



# Meeting Announcement

## Technical Working Group

---

**Thursday, November 8, 2018**  
**12:15 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.**

David Chetcuti Community Room – Millbrae City Hall  
450 Poplar Avenue – Millbrae, CA 94030

Note: To arrange an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act to participate in this public meeting, please call (650) 363-1853 at least 2 days before the meeting date.

### **AGENDA**

1. **Overview of Latest Submitted Questions to the FAA for 12/5/18 Roundtable Meeting**
2. **FAA IFP Information Gateway Updates – PIRAT**
3. **Discussion, Preferred Update Method of FAA IFP updates to Members**
4. **SFO Ground-Based Augmentation System (GBAS) Update**
5. **Summary of Action Items for Next Meeting**
6. **Public Comments on Items NOT on the Agenda**  
\*Speakers are limited to two minutes. Roundtable members cannot discuss or take action on any matters not included as part of the agenda.
7. **Adjourn**



November 5, 2018

TO: Roundtable Members and Interested Parties

FROM: Eugene M. Reindel  
Justin W. Cook – INCE, LEED GA  
Roundtable Technical Consultant - HMMH

SUBJECT: Questions for the FAA at the December 4, 2018 SFO Airport/Community Roundtable Meeting

---

The following are four (4) items for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to answer at the December 48, 2018 SFO Airport/Community Roundtable Regular Meeting. While these are specific items that we would like the FAA to answer, we are also hoping that the FAA will come prepared to discuss possible alternate solutions should they deem any of these not feasible.

**Item 1:**

Problem Statement: Following the publication of the FOGGG, SAHEY and CIITY Departure Procedures (DPs) for SFO Runways 10L and 10R immediate concern was generated over the close proximity of the SAHEY and CIITY DPs to the eastern shoreline of the San Francisco Peninsula. Both SFO and the public requested moving back to the previous DUMBARTON DP. This was deemed “not feasible” apparently due to the FAA desiring to have simultaneous dual departures thus requiring compliance with the divergent heading requirement for the FOGGG and the SAHEY/CIITY DPs.

Question: If the DUMBARTON departure procedure for Runway 10 during southeast flow conditions (not opposite direction operations) cannot be recommissioned, what would be required to achieve a new procedure with a similar heading (such as 080 or 085) that keeps aircraft largely over the Bay as the DUMBARTON DP did? We would like to examine a wide variety of options including, creating new and decommissioning and/or greatly modifying the SAHEY and CIITY departure procedures. Examine the use of a single stream departure in both day and night with projected volumes.

**Item 2:**

Problem Statement: The SFO SSTIK DP brings an extremely large volume of flights over the densely populated middle and Northern San Francisco Peninsula. Previously the PORTE and OFFSHORE DPs split the volume based on destination with a substantial amount crossing directly across the peninsula with the OFFSHORE DP, south over the Pacific Ocean. The concentration of these two previous procedures under the SSTIK DP has proved problematic.

Question: What would be required to achieve converting the OFFSHORE DP into an RNAV DP and 1) change the angle to stay over the Pacific Ocean and not over or near the Peninsula, 2) repeat to the extent possible the geographical path of the OFFSHORE from takeoff to the Pacific Ocean and 3) connect at FFOIL or another similar offshore waypoint while remaining clear of Special Use Airspace

## Questions for the FAA at the October 3, 2018 SFO Airport/Community Roundtable Meeting

November 2, 2018

Page 2 of 3

(SUA)? If the OFFSHORE DP cannot be turned into a RNAV with the above considerations, what would be required to construct a DP that achieves the same basic ground track as the existing OFFSHORE DP with the above considerations? For discussion purposes the Technical Working Group would appreciate the FAA providing Google Earth or similar graphics including waypoints, the SSTIK, EUGEN, PORTE, OFFSHORE DPs with transitions, SUAs (floor, ceiling and hours of operation) and any other procedures that may impact an OFFSHORE RNAV overlay or similar procedure creation.

Additional Clarification: As charted, the OFFSHORE departure directs aircraft from Runways 1L/R to SEPDY, WAMMY, SEGUL. As charted, the OFFSHORE departure directs aircraft from Runways 28L/R to SENZY, WAMMY, SEGUL.

If aircraft flew over WAMMY and SEGUL – they would remain over ocean and not over the Peninsula. In our question, we discuss creating a RNAV departure procedure that takes a path from takeoff to the ocean (WAMMY) and then connect at FFOIL (close to SEGUL) while remaining clear of the Special Use Airspace).

In looking at actual flights utilizing the OFFSHORE departure procedure, they turn and cut across the Peninsula instead of staying over the ocean. Our question applies to both sets of runways utilized. The goal is for aircraft to remain over the ocean and not cross over the Peninsula.

