Monday, April 17, 2023
Naples Airport Authority: Workshop Meeting Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dustin at 9:00 a.m. in the Airport Office Building, Second Floor Conference Room.

A. ROLL CALL

1. Roll Call

Present were Chair Dustin, Vice Chair Ruppert, Commissioner Cuddihy, Commissioner Cavanaugh and Commissioner Burns.

Mr. Ruppert said that he had a medical appointment and would need to leave the meeting by 1:30 p.m. Chair Dustin said that he had a personal conflict and would need to leave the meeting by 1:15 p.m. Chair Dustin said that he would conclude the meeting in order for each Commissioner to be on time for their appointment. He said he will call for a short recess at 10:30 a.m. and that lunch will be delivered at 12 p.m.

Staff and Authority Counsel present were Mr. Owens, Mr. Rozansky, Mr. Lobb, Mr. Warriner, Mr. Brown, Mr. Burch, Mr. Reyes, Ms. Arciere, Mr. Dietrich and Ms. Azarelly Acosta.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Dustin led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AGENDA

Mr. Rozansky stated that the meeting was being live streamed today and that there were two revisions to the Board packet as follows:

1. Under Noise, Item 1 – Recent Noise Abatement Efforts is being added. Previous Item 1, Review of Noise Compatibility Program by Category, will shift to Noise, Item 2.

2. Under Old Business, a new item is being added: Airspace Heading Clarification.

Briefing memorandums were distributed at the dais.

Mr. Rozansky explained the differences between Workshop, Special and Regular Meetings. Essentially, each meeting allows the Board to meet in a publicly noticed forum and discuss any topics. At a workshop meeting, he said no formal action can be taken.

D. PRESENTATIONS AND TIME CERTAIN ITEMS

1. Independent Flight Procedure Analysis

Mr. Kevin Karpe, Diverse Vector Aviation Consultants (DVAC), introduced Mr. Walter White and Mr. Doug Merritt of PBNNAS.

Mr. White provided a brief professional biography demonstrating his understanding of how the system works from a pilot's perspective.

PBNNAS was asked to review and comment on several things within the Naples airspace. Mr. White presented a preliminary flight procedure feasibility analysis. He noted that much information had been reviewed and will continue to be reviewed to ensure the professionals' first impressions will hold up over time.

Mr. White said the data presented was based on a preliminary review. Any designs were notional only and did not represent completed designs. The study began with a regional review of airspace operations and existing procedures. Airspace around Fort Myers and Naples were reviewed as well as the other airports located in Southwest Florida. All the associated procedures were reviewed.

Chair Dustin noted the Immokalee Airport was omitted. He said Miami and Ft Lauderdale are somewhat close and asked why they were omitted too. Mr. White said he took a general quick look at Miami, and they do not impact what the NAA is asking to be done.

Commissioner Burns has learned that on arriving into Florida, flying in from the north, there are three main freeways in the sky. He asked for a depiction of where the freeways were located on his exhibit, and Mr. White responded.

Mr. White said FAA data was reviewed, which included flight procedures and flight tracks. One of the issues with the Preliminary Airspace Review slide was that all the under-traffic was not shown. In addition, airport-supplied track data was displayed for air traffic at an altitude of 10,000 feet and below. The data analysis depicted Marco Island, Naples and Fort Myers airports. The data was merged, analyzed, and clarified. Mr. White stated that some distinct white lines in the slide represented precise arrivals into Fort Myers. He said they were precise, and a track arriving in Naples was also shown. There are several aircraft arriving across the shoreline at quite a low altitude. Also, with inbound traffic from the northeast, most are arriving from all directions, which would indicate a visual approach rather than an instrumental one. Mr. White stated there is a lot of structure going into Fort Myers and much less structure arriving into Naples, as far as the airplane tracks indicate.

Flight Procedure Notional Designs were discussed, including the following:

- Goodlette Road Departure Corridor
- Removal of 2,000 foot hold down
- Runway 23 Bay Departure
- Runway 14-32 Arrival Procedure
- Optimized Profile Descent Procedure (OPD)
    - 3.5-degree arrival

Mr. White said one of the things not appreciated by many is the Flight Management System (FMS) in aircraft. It is important to understand how this system operates in order to get aircraft to travel along the tracks desired.

Regarding the Goodlette Road Departure Corridor, the FAA said it would be workable. In general, because of the rules, if one is going to stay within a standard design, the first turn point can be no closer than one mile from the end of the runway. Using different leg types, which is how a computer is programmed, results in different actual flight paths. Depending upon the leg types

input, the actual place where an aircraft turns can vary greatly. Mr. White said there are ways to manipulate data to result in airplanes following a desired path.

Commissioner Burns asked Mr. White to describe the difference or how much the difference would matter in various types of aircraft. Mr. White responded that the FAA's basic calculation indicates that an airplane climbs approximately 200 feet per nautical mile. An airplane has to be 500 feet above the airport before it can start turning (after departure), which equates to a two-and-a-half-mile straight length. A smaller aircraft that is fully loaded with fuel and people would climb slower, taking up to a couple of miles to reach 500 feet above the airport. He noted all the aircraft he sees on the ramp have more than enough power and will rotate midfield, most being at 400-500 feet by the time they reach the end of the runway. The maximum allowed by FAA is a rate of climb at 500 feet per nautical mile until reaching 508 feet.

