

**TETERBORO AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TANAAC)  
MEETING  
SUMMARY OF MINUTES**

**January 27, 2021**

**ATTENDANCE**

Maria Sheridan, TANAAC Co-Chair	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Paul Griffo, TANAAC Co-Chair	Borough of Rutherford
Scott Marsh, Manager Operations and Security	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Rick Vander Wende, Manager Contract Services	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Ayo Olanipekun, Program Manager	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Doug Stearns, Aviation, Operations Officer	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Elizabeth Rogak, Attorney	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Juan Rojas, Senior Executive Community Relations	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Tina Lado, Director of Government & Commercial Affairs	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Ralph Tamburro, Program Manager	Port Authority of NY & NJ
Gabriel Andino, Manager, Noise Abatement	Teterboro Airport/Avports
John Kastens, Manager, Airport Services	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Michael Fiscus, Asst. Manager, Noise Abatement	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Zachary Miller, Noise Abatement & Environmental Compliance	Teterboro Airport/Avports
Andrew Pieroni	Federal Aviation Administration
Arlene Salac	Federal Aviation Administration
Kathleen Moclair-Shea	Federal Aviation Administration
Larry Burgess	Federal Aviation Administration
Nia A. Fields	Federal Aviation Administration
Maria Kennington-Gardiner	Federal Aviation Administration
Steven Jones	Federal Aviation Administration
Lauren Gonnelli, Representing	Congressman Josh Gottheimer
Peter Kortright, Principal Planner	Bergen County Dept-Parks & Recreation
Kathy Canestrino, Deputy Mayor	City of Hackensack
Albert Dib – Director of Development	City of Hackensack
Councilman Robert Robbins	Borough of Bogota
Councilwoman Karen Surak	Borough of Moonachie
Gina Affuso, Borough Clerk	Borough of Wood Ridge
George Muller, Representative	Borough of Little Ferry
Doug Herrick, Representative	Borough of Maywood
Roy Luster, Representative	Township of Rochelle Park
Wanda Portorreal, Alternate	Village of Ridgefield Park
Steve Riethof	NJ Aviation Hall of Fame & Museum
David Belastock	Teterboro User’s Group (TUG)
Joseph Dickinson	Teterboro User’s Group (TUG)
Alex Gertsen	National Business Aviation Association
Robin G. Goldfischer-Hollander	The Valley Hospital
Erich Thalheimer	Accoustic Specialist-The Valley Hospital

**Teterboro Airport**  
**January 27, 2021**  
**TEAMS Audio/Video Meeting**  
**Minutes Summary**

Ms. Maria Sheridan, TANAAC Co-Chair welcomed the committee members to the first meeting of the year and thanked them for participating. Ms. Sheridan explained that the meeting will now be taking place using Microsoft Teams. Mr. Paul Griffo, TANAAC Co-Chair also welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Ms. Sheridan turned the meeting over to Mr. Gabriel Andino, Manager Noise Abatement & Environmental Compliance office for new business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Andino welcomed everyone to the meeting and began by providing a brief overview of the history of TANAAC. He gave a review of the TANAAC by-laws and detailed Teterboro Airport noise rules for the benefit of any new members.

Mr. Andino then shared a slide presentation of the Statistical Report for the full year 2020 as follows:

- Aircraft movements were down for the year with a total of 84,819. This was a decrease of 50.11% over 2019. These number reflect the drop off in travel due to the pandemic. Nighttime movements (between 11:00 pm and 6:00 am) were down for the year with a total of 4,129 movements.
- Noise violations for departing aircraft for 2020 were also down significantly with a total of thirty-six violations. Thirty-two of which were first time violations and four were second time violations. No aircraft were banned.
- Runway 19 continued to be used as the predominant runway for arrivals and Runway 24 was used for most aircraft departures in 2020. Teterboro had four helicopter routes coming in and out of the airport. Helicopters continued to use the southern route most often.
- The LDN(A) (day/night average aircraft noise levels) data from the six permanent noise monitors and the one portable noise monitor reflected noise levels were down significantly, which was consistent with air traffic movements also being down for the year. The results are as follows:
  - RMS 1 in Carlstadt showed a 54.8 average decibel level. This was a 3.2 (dB) decrease from 2019.
  - RMS 2 in Hasbrouck Heights showed a 34.3 average decibel level. This was a decrease of 2.7(dB) from 2019.
  - RMS 3 at the Hackensack University Medical Center (HUMC) showed a 58.2 average decibel level. This was a decrease of 3.1 (dB) from 2019.
  - RMS 4 in Hackensack showed a 50.0 average decibel level. This was a decrease of 3.3 (dB) from 2019.
  - RMS 5 in Bogota showed a 46.6 average decibel level. This was a decrease of 2.7 (dB)from 2019.
  - RMS 6 in Moonachie showed a 48.0 average decibel level. This was a decrease of 3.6 (dB) from 2019.

