

SFO RT Meeting June 2, 2021

Public Responses to Roundtable Coordinator Memo (p 31-36 of packet) - Memo text in italics

Discussion section (p 33-35): The reasons for not amending the MOU originally identified in 1997 are similar to the reasons discussed in 2014, 2016, and 2020, and remain relevant today, and include:

- *The Roundtable purpose is to focus on noise impacts to Airport adjacent cities/towns.*

---->Public response

Out of the current 23 members, 19 are cities and towns with 4 being adjacent to the Airport (Burlingame, Millbrae, San Bruno, South San Francisco). Adjacent is defined as adjoining.

As stated in Guiding Principle #1 in its Strategic Plan, the Roundtable is the preeminent forum for addressing and resolving community concerns related to noise from aircraft operating to and from San Francisco International Airport.

- *The Roundtable size would get too large and difficult to manage.*

---->Public response

We believe that the SFO RT's legitimate concerns of dilution, scope, and unmanageability can be addressed by adopting a few, simple membership eligibility criteria that would expand membership by 2 cities at most.

- *The Roundtable strategic focus and scope would become diluted. The noise impacts would expand to include Oakland and San Jose airports, in addition to San Francisco which is regional in nature.*

---->Public response

Adding new members by using a few, simple criteria would prevent diluting the strategic focus and scope of the RT. Priorities and activities, as expressed in the 3-year Strategic Plan and 1-year Work Plan, would not need to change. The current Work Plan covers items of direct interest to potential new members (including SERFR and PIRAT arrival procedures, GBAS, legislation, noise methodology). The goals of the current Strategic Plan would not need to change either. Goal 5 (Address Community Concerns) mentions "Focusing on San Mateo and San Francisco Counties", which should not preclude the RT to work on items not solely related to San Mateo and San Francisco Counties such as legislation.

Expanding membership should be limited to communities directly affected by SFO. The RT addresses SFO ground-based noise as well as SFO arrivals and departures noise. It does not include OAK or SJC noise impacts. The SFO RT strategic focus and scope would not change.

- *Noise impacts to non-adjacent Airport cities/towns are different and would distract from the Roundtable's core mission.*

---->Public response

Correct, noise impacts of non-adjacent cities/towns are different. The SFO RT addresses the needs of both adjacent and non-adjacent cities today as described in the plans. Today 15 RT members are from cities/towns that are not adjacent to the airport.

Non-adjacent cities/towns do not distract from the Roundtable’s mission, which is stated by the Chair on the SFO RT website: “...to continue its mission to not shift noise and retain our quality of life on the Peninsula and the City of San Francisco.” (Statement captured on May 30, 2021 in the About section).

- *Cities/counties beyond Palo Alto, such as the Counties of Santa Clara and Santa Cruz, and any of the incorporated cities/towns within those counties, may want to join.*

---->Public response

Wanting to join is different from being eligible to join. Appropriate eligibility criteria would expand membership by 2 cities at most and ensure that new members would be aligned with the RT activities as described in the Strategic Plan and Work Plan.

- *The approved Strategic Plan (2020-2024), and Work Plan (2020-2021) does not include this task.*

---->Public response

Correct. That said, there is likely flexibility for the RT to consider additional items.