Chair Dustin asked Mr. Rozansky if Mr. White should focus on the jets since that is the most disruptive traffic in and out of Naples Airport. Commissioner Burns has heard many objections to the prop noise around Royal Harbor. He said people with whom he has spoken with are bothered more by noise generated from prop planes. Therefore, he asked that the discussion entail all aircraft.

Vice Chair Ruppert asked Mr. White if it would be relevant to talk about both or if it would be more appropriate to talk about jet traffic versus piston traffic. Mr. White said that all airplanes can fly by these criteria.

The potential removal of a 2,000-foot hold down has received much attention. Mr. White stated, based upon the review of all traffic, he does not see any reason why an aircraft cannot climb more than 2,000 feet. He has read everything the FAA has told the NAA and will continue reviewing additional flight tracks. Mr. White stated his professional opinion is that it would be easier for air traffic controllers for the air traffic to climb a little higher, and it would be better in terms of less pollution. He was confident that working methods could be recommended, resulting in a higher climb profile.

Vice Chair Ruppert was pleased with the preliminary conclusion but noticed Mr. White's approach to Marco Island was directed right into Naples. He asked if there was a reason for the caveat being in there from the FAA. Mr. White responded that there are two runways into Marco Island, 17 and 35. The departure lines off Naples are not affected by that operation. Because of the altitude, those airplanes must be sequenced with Naples arrivals to Runway 23 to ensure separation. It would be an FAA standard to make a climbing right turn instead of going straight ahead to eliminate the issue.

Mr. White looked at the eastbound traffic off Runway 5, with a 2,000-foot hold down, and he does not see any reason for it. He said it is possible to design a procedure that sends aircraft straight ahead, gives plenty of climb room and directs the northbound air traffic.

Commissioner Cuddihy referred to the 2,000-foot hold on two of the runways that had been discussed. She asked about the others, and Mr. White said the only runways he had spent much time working on were Runways 23 and 5. You get into a combination issue with Runways 14 and 32 depending on which direction an aircraft is flying. Runway 14 seems easier since there are no obstacles.

Mr. White stated they were also asked to look at Runway 23 departures. They studied the bay departure and the 270 heading. He said the 270-heading procedure could be designed to where it goes down the center line or has dispersion. That decision will be made by the NAA with community input.

Mr. White reviewed the FAA response. He said typically, the FAA indicated that Naples Airport could not do a bay departure due to the waypoints that are very close together. The FMS will not sequence the aircraft properly and does not meet FAA regulations. He presented notional possibilities that would meet FAA criteria.

Mr. White reviewed the Runway 23 Bay Departure. Commissioner Cavanaugh asked if, for someone flying, there is variability that would create variable flight paths for each aircraft traveling that route. He noted this discussion came about due to people wanting to mitigate and reallocate noise. Commissioner Cavanaugh asked how the FAA quantifies changing flight patterns regarding safety and airport aircraft performance versus a concern by the community that wants to reallocate noise and move flight patterns. Mr. White said the FAA will look at this from a technical standpoint, and they will see some variation. Everyone will be approximately 100 feet to the left or right of the center line when rolling out of the airport. Mr. White stated that his presentation includes only notional possibilities. However, he is confident that the possibilities could be done and would meet standard FAA design criteria. Commissioner Cavanaugh asked if there would be flight path variability, even in the final design. Mr. White said absolutely. Commissioner Cavanaugh confirmed that some of the flights would go down the peninsula, and Mr. White said yes. Commissioner Cavanaugh asked for an explanation of concerns the FAA would raise versus the 270 departures that would take an aircraft to the gulf within 1-1.2 miles. Mr. White said it meets standard FAA criteria, and one part of the design process is making sure there are no obstacles underneath the flight path that would affect safety of flight. The FAA does a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review to ensure compliance. There are specific thresholds, and the review is very technical. That process is separate and distinct from whether something is technically feasible.

Commissioner Burns asked if Mr. White could provide some idea of what the altitude would be if the 2,000-foot hold is put into play, and Mr. White said it is variable. Some preliminary work was conducted with averages, and it could be many thousands of feet. Due to the variability, it really could not be quantified. Commissioner Burns said raising the 2,000-foot hold is the one community recommendation upon which everyone agrees.

Mr. White noted they were asked to review Runways 14 and 32 procedures. There are already procedures, but one of the reasons they don't say Runway 14-32 arrival is because there is some type of obstacle that prevents the aircraft from getting down low enough by the end of the runway. The further away a missed approach, the greater the visibility requirement becomes. It will have to be reviewed more in-depth to figure out why the minimum descent altitude (MDA) is so high. The same holds true for Runway 14 arrival, it is the same MDA, and the issue, again, is that there is some obstacle creating an issue.

They looked at a 3.5-degree descent (glideslope), and FAA responded with flight standards approval that were operationally feasible for all except Runway 14 (ATC). He said 3.5 degrees has been a level criterion that is approvable with justification. Mr. White looked at Optimized Profile Descent Procedure (OPD) and for them to be successful, it would have to integrate with the existing traffic control system. It is important to make sure any new approaches integrate well

with the current approaches. He said STARS (Standard Terminal Arrivals), specific to Naples, will be necessary.

Mr. Rozansky stated that the NAA has been working on this for years and is pleased with the optimistic feedback being provided by Mr. White. Not only could this result in more efficient airspace, this may even reduce controller workload in addition to providing tangible noise benefits for the Naples community.

Chair Dustin asked if adopting OPD would bring aircraft in at higher levels and reduce the environmental and noise impacts. Mr. White said it would reduce the measured noise impact.