- RMS 8 in South Hackensack has shown an average reading of 51.0 (dB) since its inception on January 23, 2020.
- Teterboro had a total of 22,628 noise complaints related to Airport traffic received from 177 residents in 2020. 17,093 of these complaints came from 1 person who utilized a Third-Party Application to register complaints. Overall, for the year there was a slight increase in the number of complaints compared to last year although the number of actual complainants had dropped considerably since 2019. Maywood had 18,444 complaints from 9 residents; of that number 17,093 complaints were received from 1 resident using a Third-Party Application. Additionally, there were, 1,928 complaints from 21 callers in Hackensack, 647 complaints from 32 residents in Rutherford, 324 complaints from 3 residents in South Hackensack, 84 complaints from 14 residents in Carlstadt and 26 complaints from 10 residents in Little Ferry. The remaining TANAAC towns totaled 20 complaints from 11 residents.
- The yearly breakdown of the complaints from northern NJ non-TANAAC towns included Woodcliff Lake with 195 complaints from 7 residents (which included 114 from 2 residents using a Third-Party Application), Lyndhurst had 337 complaints from 3 residents, Warwick saw 127 complaints from 1 resident, Allendale had 63 complaints from 1 resident, Mahwah has 57 complaints from 5 residents, Saddle River had 68 complaints from 3 residents, and Fort Lee saw 63 complaints from 3 residents. The remaining towns had less than 50 complaints for the year.
- The top five reasons given for complaints were “*too loud and low*” (17,663) followed by “*too loud*” (1,708), “*excessive vibration*” (1,334) “*too early or too late*” (970), and “*too frequent*” (685). The majority of complaints for 2020 came from the Hackensack and Maywood area and mainly involve one person using a third-party application. Complaints from Rutherford were mixed and mainly involve departure traffic and some arrivals coming into Runway 6 from the south. Other complaints from communities to the far north involve aircraft approaching and landing using Runway 19.

At this point Mr. Andino opened the floor for questions.

Kathy Canestrino, Deputy Mayor Hackensack, questioned whether or not air traffic had started starting to increase during the last quarter of 2020. Mr. Andino pointed out that traffic was still down during the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2020 and that trends were not conducive to any major increase for the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2021. Ms. Canestrino further questioned why Hackensack was at 58.2 LDN(A) noise levels when the traffic was down so much and was told that the calculation was a bit complicated, but that data is highly accurate from the monitors. The Noise and Environmental office will follow up and send her a more detailed report on activity. She also requested individual noise data analysis charts be sent to her.

The next agenda item, which was the FAA’s Environmental Assessment presentation for the RNAV Runway 19 Offset Approach Procedure, was delayed due to technical issues and Ms. Sheridan moved forward with the agenda and turned the meeting over to Robin Goldfischer-Hollander of The Valley Hospital for their presentation.

Ms. Goldfischer-Hollander thanked the committee for allowing her to appear before them to discuss The Valley Hospital’s concerns regarding the impact that the alternate approach for Runway 19 to Teterboro Airport would have on the new Valley Hospital facility in Paramus and on their existing facility in Ridgewood. Mrs. Goldfischer-Hollander expressed concern that the alternate approach would allow aircraft to fly over the current Valley Hospital site in Ridgewood and also the new Valley Hospital site currently under construction in Paramus. She was concerned that The Valley Hospital had not been directly notified by the FAA about the alternate route. In addition, she pointed out that people were unaware that Valley Hospital

would be impacted by this alternate route because maps used by the FAA for analysis of the area did not reference Valley Hospital locations nor did they contain any data with regard to the impact of the height of The Valley Hospital buildings. She went on to say that her data indicated that the current alternate route, as published, went against FAA guidelines for safety by going from a precision approach to a non-precision alternate approach which would put pilots at greater risk. Finally, she questioned why the FAA would not reopen what she felt to be a flawed study into the safety of the new approach given that the FAA was apparently not aware of their existing medical facility or their new facility being built in the flight path of the alternate route to Teterboro Airport. She viewed this as an oversight on the part of the FAA given that the maps used for the study did not include the Valley Hospital locations.

