

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting/Project Name:	Noise Stakeholder Meeting #2		
Date of Meeting:	09/29/2022	Time:	1800 – 2000
Minutes Prepared By:	Derick Chick	Location:	Bachman Recreation Center

1. Meeting Objectives

- Introductions
- Facilitator
- HMMH
 - Review existing Dallas Love Field (DAL) Voluntary Noise Program (VNP)
- Break into Working Groups
 - Solicit stakeholder ideas and feedback on the current or suggested measures
 - Discuss possible modifications to the VNP
- Adjourn

2. Attendees

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Beverley Wright, Facilitator | 31. Chris Sandoval, FAA – Virtual |
| 2. Gene Reindel, HMMH | 32. James Anderson, Council Liaison D13 – Virtual |
| 3. Tim Middleton, HMMH | 33. Marissa Sanchez, Dept of Aviation – Virtual |
| 4. Kris Sweckard, Dept. of Aviation | 34. Mark Duebner, Dept of Aviation – Virtual |
| 5. Sana Drissi, Dept. of Aviation | 35. Sheneice Hughes, Dept of Aviation – Virtual |
| 6. Isaac Ellison, Dept. of Aviation | 36. Mike Luckock, Mockingbird Lane – Virtual |
| 7. Derick Chick, Dept. of Aviation | 37. Bill Cohn, Love Field Action Committee – Virtual |
| 8. Lilia Gonzales, Dept. of Aviation | 38. Holly Russell, Town of Highland Park – Virtual |
| 9. Rachel Simpson, Dept. of Aviation | 39. Clint Bradley, FAA – Virtual |
| 10. Rafael Garza, Dept. of Aviation | 40. Dawn Blair, Dept of Aviation – Virtual |
| 11. Hunter Davis, Signature | 41. Michelle Diaz, Alaska Airlines – Virtual |
| 12. Trey Turner, Southwest Airlines | 42. Dominique Bindon, FAA – Virtual |
| 13. Rick Dalton, Southwest Airlines | 43. Patrick Carreno, Dept of Aviation – Virtual |
| 14. Nick James, Southwest Airlines | |
| 15. Steve Klein, Bordeaux Village | |
| 16. Carol Klein, Bordeaux Village | |
| 17. Linda Blase, West Love | |
| 18. Deats Beard - Observer | |
| 19. Michael Cintron, Bradford Estates – Observer | |
| 20. Ryan Brown, Friends of Bachman Lake | |
| 21. Andrew Matheny, Friends of Bachman Lake | |
| 22. John Womack, Oaklawn Committee | |
| 23. Bill Lindey, Town of Highland Park | |
| 24. Matt Thocker, Signature | |
| 25. Pat White, Bluffview | |
| 26. Don Word, Bluffview | |
| 27. Nancy Kenty, Bluffview | |
| 28. Robert Prejean, SW Medical District | |
| 29. Fred Pratt, Southwest Airline | |
| 30. Chris Perry, Southwest Airline | |

