight paths over subsequent communities at the Summit and all the way to SFO. This change should allow the BRIXX route to be adjusted. We strongly urge the Select Committee to have the FAA revisit the BRIXX flight path procedure that is causing unbearable pain to the residents of the Summit and Skyline areas. **Page 5 Altitude**

Second: **Page 18 Class B Containment:** We do not support the FAA proposal to amend the SFO Class B airspace to contain all procedures. This is a band-aid to make up for a poorly designed procedure. Please reference page 17 of the Study. SERFR cannot fly an OPD.

Third: Page 17 b. Use of Descend Via – In theory is a good thing but we know they can't fly SERRFR OPD so it will always be noise producing. We ask that you not consider this as a feasible option.

Since the creation of the initial proposal the initiative process has continued to develop and we have worked to fine tune our original proposal which is before you today. We believe the Feasibility study is a good faith effort. Yet there is room for improvement. In addition SOSSC would ask for more transparency in this process. It is noted in the Executive Summary that our Congressional Representatives will be given a report explaining why specific asks were deemed "unfeasible" We recommend the Select Committee obtain a copy of this report and make this report available to the Public.

In closing we recommend the Select Committee consider the Regional Proposal as the source for positive change. SOSSC will deliver to the Select Committee a letter report expanding on our analysis of the Feasibility Study before the final Public Meeting.

Thank you for your concerns and your commitment to saving our community from this nightmare!