Ms. Goldfischer-Hollander then turned the meeting over to Erich Thalheimer, a certified Acoustic Engineer for Valley Hospital, to provide a slide presentation on the potential noise impact to The Valley Hospital site.

Mr. Thalheimer shared a slide presentation on Acoustic Statistical Data on behalf of The Valley Hospital as follows:

- Mr. Thalheimer began the presentation by giving a brief history of his qualifications and background. He is currently working independently to represent The Valley Hospital and is a board-certified acoustic engineer through the Institute of Noise Control Engineers and has worked in acoustics for private businesses, federal agencies including work for the FAA, and has consulted for various airports including LGA and Logan, over the past 35 years. His purpose here today was to evaluate the significance of noise levels as it involved the alternate approach to Runway 19 which may impact the new Valley Hospital site.
- Aerial Map of the new Valley Hospital.
  - Mr. Thalheimer presented a map depicting an aerial view of the New Valley Hospital site as it stands in relation to the current flight paths and the alternate flight path. The map showed three approaches: the proposed new alternate approach and the two current approaches for Runway 19, one that is utilized 97% of the time and the other which is utilized 3% of the time. The numbers, locations and quantities Mr. Thalheimer referred to in his report were based on the Final Environmental Assessment published in September in 2020 for the Runway 19 Offset procedure. The concern was the safety, function and compatibility of the new Valley Hospital site and impacts to it from the new alternate flight route. The map shows that the alternate approach will be significantly closer to the new Valley Hospital than the current routes.
  - The new route will pass 2200 feet away from the new Valley Hospital site. According to flight operation data, Runway 19 gets 43% of all landings for Teterboro, which is a potential landing of once every 15 minutes.
  - For the new Valley Hospital, the real issue is the loudness of each individual event not the long term 24 hour daily/yearly average of an LDN that is typically monitored by the FAA for community impact. In this case what is more important to the hospital is the noise created by each individual event. Therefore, he analyzed for the loudest noise that each individual landing may cause, utilizing the Maximum Noise Level (LMax) noise metric for a sample aircraft flyover. He then provided the methodology he used for this.
- Noise Study Methodology
  - He first determined the lateral and altitude distances between the New Valley Hospital and the existing and proposed Runway 19 approaches.

- He then ascertained the typical Teterboro aircraft sound power emission data from the FAA’s Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) Model to determine the potential sound range for aircraft typical to Teterboro.
- He used the Cadna-A noise model to compute noise levels affecting the exterior of the new Valley Hospital as caused by aircraft using the existing and proposed new approach.
- Finally, he evaluated the severity of the aircraft noise levels for speech interference based on a typical conversation sound level of 65 dB(A).

- **New Valley Hospital Noise Study Results**

<b>Sources Affecting Valley Hospital</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Absolute Lmax dB(A)</b>	<b>Relative Increase dB(A)</b>
New Approach	Hospital - roof	75	N/A
Existing 3% Approach	Hospital - roof	71	4
Existing 97% Approach	Hospital - roof	62	13
New Approach	Hospital - east	72	N/A
Existing 3% Approach	Hospital - east	74	-2
Existing 97% Approach	Hospital - east	65	7
New Approach	Hospital – west	76	N/A
Existing 3% Approach	Hospital - west	61	15
Existing 97% Approach	Hospital - west	42	34

- **Results:**

- According to Mr. Thalheimer’s analysis, the anticipated absolute and relative increase changes in noise level affecting the new Valley Hospital do represent a significant impact and should be avoided. The data shows that the noise levels for the alternate route would interfere with speech intelligibility outside of the hospital building.

At this point Mr. Thalheimer opened the floor up for questions.