Mr. Merritt with PBNNAS stated that Mr. White is very good at designing procedures to separate aircraft, so that the altitudes and routes do not touch. He was confident that if pilots do what they are directed, and controllers stick to the procedures, there would never be an incident.

Mr. Rozansky said this type of analysis should be part of every airport land use compatibility, noise study. However, it is not eligible for FAA funding.

Commissioner Cuddihy said this should be part of the lobbying efforts for FAA reauthorization because more funding is needed for this type of work.

In accordance with the presentation and process, Mr. White explained the next steps in this process as follows:

- Further analysis of flight tracks and surrounding paths
- Complete feasibility analysis
- Develop potential implementation plan
    - Key actions
    - Explore paths to directly interact with the FAA
    - Estimate timelines (February 2025 review of procedures already on FAA timeline)
- Develop written reports with supporting documentation
- Additional on-site briefing
- FAA IFP Gateway and project initiation

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked if the NAA could approach FAA to get some relief before 2025. Mr. White was reluctant to talk about time frames because there are so many variables. He said the FAA rotates through every procedure in the United States, basically every five years, to ensure there are no new obstacles and that criteria is met. Upon review of the FAA website, Mr. White said Marco Island is scheduled to be looked at in 2025. The NAA should use that to its advantage. Commissioner Cavanaugh asked whether February 2025 is an opportunity to do anything significant. Mr. White said that would depend on the level of project. Some of this requires no new publication, it is simply a change to internal air traffic control procedures. The rest of these are separate procedures and are on a different timeline. Commissioner Cavanaugh asked, "where these two get married." Mr. White said it is a large organization and those procedures would probably be performed at the regional level and at the local facility level. Naples Airport falls under Atlanta and the facility would have to do a safety case and come up with procedures that they would give to the Naples Tower providing guidance regarding departure climb altitudes. This would not require any new publications that would be seen by the public. It is not like a new

approach procedure; it is merely an air traffic control instruction. However, if having new published procedures or changing a missed approach, that is a different department within the FAA and there is a line of all of the procedures in the United States requiring each one in line to be in the queue.

Vice Chair Ruppert followed up acknowledging that getting through the portal takes time. He asked how the process starts, expressly, who one would call and how to get them to take the call once the NAA knows what it would like to do. Mr. White said the NAA has already spoken with people in the FAA, and it would be important to continue those communications. The regional level may help encourage the local level to come online.

Commissioner Burns stated he believes the NAA should authorize Mr. White to continue studying Naples Airport. He said the NAA has its eyes open to a new way of approaching the issues, and he suggested the NAA provide the necessary resources to allow the professionals to get their work done and make it easier for the FAA to decide.

Commissioner Cuddihy said it would be great, as the professionals are looking at this, for them to make suggestions if they observe other areas where efficiency may be improved. Mr. White agreed.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked Mr. White if he could provide any information about the airport reaching capacity, what the FAA does concerning the actual capacity in the air and how is that managed in the future in an airport like Naples. Mr. White said that those aircraft fly at higher altitudes because most of the traffic is jet traffic. A computer in Herndon, Virginia, houses the control center. That control center looks at all airports' routes to identify high-altitude sectors. Mr. White also noted it would be doubtful that the FAA would, given its mission, support anything to reduce capacity at an airport.

Chair Dustin stated the NAA members had no further questions but were excited and hopeful about Mr. White's work and that of his colleagues.

Mr. Rozansky thanked Mr. White, Mr. Merritt, and Mr. Karpe for engaging with the NAA to assist in navigating the system. Chair Dustin suggested that this information be communicated to as many constituencies as possible.

Please note that a short break was taken at 10:45 a.m.

2. Runway 23 Departures over Naples Bay

Mr. Zachary Burch, Senior Community Engagement/Communications Manager, presented to the NAA. He said staff has researched historical documents about Runway 23(22) use and Naples Bay. Four relevant documents were discovered: 1) 1968 Master Plan; 2) 1987 Part 150 Noise Exposure Maps; 3) 1996 Part 150 Noise Exposure Maps; and 4) 2010 Part 150 Noise Exposure Maps. The 1968 Master Plan did note some objections to noise, and at that time, they recommended a left-hand departure from Runway 23, in 1968 the mapping was not very specific.

Mr. Burch presented maps and charts depicting Runway 23 departures over Naples Bay based on previous Part 150 Noise Studies data. The information presented was drawn from the four historical documents previously referenced.

Mr. Burch said approximately 10% of the Naples flights head south or east, and of that, approximately 50% turn on that 270 and about 40% go straight out, and about 40% make the left turn in the Bay area.

Commissioner Burns had stated at the last meeting that there were flights going down the bay before 1997. He knows the table was not included in the presentation, and there may not have been jets, but there were turboprops traveling down the bay in large numbers. Mr. Burch said there was also a piston track that largely followed the bay. Commissioner Burns said his understanding was that the turboprop aircraft make quite a bit of noise. He thanked Mr. Burch for the information provided.

3. Summary of Draft Noise Compatibility Program Public Comments

Ms. Autumn Ward, Senior Airport Planner with Environmental Science Associates, reported on official public comments received during the Noise Compatibility Program study. She provided an overview of recent meetings, particularly the open houses and public hearings recently held. FAA only requires legal notice in the newspaper to be circulated one time. Exhaustive efforts were made to solicit as much community involvement as possible. There were 34 people in attendance at the public open house, and 19 people attended the public hearing. More than 1,000 total public comments were received during the process, and each comment will be responded to in the Final NCP Report.