### Item 3:

Problem Statement: Continuing with the SSTIK DP though focusing on the waypoint SSTIK - The November 2017 Phase II Final document included the Airport/Community Roundtable's ask stating in Appendix D, 2.38 "Move SSTIK N + E as much as feasible to allow maximum altitude gain before turning to fly over land using the historic SEPDY waypoint as a guide." The FAA responded somewhat cryptically, "Due to a change in criteria, the SSTIK waypoint is in the process of being moved 0.44 NM to the East-Southeast of its present position. The FAA does not support moving SSTIK north due to the close proximity to OAK procedures." We discovered later that, "Due to a change in criteria, the SSTIK waypoint is in the process of being moved 0.44 NM to the East-Southeast of its present position. The FAA does not support moving SSTIK north due to the close proximity to OAK procedures." When requesting more information, we received the following: "AFS 8260.58 criteria has changed since this SID (Standard Instrument Departure) was originally implemented. RNAV SID criteria now requires that when successive Direct to a Fix (DF) is used, it must be within 15 degrees of the runway centerline. The current location of SSTIK is 22.95 degrees from the departure end of Runway 01R." On September 13, 2018 the charting release date we had been informed by the FAA to expect the SSTIK waypoint move, it did not. We were informed that only the YYUNG transition changed adding and dropping waypoints. This revision did not include the SSTIK move.

Question: What would be required to have the FAA overlay the proposed new SSTIK waypoint with the current SSTIK waypoint in the same image and provide both current and proposed SSTIK DPs in Google Earth KML files? This will include the ground track for the procedure as it is today as well as the procedure as it would look with the new SSTIK waypoint. We would appreciate any modeled flight track information for these two waypoints on the SSTIK procedure as well as the new charting date. Please provide the design notes for the change in the SSTIK waypoint location.

### Item 4:

Problem Statement: Following the recent appearance of the STAR PIRAT (RNAV) One on the FAA's Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Information Gateway, there has been community concern generated around its altitudes and locations over the middle and southern San Francisco Peninsula.

## Questions for the FAA at the October 3, 2018 SFO Airport/Community Roundtable Meeting

November 2, 2018

Page 3 of 3

### Questions:

1. What would be required to for the FAA provide a graphic representation of the STAR PIRAT that displays the projected flight paths estimating the projected corridor of the flight paths and altitudes in 1,000-foot increments on a Google map?
2. Provide information on whether this procedure result in any changes between the current flight paths and altitudes being flown today (from the Pacific Ocean coastline to the Woodside VOR to the Bay)?
3. Provide information about any increase in number of flights that will not use the proposed STAR PIRAT?
4. Would the FAA provide graphic representation showing the evolution of Oceanic arrivals for both SFO and OAK over the last 5 years? Take for instance one month and the same month for 2013-2018.
5. In looking at the procedure development graphics, is the use of the previous San Francisco Class-B Airspace different from the current San Francisco Class-B Airspace? Can the FAA create a new graphic showing the previous and current San Francisco Class B Airspace?



November 5, 2018

Federal Aviation Administration  
Western Service Center - Operations Support Group  
1601 Lind Avenue SW  
Renton, WA 98057

Re: Request for an Extension of Public Comment Period for PIRAT STAR (RNAV)


This request for a sixty (60) day extension of the public comment period from November 13, 2018, is in reference to the proposed PIRAT STAR (RNAV) procedure that was recently posted on the IFP (Instrument Flight Procedures) Gateway.

As the Chair of the San Francisco Airport Community Roundtable, this newly proposed PIRAT STAR (RNAV) procedure comes as a surprise. Over the past several months we have been in regular communication with the Office of the Regional Administrator FAA regarding overflight noise impacts to our San Francisco Bay Area communities. At no time was there mention of this new procedure. In fact, at least two FAA representatives have attended the Roundtable's past two regular meetings. In our pre-meeting conference calls and at the meetings no one mentioned that this procedure was being processed. It is our understanding that the public comment period deadline is November 13, 2018.

Members of our community and our technical consultants just recently (within the past week) brought this to my attention with great alarm. There is concern that the new procedure will increase the amount of flights currently using the OTA over Portola Valley, Woodside, Los Altos and Palo Alto. There is concern that this procedure has been developed without input from our communities with regard to altitudes and vectoring over the middle and southern San Francisco Peninsula. There are questions and concerns about whether the use of the previous San Francisco Class-B Airspace via the current San Francisco Class-B Airspace is still valid. There are many more areas of this procedure we need to analyze, and to do that, we believe a sixty (60) day extension is necessary. Therefore, we respectfully request a sixty (60) day extension of the public comment period.

A key part of the Roundtable's mission is to continually abide by Article II Section 5 of its Memorandum of Understanding which states, *"that the Roundtable members, as a group, will not take an action(s) that would result in the "shifting" of noise from one community to another, related to aircraft operations at San Francisco International Airport."* It is our intention to fulfill this article for our stakeholders in San Mateo County and the City and County of San Francisco through a thorough review of the proposed PIRAT STAR (RNAV) procedure in its entirety, including technical reports.

Respectfully,



Elizabeth Lewis, Roundtable Chairperson