Ms. Goldfischer-Hollander provided a follow up statement as follows:

She stated “that the new hospital campus was designed to provide a healing environment for patients. 30% of the site was dedicated to outdoor healing spaces for patients, families, and the community”. She is “not only concerned for the safety of the community but that the noise from aircraft going overhead would negatively impact care and destroy the healing environment they had endeavored to create”. She requested that the FAA stand by its commitment to the highest level of ethics, excellence, professionalism and accountability by acknowledging the obviously flawed study that was performed and rescind the proposed change to Runway 19 approach before it is implemented. By acknowledging this they will be supporting its proposition for transparency and further its commitment to safety both in the air and on the ground. If additional information is needed before this determination can be made, they request that a new impact study be undertaken with appropriate aeronautical engineers to determine the safety of the new procedure and determine the impact on this vital community asset, The Valley Hospital.

Ms. Sheridan turned the meeting over to Andrew Pieroni of the FAA who had the earlier technical difficulties, to discuss the Air Traffic Organization (ATO) NEPA Overview of the TEB RNAV (GPS) X Runway 19 Offset Procedure.

Mr. Pieroni shared a slide presentation as follows:

- FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures
  - Describes how the FAA is to implement NEPA guidelines specifically for FAA actions
  - Describes the various environmental review processes, and the kinds of impacts that need to be analyzed.
  - Defines impact categories that require analysis. Noise and air quality impacts are primary issues associated with air traffic actions.
  
- NEPA Overview
  - The Runway 19 alternate approach procedure development began in 2007
  - NEPA environmental review for the final procedure design started in 2018
  - Conducted Noise Analysis in 2019 using 2018 data
  - Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Published
    - December 23, 2019
  - A Public Comment Period
    - December 23, 2019 to January 22, 2020
  - Community Outreach took place between 2018 – 2020
    - Outreach consisted of newspaper, social media, congressional correspondence, TANAAC Meetings, Public Workshop and FAA Community Involvement website.
  - Public Workshop held January 8, 2020 in Mahwah, NJ - (Received 95% approval to move forward from this meeting.)
    - The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) held a public workshop on January 8, 2020, in Mahwah, NJ. The purpose of the Workshop was to inform all interested residents about the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed new arrival procedure to Runway 19 at Teterboro airport. Attendees were able to view the flight path and altitudes of the proposed procedure and they were able to discuss it with FAA air traffic control experts. Attendees also learned about the environmental process and had the opportunity to comment on the proposed procedure.
  - Final EA and Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) was published on September 10, 2020.
  - Published Notice of Availability of the Final EA and FONSI/ROD on September 17, 2020.
  - Published Federal Register Notice for FONSI/ROD on September 18, 2020.
  
- Procedure Status
  - Published the TEB RNAV (GPS) X RWY 19 Offset procedure on December 31, 2020.
  - The procedure is not currently in use because COVID-19 has delayed required FAA training.

At this point Mr. Pieroni opened the floor for questions.

Ms. Goldfischer-Hollander followed up with a few questions. She maintained that the FAA was in charge of air safety and that this not only included planes taking off and landing but also noise and the impact of noise on hospitals. She questioned why the FAA was going to stand by the proposed procedure when they clearly did not know that The Valley Hospital was in the flight path and did not assess the impact this would have on the hospital. She questioned how the FAA would change a precision landing approach for a non-precision offset approach and she expressed her displeasure that The Valley Hospital did not receive some form of notification of this alternate route directly from the FAA. She requested that the FAA redo the analysis to include the potential impact to The Valley Hospital environment.

Kathleen Moclair-Shea, from the FAA responded that the FAA had done their due diligence with this project. They were at the TANAAC meeting at the request of the Port Authority and TANAAC to give background information on the NEPA process that was followed. FAA had explained and provided the documents on the environmental assessment. The procedure is an alternate approach to the ILS and was developed at the request of the Port Authority and TANAAC for noise abatement purposes and will not become the primary approach. All of the approaches that are developed, flight inspected and published are fully evaluated for safety.

Ms. Goldfischer-Hollander continued to express her displeasure about the alternate approach and the impact on safety and noise this would have on The Valley Hospital sites.