There were 736 comments received on notice abatement measures. Public comments suggest that individuals have strong opposition to the following:

- Shift Goodlette-Frank Road Departure Corridor East and Create a "Golf Course Corridor"
- Route South and East Bound Jet Departures from Runway 23 Down the Bay

There was also some support for the 2,000-foot hold down, although only 16 people commented. It has been expressed that they would like to see the 2,000-foot hold-down removed.

Commissioner Cavanaugh stated that the measures are referred to as Noise Abatement Measures. However, as he reads through them, some are not abatement but seem to be a redistribution of noise. He wanted to make sure there was a distinction between what was being offered as abatement and sound distribution.

Ms. Ward stated for the land use measures, there were 40 comments. Twenty-four of the commenters supported investigating the feasibility of relocating the airport. There were a few in opposition and very few additional comments.

Commissioner Cuddihy asked where the outcry from the public gets captured. Ms. Ward responded there was a fair amount captured at the Open Houses after the noise exposure map report. Those open house comments were responded to and included in that report. The ones submitted to other entities were not captured in this study. Ms. Ward said FAA requires public comment periods, and the comments captured during those periods are responded to, corresponding with their report log. Everything is documented in the meeting minutes and included as part of the appendices. Mike Arnold, LEED AP and Vice President at ESA, added at the December Board meeting that all comments received leading up to that meeting were addressed. The public hearing is included in recommendations in the Noise Compatibility Program and addressing those comments as federal law requires. The FAA is looking for the comments

and which compatibility measures were supported or not. He also said, as indicated by Ms. Ward, many public comments were captured during the noise exposure map phase or during initial kickoff phase meetings for the NCP, which are included in the list, or during the formal public comment period as part of the hearing process on NCP recommendations. Mr. Arnold further explained the public comment process and how the comments have been captured and are being addressed.

Mr. Rozansky stated that a summary of the comments appear in some of the supplemental portion of the NCP submission, but this is the format that FAA expects. Chair Dustin would like to see a supplemental portion recognizing every comment made by public participants. Mr. Rozansky advised that if ESA is asked to compile a supplemental document, there will be a financial impact. Commissioner Burns is thinking about the timing, not the cost. With the NAA trying to finish the Part 150 study, now might not be the appropriate time to create a new document. He said everyone knows what the comments have been and that those comments have been considered.

Commissioner Cavanaugh said he would like to get the numbers but would want to ensure they are for the same region. He expressed concern that if tabulated, the commentary may be duplicated where this is a distance empirical count of 500 people who have provided input. He was not in favor of stopping to have another document created.

Commissioner Cuddihy said she now understands the elements that will be going to the FAA and is satisfied that previous meeting minutes will be included in the FAA packet. Commissioner Ruppert also appreciated all the comments received outside of the Part 150 process. He does not want to hold the Part 150 process up because of the complexity and volume of activity. He would like to continue the process moving forward.

Ms. Ward said Program Management Measures only got seven comments.

She provided a brief summary of actions that have been taken to date. A summary of November TAC and NCC Joint Workshop ranking of noise abatement measures was provided. Ms. Ward reviewed ranking from last November.

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS (5-minute limit) ON GENERAL TOPICS NOT ON THE CURRENT AGENDA

Mr. Raphael Alberto, 1467 Marlin Drive, was pleased with the presentation and happy to hear about the 2,000-foot hold measure. He was disappointed with the continued discussion about Down the Bay. He encouraged the NAA Board to continue looking at ways not to relocate the noise. He thought the 2,000-foot hold may be the most important measure. The flight idle descent has not been elaborated on, but Mr. Alberto felt this could be likened to taking a foot off the throttle in a NASCAR vehicle. Regarding turboprops versus turbo jets, the noise comes from the air going through the engine, not through the propellers. He stated that on behalf of his community, Royal Harbor, and other communities, they do not want to see the noise relocated into their residential areas.

Ms. Eileen Lowry, 681 West Lake Drive, Naples, thought Mr. White brought up some interesting things that are being considered: the 2,000-foot hold and down the bay. On the 2,000-foot hold, she was concerned that noise may be increased due to the additional thrust required to reach above 2,000 feet. She suggested a study be conducted to understand the noise implications to the surrounding community before further consideration. In addition, currently, most of the jets that

fly over Naples are not near a 2,000-foot altitude before they reach the Gulf. She does not understand why the jets are not climbing to 2,000 feet if given the clearance to do so. Ms. Lowry referred to a conversation about how to best get the FAA's attention, she believed by including the NCP would get their attention. She said the comments were for the public to send an e-mail to a specified address. This feedback was not done in a survey format. Therefore, when comments were sent to the City, it was subjective as to how that correspondence was accounted for in the study. The last point made by Ms. Lowry was that clearly, given the results, the system was beat. There were requests from members of golf courses in order to do that. General citizens who took a lot of time and effort to draft a comment or response, may not have been given the same level of consideration.

Chair Dustin asked for commentary on why getting higher at a faster pace reduces noise pollution. Mr. Rozansky said ESA performed some analysis around that. Mr. Arnold said that it was looked at and at the last workshop that was held with pilots, it was indicated that one of the things mentioned was that as those jets are climbing, they are climbing so fast that they have to be on the brakes at about 1,000 feet to slow down before getting to 2,000 feet, to keep from blasting through that 2,000 foot altitude. If they were allowed to climb freely, they would get to higher altitudes. This is why ESA is also recommending, along with the 2,000-foot hold, the use of the noise abatement departure procedures established by the NBAA, which establishes the different rates to climb from a noise standpoint to minimize or offset any potential increase in noise.

