

Input to the Select Committee on South Bay Arrivals, presented at the May 25th, 2016 Committee meeting at the Santa Cruz Civic Auditorium by George Wylie of the San Lorenzo Valley Advocacy Group.

Good evening. My name is George Wylie. I am a retired Navy pilot and United Airlines Captain with 35 years experience, and I have flown the BIG SUR arrival countless times. I am a San Lorenzo Valley resident and serve as an elected trustee on the SLV board of education.

Thank you for the opportunity to present perspectives from all parts of Santa Cruz County. Many of us are new to the table here and are grateful for the opportunity to provide meaningful input to this Committee for the first time.

I'd like to direct your attention to Page 11 of the FAA Initiative document, wherein the *Quiet Skies NorCal* advocacy group proposes that the SERFR arrival ground track be moved back to the BIG SUR track, and that the BIG SUR flight track altitudes then be adjusted in order to allow for Optimum Profile Descents.

This suggestion has been assessed by the FAA as 'Feasible'.

It should be noted that *Quiet Skies*, in making their proposal, failed to adequately seek input from the very stakeholders who would be most affected by this proposed flight path change – those who live under or near the BIG SUR flight path

The failure to include these essential stakeholders during the formative stages of this proposal deprived entire communities of the opportunity to provide vital input to this discussion. When a small number of us became aware, we met with *Quiet Skies* organizers to provide input, but our ideas were rejected and no consensus was reached.

The result is that this proposal erroneously concludes that the solution to the SERFR noise problem is to move the flight path. All this would do is move the noise elsewhere.

Put simply, the notion that moving the arrival from SERFR to BIG SUR will reduce aircraft noise is patently false. According to this document - the FAA Initiative - Optimum Profile Descent parameters would be applied for BIG SUR in the same manner as they were for SERFR, resulting in lower overflight altitudes along the BIG SUR track. The noise intensity under BIG SUR would then be exactly equal to what currently exists under SERFR.

Can you imagine the outcry from the Santa Cruz Downtown and West Side, Pasatiempo, Mount Hermann, the San Lorenzo Valley, Bonny Doon, and Scotts Valley residents when they are impacted by this new, lower, louder, more concentrated flight path?

Fortunately, our elected officials had the foresight to impose the following guiding principles:

- Last June the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors instructed Supervisors John Leopold and Bruce McPherson, who are primary members of this Select Committee, to "discuss only remedies that do not impact other Santa Cruz County residents."
- The currently published *SFO Airport/Community Roundtable Strategic Plan* directs that: "The Roundtable members, as a group, when considering and taking actions to mitigate noise, will not knowingly or deliberately support, encourage, or adopt actions, rules, regulations or policies, that result in the "shifting" of aircraft noise from one community to another..."
- And Congresswoman Anna Eshoo made absolutely clear during her announcement of the creation of this Select Committee that "This is a regional problem that calls for a regional solution. Simply shifting noise from one community to another is not an option."

Please consider...

- A sizeable and growing group of community members do not agree with the proposed movement of the SERFR flight path to BIG SUR. Therefore, this proposal does not constitute an authentic regional solution to this problem.
- A much larger group of now silent and as-yet unaware community members will become exceedingly vocal if this flight path change is considered.

We therefore ask for this Select Committee to follow the guiding principles set forth during the Committee's creation and reject the proposal to move SERFR to BIG SUR; and instead seek other, more viable regional solutions (such as the use of higher altitudes), that do not shift the noise problem from one community to another.

Finally, we greatly appreciate the Committee's hard work and fairness in trying to find a workable solution to this challenge among a multitude of conflicting opinions offered. Thank you for your considerable time and effort to address this difficult issue.

Good evening. My name is Jacqui Rice and I am a community member that lives in the San Lorenzo Valley.

I have been closely following any newspaper articles or announcements about the jet flight path change that occurred last March.

The Sentinel newspaper had the first published open invitation to a Save our Skies-Santa Cruz meeting on May 18, for a meeting the next evening.

I came to this meeting with our neighboring community group empathetic to the lower planes and noise especially at night.

I expected to hear some win-win solutions.

What was shared there was a 180° different viewpoint.

1. I witnessed Patrick Meyer, co-chairman of this committee, speak about how the FAA doesn't like to hear the term 'move back the jet path', so he has changed the wording, added some directional changes, and altered flight course info, to trick the FAA that moving the flight path back was not his true goal. At the audience loudly cheered and voiced visceral verbal approval responses to this.

i.e. Stick it back to them! Let them deal with this, Dump it back to them!

2. An FAA document was presented with the # complaints and number of callers for Jan. News articles have listed over 100,00 complaints in 2015.

This is why:

Scotts Valley 23,239 complaints -110 callers

Simple math can tell us how these yearly complaint numbers are so high.

(3. A lottery bag with date and time slips for when was your turn to call the FAA was passed around. One member admitted that she had called so often her number was blocked.) This paragraph was eliminated due to speech time limits.

4. After the meeting I asked Ben Shelef about the absence of shared information to the future affected flight path residents.

He assured me that returning back to the old flight path, would not affect SLV. We looked at a map, and HE had determined that SLV was only a narrow corridor of homes along Hwy 9.

So now, and by their zip code/city correlations, Felton, Ben Lomond, Mt Hermon, Henry Cowell Park, Lompico, Brookdale, Boulder Creek are not in the San Lorenzo Valley?

And these communities are not living under this group's proposed changes? And, as a caveat, also mentioned that this flight path change may have a lower altitude over these areas, as

discussed in the FAA Feasibility Study!

I thought our county residents stood up for each other, made sure that everyone that will be affected by big community decisions are publicly made aware of these discussions. Not by Facebook and website announcements only, as not all folks partake in these.

We have a huge unsuspecting swath of residents, 37,000 in the SLV alone, not counting West side Santa Cruz, Pasatiempo or Bonny Doon, that will come forth with a roar to public officials, over the fact that the primary goal and impact of this group was decided without any voices heard but their own.

This is NOT community consent or regional approval, as required by the FAA and Select Committee Members and also certainly not how two neighboring communities interact with each other.

Jacqui Rice