

**SFO RT - Work Plan Meeting  
June 27, 2023 – 12-1:30pm**

To: Angela Montes, [amontescardenaas@smcgov.org](mailto:amontescardenaas@smcgov.org)  
From: Darlene Yaplee

**Written Comment**

**Agenda Item #2: Work Plan & Budget Discussion**

Kudos to the Ground Based Noise Subcommittee for Work Plan Item – “Strategic Goal #3”, packet page 9. You are on the 99-yard line, **please consider making the following INSERT:**

- Item 2. “The Roundtable Ground Based Noise Subcommittee will complete Recommendations on Airport Rules and Regulations (Noise), Airport Directors Reports metrics to include C-weighted noise **and N-Above from 45 to 85 dB in 5dB increments** in the Director's Report; Airlines using gates that only face away from close-in communities; see where ANEEM and C-weighted fits within these goals.”
- **Why?**
  - **C-weighting is not enough by itself**, it must be combined with N-Above to be of value to accurately understand and represent the noise experienced by residents.
  - As an example, for one of the SFO RT cities, Millbrae monitor #9 (NOTE: this monitor does not pick up the worse noise in Millbrae) shows why N-Above is needed.
  - Per the March 2023 report, monitor #9 went from 14 events using ANOMS to 143 using ANEEM. The DNL only increased 2 dB, from DNL 52 to DNL 54 -- DNL does calculate the total number of single events like N-Above does. N-Above versus DNL better reflects the noise impacts and reports the 143 events.
  - With my suggested INSERT, the Director’s report **\*for all cities with monitors\*** would state N-Above using C-weighted from 45 to 85 dB in 5dB increments. This is what the current FAA’s Noise Policy Review is about - asking what other metrics (beyond DNL) are needed for decision making and what the thresholds should be (e.g., N-Above at a specific dB level using C-weighting).
  - **Without reporting N-Above at different increments you will not understand your impacts nor will you be able to advocate for what is needed.**