F. NOISE

1. Noise Abatement Efforts

Mr. Burch stated this document was put together outlining efforts made during the last couple of years. He highlighted the results experienced during the fiscal year to the present.

Summary of recent noise abatement efforts undertaken by the NAA included:

- Top Initiatives
- Operational Initiatives
- Community and Industry Engagement
- Advocacy
- Initiatives Under Development

Mr. Burch said there had been some results, such as since October 2022, a 34% overall reduction in curfew violations, including a 51% reduction in jet curfew violations, resulting in a 98.9% curfew compliance rate. He said noise comments are down over 40% compared to last year. These are positive trends and looking forward to more new ideas and concepts in the future.

Commissioner Cuddihy asked what percentage of jet operations down year over year were. Mr. Rozansky said approximately 16 percent. He said jet operations are down but emphasized the 51% reduction in jet curfew violations. A larger component is the goodwill earned from the tenants and aircraft operators.

Commissioner Burns said that since this item was added to the agenda after publication, he hoped it would be available to the public. Mr. Burch affirmed that this information would be added to the final meeting packet.

Chair Dustin thought the positive trend information was optimistic and should be released to the community. Mr. Burch noted this information in the April 20, 2023, NAA agenda packet.

Mr. Rozansky noted staff advertised a solicitation for on-call Aviation Planning Services to the potential scope of work for an Airport Exploratory Study, and a Consultant Selection Committee meeting has been scheduled.

2. Review of Noise Compatibility Program Recommendations by Category

Mr. Burch introduced the review of recommendations and turned the floor over to Mr. Arnold. Mr. Arnold will present a summary of the 957 comments received during the comment period for inclusion in the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program. The presentation will also include a summary of the votes on individual recommendations by the Noise Compatibility Committee, Technical Advisory Committee and Naples City Council.

Mr. Arnold stated there is a National Environmental Policy Act process required. Regarding flight procedure implementation, about 99% of flight facilities go through a categorical exclusion process, meaning that they have minimal impact or effect on surrounding communities relative to noise, emissions, or other concerns. Because the DNL 65 Contour (the threshold above which aircraft noise is incompatible with residential areas) is solely related to the airport property boundary, it would be expected that while these measures are being reviewed from a noise standpoint, the FAA would likely say there is no noise factor one way or the other because it does not change the DNL 65 Contour procedures. One of the things the FAA looks at when doing a categorical exclusion is extraordinary circumstances. Those circumstances involved federal special purpose laws that affect things such as flood plains, wetlands and other defined environmental categories. One of the categories is related to public controversy, which can trigger a measure going from a categorical exclusion to an environmental assessment. An environmental assessment is a more focused and exhaustive process. The FAA wanted to ensure the community was on board with the measures being pushed forward. The FAA does not want to decide on whether to advance a measure. They want the NAA to make the decision and then promote their decision with the FAA. Because of the potential public controversy related to some of the measures, there would likely be a more intensive environmental process associated with the FAA review. It is an important consideration for the FAA to see the NAA endorsing the measures and identifying that it wishes to move forward with the measure. Mr. Arnold addressed a question regarding why all the noise abatement measures are not being moved through as formal recommendations as part of the NCP to the FAA. He said that used to be normal practice because FAA, from a regulatory standpoint, only approves measures that demonstrate a reduction within the DNL contours; what ends up happening is they disapprove it for Part 150. The consultants have found that their traffic organization uses that disapproval as a reason not to move measures forward.

Vice Chair Ruppert asked if the FAA would have a public outreach on its own, irrespective of the NAA vote. Mr. Arnold said it is his understanding that the FAA would likely have some type of community outreach to solicit feedback if they were to advance some of the measures.

Commissioner Burns thanked Mr. Arnold for the explanation. He said comments have been received from the public, including the City Council, regarding why there is only one noise abatement recommendation for formal FAA approval.

Mr. Arnold provided the Review of Noise Compatibility Program Recommendations by category. He displayed a heat map for jet arrival and departures. The heat map better depicted the arrivals and departures. Jet and Non-Jet Radar Flight Tracks were also displayed. A comprehensive population analysis was conducted as part of the study. Not only the population densities but also seasonal populations were evaluated to understand peak population now and in the future.

Mr. Arnold presented the noise abatement measure recommended for formal FAA approval in the NCP Update: Noise Abatement Measure (NAM) 1: Implement Procedures to Increase Glide Slope to Runway End 5. He also discussed the potential noise abatement measures for pursuit outside of the Part 150 process.

The noise abatement measure, Implement Procedures to Increase Glide Slope to Runway End 5, would reduce noncompatible land uses within the DNL 60 contour southwest of APF. It would increase the altitude of arrival aircraft landing on Runway 5 as they overfly communities to the southwest and it would increase the glide slope from 3.0 to 3.5 degrees.

Mr. Arnold addressed routing the south and east bound aircraft departures, currently approximately 12% of the Runway 23 departures. He showed the population effects in the area of the 180 heading. It has been determined that the number of people impacted would be reduced, but new people would be affected.

Mr. Arnold discussed the 2,000-Foot Hold. This measure would remove the 2,000-foot hold down on departures to allow an unrestricted climb or a climb to a higher altitude. Removing the hold down could increase noise between 1.5 and 3 miles from airport property and is recommended in conjunction with the use of the National Business Aviation Association (NBAA) Noise Abatement Departure Procedures (NADPs) to ensure noise reduction benefits for all communities.