3. Agenda and Notes, Decisions, Issues

Topic	Discussion
Update Day-Night Average Sound Level Contours Study	<p>Andrew Matheny said that the use of 2019 noise contour is no longer accurate to use as a reference due to changes that have recently occurred such as the runway reconstruction project, the global pandemic, Southwest fleet mix changes, unused Trinity Departure, and lax enforcement of existing measures. A new study will be beneficial and should be conducted to reflect these recent changes. He also recommends including a 55 DNL contour to the study.</p> <p>Gene Reindel with HMMH explained that 2019 is the last stable data that is available because the years 2020 and 2021 are considered to be anomalies due to the effects of the global pandemic. Airports around the country are struggling with the same issue and are still waiting for a stable time to be able to conduct a study.</p>
Noise Abatement Departure Procedure (NADP)	<p>Bill Cohn asked Southwest Airlines representatives about their optimal takeoff procedures and which profile is being used. Trey Turner explained SWA's optimal takeoff profile procedure and expanded that they are utilizing the NADP-2. Bill Cohn said that NADP-1 should be utilized instead because it will generate less noise closer to-DAL. Gene Reindel (HMMH) explained to all participants that because aircraft require a set amount of energy to get from takeoff to cruising altitude, NADPs reduce noise near the airport and then there is an increase in noise where the aircraft reengage standard climb power. NADP-1 is utilized to reduce noise closest to areas at end of runways, whereas NADP-2 will reduce noise to close-in areas a bit further from runways.</p> <p>Andrew Matheny then asked if the Trinity departure's goal is to reduce noise in communities close to the airport, why would the NADP-1 not be considered? Gene Reindel responded by saying a study comparison can be done to determine the potential noise reductions because changing the NADP profile could result in areas with higher noise levels. In addition, the NADP-2 is considered a fuel saving measure and emits less CO2 which results in a win-win situation for both the airline and communities. Bill Cohn said that there should be a balance and pointed out AC-91-53A and the NBAA "best practice" as reference.</p> <p>Robert Prejean added that a land use study should also be considered because there are many new apartments being constructed at Maple Avenue, Oakland Heights, and West Love. Bill Cohn added that we do not have to move the noise if we are reducing noise.</p> <p>Beverley Wright concluded the topic discussion by saying that the Department of Aviation will continue talks with the FAA to produce a more clear response on what can be tried and what timelines that participants can expect.</p>

RNAV for Trinity Departure	<p>Andrew Matheny asked why the Trinity departure was not included as a RNAV procedure. Chris Sandoval (FAA) said that they will do some research at their TRACON office and should have some information on why it is not part of RNAV procedures.</p> <p>Andrew Matheny also suggested that the Trinity departure should be implemented on both runways for southbound departures. Beverley Wright responded by saying the FAA should be given some time and prepare a response to these questions and suggestions before the third meeting.</p> <p>Bill Cohn was asked for any input, and he brought up that the Five Party Agreement resulted in many outcomes which includes the Trinity departure and the FAA not implementing them is something that they are not allowed to do. He insisted that the Trinity departure be reinstated and believes that not every flight needs to be converted to RNAV since there are not many flight operations during the nighttime.</p> <p>Instead of waiting for it to be implemented as a RNAV procedure, the original measure should still be in place until the new version arrives. Isaac Ellison responded that the Trinity departure is still currently available for use even though it is not converted into RNAV. Chris Sandoval (FAA) confirmed that the Trinity departure charts are still published as of September 2022. Mike Luckock asked if they are being used. Chris Sandoval said that he is unable to confirm. Trey Turner (SWA) said in response that Southwest utilizes the procedure that is assigned by the FAA and tends to favor RNAV because they are optimized. However, after hearing feedback from the community, they are willing to see what they can do and work with the FAA for a viable solution.</p> <p>Mike Luckock suggested that every airline operating out of DAL should be notified that the Trinity departure is still active and available. Bill Cohn reiterated that pilots will just do what they are told and will not fly the Trinity departure. It can only be done by Air Traffic Control (ATC) instructions.</p>
----------------------------	--

4. Highlighted Items	
1	To ensure open communication, all questions, concerns, and suggestions can be sent to AVINoise@dallas.gov . The Department of Aviation will continue to accept any recommendations from participants even after the meetings.
2	Andrew Matheny recommended for the Airport to use WhisperTrack. Gene Reindel with HMMH says that he is familiar with it and will provide more information on it to the Department of Aviation.
3	FAA to provide more information on why the Trinity Departure is not converted into a RNAV procedure and if it is possible to implement it for southbound departures on both runways during nighttime.
4	Mike Luckock suggested that the Department of Aviation should share any questions and suggestions received to all participants in the Noise Stakeholder Meeting.
5	Southwest Airlines to check on scheduled flights times. Andrew Matheny reported that there were 6 arrivals scheduled after 11pm.

6

Bill Cohn and Andrew Matheny submitted a document titled “Love Field Noise Stakeholders Response” as an overview to the Department of Aviation to review. This will be shared with all Participants.

Disclaimer: The document titled “Love Field Noise Stakeholders Response” is not published by the City of Dallas’ Department of Aviation. Opinions, point of view, and suggestions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Department of Aviation.