| PROS | CONS | PUBLIC RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| <p><i>\$1,500 increase in annual budget (2021-2020) – Member dues</i></p> | <p><i>Part-time staff is already maximized with six Membership meetings per year, plus up to 10 Subcommittee meetings per year. Increased work is expected depending upon number of additional cities / counties being added. Exact budget impact must be determined before a decision can be made and depends on the direction of the Membership (e.g., one City, one County, two Counties).</i></p> | <p>- Adopting a few, simple eligibility criteria would expand membership by 2 cities at most. The number of scheduled meetings would not increase. One-time work to amend the MOU and Bylaws would be necessary but minimal.</p> |
| <p><i>Additional thought leadership on the Roundtable Membership.</i></p> | <p><i>The SCSC Roundtable is currently active and operating and representing the City of Palo Alto. By initiating amendment to the SFORT MOU, the City of Palo Alto would have a seat on the SCSC Roundtable and a seat on the SFORT Roundtable. What about other SCSC Members (In Santa Clara County: Cupertino, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Santa Clara, Saratoga, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County) do they want to join.</i></p> | <p>- The SCSC RT is currently suspended and has been since January. The May 26th was a special meeting not a regular meeting. No future meetings have been approved.</p> <p>- If the SCSC RT resumes...yes, Palo Alto could potentially be on both RTs. This could benefit both RTs because of the leverage of effort and knowledge on topics such as legislation.</p> <p>- Wanting to join is different than</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | being eligible to join. |
| <i>Addressing regional air space.</i> | <i>Historical focus has been on cities adjacent to airport, and related airspace issues. If Membership is expanded, will the focus expand outside the two counties? What will be the Roundtable priorities? Is the Roundtable the best entity for regional airspace topics, or is the Metropolitan Transportation Committee Regional Airport Planning Committee?</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Out of the current 23 members, 19 are cities and towns with 4 being adjacent to the Airport (Burlingame, Millbrae, San Bruno, South San Francisco). Adjacent is defined as adjoining. - Expanding membership should be limited to communities directly affected by SFO. It does not include OAK or SJC noise impacts. The SFO RT strategic focus and scope would not change. - Priorities and activities as expressed in the 3-year Strategic Plan and 1-year Work Plan would not need to change either. - As stated on their website, "The Regional Airport Planning Committee, or RAPC, oversees the periodic development and updating of the Regional Airport System Planning Analysis, which recommends policies for both commercial and general aviation airports." RAPC works on airport changes, not on procedure impacts from one or multiple airports. - Cities who are seeking SFO RT membership are not asking for membership in a future regional RT or a regional coordination of multiple bodies. These cities are asking for SFO RT membership because of SFO impacts. |
| <i>Modification required to MOU, Bylaws, Strategic Plan, Work Plan, and Budget to reflect change.</i> | <i>SFO Roundtable has existed for 40-years with a commitment to jurisdictions adjacent to the Airport. Staff time and effort redirected from Work Plan to facilitate MOU amendment</i> | - Yes, a one-time modification would be required to the MOU and the Bylaws (one sentence for each) similar to past examples in the packet, e.g. page 81. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p><i>through all Member Board of Supervisors and City Councils, estimate 3-4 months.</i></p> | <p>- Out of the current 23 members, 19 are cities and towns with 4 being adjacent to the Airport (Burlingame, Millbrae, San Bruno, South San Francisco). Adjacent is defined as adjoining.</p> <p>- The estimated 3-4 months represent the elapsed time based on the meeting schedules of the Board of Supervisors and City Councils. Each RT member would bring the MOU amendment to their governing body.</p> |
| <p><i>Benefit from Noise Mitigation to reduce noise.</i></p> | <p><i>FAA does not recognize Palo Alto as being within the 65 CNEL noise impacted area so Palo Alto residents are not eligible for noise mitigation (insulation, windows, doors). At this time, it is unclear on the financial implication from SFO on this topic</i></p> | <p>- Correct. Similar to the vast majority of cities on the SFO RT, Palo Alto is not within the 65 CNEL noise contour. Palo Alto is not asking for, nor qualifies for noise insulation to mitigate noise impacts.</p> |

Rep Anna Eshoo letter (p 103 of packet):

---->Public response

Context is everything. In her Feb 2, 2016 letter to the FAA Western Regional Administrator, Representative Eshoo indicated that she did not support Palo Alto joining the SFO RT because she wanted to have "...a new Select Committee representing the entire region (three Congressional Districts) put in place". She may have been concerned that the FAA would not support a new Select Committee if Palo Alto was already a member of the SFO RT.