Discussion ensued; Mr. Arnold responded to questions raised by the Commission regarding the modification of the 2,000-foot hold down. Commissioner Burns thought the departures generated more noise. Commissioner Cavanaugh lives where the aircraft arrive. He asked for an explanation of why departures make more noise than arrivals. Mr. Arnold responded. In response to Commissioner Burns' comments regarding the flight concentrations in Old Naples, Commissioner Cuddihy stated that for clarity, the intensity is even bigger for people under Runway 5 departures even though there is not the same density of population right off the runway. Commissioner Burns agreed.

The promotion of voluntary use of NBAA NADP involves the voluntary implementation of NBAA's "High Density Airport Departure" (HDDP) noise abatement procedures.

Mr. Arnold presented a graphic to demonstrate the various altitudes and what the level out procedure might look like. Commissioner Cavanaugh noted that most of the benefit would be to residents in the county.

Mr. Arnold discussed the recommendation of procedures to increase glide slope to runway end 23 and Runway 14/32. He indicated there could be some airspace conflict issues that would have to be explored further. This measure would reduce the noise impact for residents who live further out.

Dispersing of Flight Track Operations was a recommendation to continue the dispersion of flight tracks around the neighboring communities to moderate the impact of overflights in areas with a

high concentration of operations. Naples ATC would assign aircraft different headings for departure aircraft. Arrival aircraft would be on an extended final for each runway, and opportunities for dispersal are limited. Commissioner Cuddihy clarified that this would be general dispersion. Mr. Arnold affirmed. He said that currently, there is a lot of dispersion, and he asked if that is something the NAA would be interested in maintaining. He said procedures could be implemented that would concentrate the flights over fewer people, however, there would be more intensity associated with that type of procedure. There may be a way to mitigate the concentration through the first turn being more dispersed. Mr. Arnold did note that this procedure is one that could be taken off the table because it is not well defined. Commissioner Burns was not interested in eliminating this procedure.

Commissioner Cavanaugh said in looking at the map, the runway with the most dispersion is going from southwest on Runway 5/23.

Mr. Rozansky noted on the topic of dispersion that staff is starting to see letters from folks around the county about things they want to see in FAA for authorization. Interestingly, one of those recommendations that keeps coming up is regarding dispersion because many GPS flight procedures have created a great concentration of flights over very narrow areas.

Mr. Arnold discussed the measure that would increase use of the crosswind runway over time. He stated it was around 9% last year; and looking at raw numbers, the number of operations on the crosswind by jets are about the same. Currently, when winds are between 5 and 10 knots, the tower is keeping them on the primary runway during those higher wind conditions.

Vice Chair Ruppert asked if the step down in the glide slope would primarily be for arrivals on 14. Mr. Arnold said it would be for 14 or 32.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked how "runway use" would reduce noise. Mr. Arnold responded it would establish a criterion that states when certain conditions exist, the crosswind runway will be used. Commissioner Cavanaugh confirmed it just reallocates noise. Mr. Arnold affirmed.

Commissioner Cuddihy said, concerning increased use of the crosswind runway, that the change in percent it needs to be versus what it is currently is one thing, but she believes the actual number of jets is about the same as it has been over the past several years. Mr. Arnold said that is correct and he reviewed the numbers.

Commissioner Burns asked about the crosswind runway. He noticed ten jets taking off on Runway 5 this morning. Interspersed with that were take-offs on the crosswind runway to the southeast. He asked if Runways 14/32 and 5/23 were identical in length, would it be possible for a jet to decide to take off on 14/32 instead of 5/23? Mr. Arnold said there are other factors that come into play such as where the aircraft would be taxiing from, also the smaller aircraft are more sensitive to winds. Commissioner Burns would be interested in determining what it would take to lengthen Runway 14/32.

Mr. Rozansky said 14/32 could be lengthened, but not enough to equal 5/23 in length. Even if it were, the predominant factor is wind direction. Most of the year favors 5/23 due to winds. He shared that shortly after he started with the Naples Airport Authority, an engineering analysis was done and it is not just the land needed for a runway, there is a 1,000-foot buffer that must be maintained off the end of the runway. There is also a runway object-free area that is quite large. The analysis sets forth all the information.

Mr. Arnold discussed shifting Goodlette-Frank Road Departure Corridor East and create a "Golf Course Corridor." Commissioner Cuddihy asked the net difference between people who would be positively or negatively impacted. Mr. Arnold said essentially the SEL 80 contour reduced the number of people within that SEL 80 by 1,439 but added 476 new residents who were not already being exposed to the noise level. It decreased the population within the SEL 75 by 2,300. Of all the measures looked at, this one had a significant reduction in population. Commissioner Cuddihy asked approximately the number of flights per day, and Mr. Arnold said for jets, the airport does approximately 140 operations on average per day, so there could potentially be 70 departures and 70 jet arrivals, so for departures headed up that corridor if about 15% were shifted, there would be about 10-12 that might be flying over the golf course but could be doubled during a peak day.

Commissioner Burns noted that one of the recommended routes would fly over two schools and a church. He thought that would be the wrong location to take a new flight pattern. He also noted there is a Moorings Park retirement community where he would also discourage moving a flight path over.

Commissioner Cuddihy asked what would happen with the comments that were submitted but were general in nature. Mr. Arnold said basically, if it were a general noise comment, then it would have been documented as a formal noise complaint. It would be demonstrated to the FAA by way of inclusion in the document being submitted to the FAA. Ms. Ward said there is a section in the report on public involvement. That section would summarize the comments received more broadly than what has been presented today.

Mr. Arnold reviewed the Land Use Measures and Program Management measures being recommended. Both items were listed in the ranking presented by Ms. Ward earlier from the TAC and NCC meetings.

Commissioner Cuddihy asked if each measure would be reviewed in detail on Thursday, and Mr. Arnold said that is the plan. He offered to address any questions or issues raised today.

Commissioner Cuddihy said the professionals have done a fantastic job. However, when she sees something like the noise disclosure, she does not know why the FAA would find that significant. Mr. Arnold said in trying to work with the FAA on measures that go beyond what is traditional, they are going to be looking at what the community is doing to try to help advance protections. Commissioner Cuddihy said there are two issues. One is where they are asked to examine the zoning and land use. The other is the disclosure code on existing property which does not abate or mitigate noise. It simply informs someone else, and she was unsure how the FAA would address this. Mr. Arnold said this is something that the Authority would work with the local government to promote. He suggested language "Support local government's efforts to establish real estate disclosures" or something to that effect. Board members agreed.

Mr. Arnold reviewed the final Part 150 Study completion timeline which includes Spring 2023 and Summer/Fall 2023. He said the NAA would continue to separately pursue potential measures outside of the Part 150 Study process.

Vice Chair Ruppert inquired about the FAA timeline for responding. Mr. Arnold said the FAA is going to respond to all the measures, if the Residential Sound Insulation Program is approved, then they would go for federal funding. There would be 12 measures up for formal consideration.

G. NEW BUSINESS

H. There was no new business.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Airspace Heading Clarification

Mr. Justin Lobb, Deputy Director of Aviation, presented an update on potential airspace conflicts related to routing Runway 23 departures on a southerly heading. He summarized the discussion and concern raised by a pilot during the March Regular Board meeting, which pertained to a potential conflict between Runway 23 jet departures turning south and propeller aircraft traffic using the beach as a visual guide.

Mr. Lobb stated that Authority staff has spoken with the air traffic control staff, who confirmed the potential conflict while explaining possible options for alleviating the conflict, including not routing jets south when conflicting propeller aircraft are in the vicinity or vectoring propeller aircraft further inland and away from the coast. Instituting a new southerly departure heading for Runway 23 departures may be possible but would require increased situational awareness from the controllers, and the ability for southerly departure clearances may vary depending on airspace availability and controller safety considerations.

Vice Chair Ruppert commented if someone was asked if this would increase or decrease the probability of safety, what type of answer would be received? Mr. Lobb said initially, there was some concern due to how the airspace is currently being operated. It does not mean the pilots cannot adapt or reanalyze how they would direct piston aircraft into the airport. Chair Dustin further clarified the information presented by Mr. Lobb. Mr. Lobb said in conversations with the acting manager and one of the controllers, they indicated this is something they do every day.

J. PUBLIC COMMENTS (5-minute limit)

There were no public comments.

K. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS & REQUESTS/MEETINGS

1. Maps and Air Traffic Control Letter of Agreement – Commissioner Burns

Commissioner Burns referred to a 1997 Part 150 Study, where the figures shown were part of the analysis and metrics calculated for the affected population. Commissioner Burns showed an exhibit of what happened after 1997 on Runway 23 with a 270-degree heading. At the end of Runway 23, Commissioner Burns indicated where it would be going down 3rd Avenue South (noted in red). That is what was implemented and what exists today from the 1997 noise study. He asked the Commissioners to look at exhibit 2-7 which shows that 270 was in the Noise Compatibility Program from 1997. He said it was adopted, but there were never any metrics shown for this route. He said it was just chosen as a way of getting to the Gulf of Mexico sooner, going over a commercial area and has existed all this time. The information can be found in the agenda packet back-up information. Commissioner Burns said this is the time for the NAA to take action that may relieve some concentration on the 270-degree heading.

Chair Dustin asked Commissioner Cuddihy to further clarify her earlier comments that the golf course route and down the Bay route would involve 10 or 15 flights a day and in another case, 7 or 10 flights a day. She said she was not the expert but her understanding was some relatively small number on each of those routes. She asked Mr. Arnold to clarify further. Mr. Arnold said that based on the amount of time that those runways are currently being used, that would be a percentage of time that would be estimated that those routes are currently being used. If looking at the Down the Bay route, it is a little more than 1,100 per year. Looking at daily flights of an average 70 departures every day, it is about 12% or about 8 or 9 flights per day. Activity at the airport changes significantly during peak events, and the number would be doubled with possibly a few more for those days. In looking at the Goodlette Corridor, some of the aircraft were already east of Goodlette Road, the goal would be to adjust that so more of the aircraft would be over the corridor rather than over the densely populated residential area. At this time, it is unknown what the actual shift in numbers would be even though an estimate is that about 15% would shift over. Commissioner Cuddihy asked how many peak days would be accounted for during the year. Mr. Rozansky said approximately two dozen.

Chair Dustin thought in discussing this many flights in a day moving from a relief standpoint, would it be enough? He was trying to make sure the public understands what the NAA is facing. Mr. Arnold said when talking about areas that already receive overflights, many times, adjustments in the number aren't very noticeable. However, areas that never received overflights and are suddenly receiving the overflights would notice. The challenge is that with limited options available and the intensity of overflights in some areas, the question is whether an adjustment and reduction in intensity are worth the increase in overflights that another area may receive.

Vice Chair Ruppert noted that the shift at Goodlette-Frank involves Runway 32 departures. Secondly, several hundred more people are going to be introduced to overflights. He said the newly affected would not be a desirable outcome. He noted this program is not the end of noise, it is a tool.

Mr. Rozansky added that the submission of this NCP is not the finish line. There is still a lot more work to be done. The NAA vote on Thursday is not the end of the process. There is a lot more analysis to be done. At any point along the way, there may be a new recommendation, and the NAA still has the opportunity to withdraw or suspend a previous recommendation. The vote that the NAA casts on Thursday is about whether this is worth further consideration.

Commissioner Burns recalled the City Council referred to all of the steps that are being considered as a blend, a total package. He said that blend is necessary, and it is important for the public to know that they are being heard.

Commissioner Cuddihy asked how to take all the comments received over the past several years and help the FAA understand where the NAA is in the process. She has called several association presidents and had individual conversations with some of them. She talked about the numbers in Naples and went through the measures with these presidents and what they thought about them. She saw universal support for the 2,000-foot hold, for the 3.5-degree glide slopes, for the OPDs and NBAA noise abatement departure procedures. She thought that was big for the FAA to hear from NAA. The others she spoke with addressed her questions more from a perspective of where they live and what they support. Commissioner Cuddihy saw a vision that the NAA could put together a chart for the FAA. Each initiative would be listed and how the NAA voted, how the City voted, and how each Homeowners' Association would support it. She felt this would create

a visual representation of how to look at the issues being addressed. The goal would be to focus the FAA on the areas where everyone agrees.

Vice Chair Ruppert asked if the number of people objecting to an idea is listed explicitly, even if the NAA is in favor of the idea, would that work against the goals of the NAA.

Commissioner Burns was appreciative of Commissioner Cuddihy's suggestion.

Vice Chair Ruppert was not against Commissioner Cuddihy's suggestion but was concerned about taking four of the eight measures off the table, by default giving them an easy out in disregarding those four.

Chair Dustin thought it was a good and creative idea. He asked Mr. Rozansky and his staff to give the suggestion some thought.

Commissioner Cavanaugh suggested if this idea is pursued, that some larger groups that are not neighborhood-based also be included. It would be important to get a variety of viewpoints to gather information on how the entire community feels.

L. ADJOURN

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:21 p.m.

Christopher A. Rozansky
Secretary

NOTE: Printed copies of all visual presentations and handouts are on file in the Executive Assistant's Office.

CITY OF NAPLES AIRPORT AUTHORITY (NAA)
Board of Commissioners
Notice of Workshop Meeting

FINAL AGENDA

Naples Airport Authority
Airport Office Building, Second Floor Conference Room
200 Aviation Drive North, Naples, FL 34104

Monday, April 17, 2023
9 a.m.

Members of the public may view the workshop following this link:
https://www.flynaples.com/live-stream-video/

Commissioner Kerry C. Dustin – Chair
Commissioner Rick Ruppert – Vice Chair, Consultant Selection Committee Chair, Audit Committee Member
Commissioner Rita Cuddihy – NCC Liaison
Commissioner Robert P. Burns – Consultant Selection Committee Member, Audit Committee Member
Commissioner Terrence W. Cavanaugh – Audit Committee Chair
Executive Director: Christopher A. Rozansky
Authority Attorney: William L. Owens, Esq. of Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC

Welcome. If you wish to address the Board of Commissioners regarding an item listed on the Agenda, please complete a Speaker Registration form (available at the rear of the room) and hand it to the Executive Assistant prior to consideration of that item. We ask that speakers limit comments to 5 minutes and that large groups name a spokesperson whenever possible. All written, audio-visual, and other materials distributed to the Board or staff during this meeting will become the property of NAA and will be a public record. Thank you for your interest and participation.

NOTICE

Formal action may be taken on any item listed on the Agenda below, or added to the Agenda before or during the meeting, or discussed during the meeting without being added to the Agenda. Also, the sequence of items may be changed as the meeting progresses.

Any person who decides to appeal a decision of this Board with respect to any matter considered at this meeting (or hearing) will need a record of the proceeding and may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be heard.

Any person with a disability requiring auxiliary aids or services in order to participate in this proceeding for meetings at the City Council Chamber may call the City Clerk's Office at 213-1015, or for meetings at the Airport Office Building, the NAA Executive Assistant's Office at 643-0733, with requests at least two business days before the meeting.

Information on Action Items and other items which has been provided in advance of this meeting may be inspected at the office of the Executive Assistant, General Aviation Terminal Building, 2nd Floor, 160 Aviation Drive North. Minutes of this meeting will be prepared for Board approval, usually at the next Regular Meeting.

A. ROLL CALL

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. AGENDA (Add, delete or re-sequence items)

D. PRESENTATIONS AND TIME CERTAIN ITEMS

1. Independent Flight Procedure Analysis
2. Runway 23 Departures Over Naples Bay
3. Summary of Draft Noise Compatibility Program Public Comments

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS (5 minute limit) ON GENERAL TOPICS NOT ON THE CURRENT AGENDA

F. NOISE

1. Recent Noise Abatement Efforts
2. Review of Noise Compatibility Program Recommendations by Category

G. NEW BUSINESS

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. Airspace Heading Clarification

I. PUBLIC COMMENTS (5 minute limit)

J. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS & REQUESTS/MEETINGS

1. Maps and Air Traffic Control Letter of Agreement - Commissioner Burns

K. ADJOURN