Maria Kennington-Gardiner, from the FAA responded that the NEPA process was strictly followed. The FAA held public meetings and they posted the approach in the Federal Register. The FAA stands by the NEPA process that they followed.

Ms. Goldfischer-Hollander continued to express her displeasure by alleging that the FAA used outdated and incomplete data which did not include the hospital sites in the NEPA process, she further alleged that the FAA was not willing to reopen the study at the request of The Valley Hospital and they they were favoring one hospital over another

Ms. Kennington-Gardiner responded that the FAA evaluation process took into consideration the impacts to all properties in the flight path. The FAA was aware of the hospital construction via the FAA 7460 cases that were submitted by The Valley Hospital and that they always use all data that they have on hand at the time. The alternate procedure was considered for Hackensack Hospital because the current flight path took planes within 750 feet directly over Hackensack Hospital.

## **COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

At this point Ms. Sheridan opened the floor for additional comments.

Kathy Canestrino, Deputy Mayor of Hackensack, wanted to thank the FAA for all the work they did in the study. She pointed out that the Hackensack area, including the hospital, is in a very densely populated area and that planes fly over the area at a much lower altitude than that which would be experienced at The Valley Hospital sites. She expressed her gratitude that the FAA had taken into consideration all the impacts, including noise and safety, especially as it came to the closeness of some of the flight descents as they came into Teterboro. This approach was something that Hackensack and the surrounding towns had been waiting for, for a long time and she was very thankful to the FAA for all the hard work that went in to this process.

Mr. Griffo had a question for Mr. Andino regarding flight activity and noise over Paramus. He questioned how the noise levels predicted by The Valley Hospital's model could be higher than the levels currently being picked up by the noise monitors in near Teterboro for flights at much lower altitude than what would be over the Paramus hospital area.

Mr. Andino responded that two different metrics were being looked at in this case. The data used by the Teterboro Environmental Office were based on 24-hour noise averages. The data used in The Valley Hospital model were based on single noise events. He confirmed that aircraft coming in to Teterboro fly lower over Hackensack than aircraft that would be flying over Paramus.

Mr. Griffo questioned the model used, and the assumptions made, by The Valley Hospital when currently there were no major issues with flights over Paramus, or other nearby areas. He pointed out that most of these areas experience flights at lower altitudes than would pass over The Valley Hospital.

Mr. Thalheimer responded that noise metrics can vary. Teterboro Noise Office follows the same guidelines as the NEPA process which is based on 24-hour average of data for a years' worth of flights. This metric, LDN, adds additional weight to nighttime noise, so the total noise value is adjusted to account for this. In his report he attempted to boil the noise level down to what would impact the hospital functions the most, which is the loudest moment of a single aircraft flying over.

Ms. Canestrino pointed out that the lowest point for flights going over Hackensack was lower than the lowest point of flights going over Ridgewood and that numbers would have to be compared using similar events. The aircraft altitude over Hackensack is much lower, and the ground elevation much higher, than that which would be experienced by Ridgewood and Paramus. She continued to say that the people at Teterboro have been doing this a long time and use the standards that had been established in the industry. At this point she requested that the issue be continued off-line with The Valley Hospital and that the TANAAC meeting move on to the next topic.

Ralph Tamburro asked Mr. Thalheimer how he determined the type of aircraft used in his model and requested the list.

Mr. Thalheimer explained that he went onto the FAA's website to determine the type of aircraft frequented at Teterboro per the EA report. He use a Lear Jet 35A, Gulfstream G4, Bombardier Challenger CL600 and a Dassault Falcon 2000 and created an power level using the performance characteristics of these aircraft.

Mr. Tamburro received confirmation from Ms. Goldfischer-Hollander that the New Valley Hospital site in Paramus would not be opening until 2023.

Alex Gertsen asked Mr. Thalheimer for clarification on whether the data he used was from departing flights (which throttle at higher setting) or from arriving flights (which would be throttled back). Mr. Thalheimer clarified that the data he used was for arrivals.

At this point Ms. Sheridan asked for any final comments from TANAAC members.

## **OPEN DISCUSSION**

Roy Luster pointed out that the alternate route flight path was designed to follow along Route 17 but Route 17 is not a straight path. He questioned the placement of the actual aircraft path in relation to his community, Rochelle Park, as well as the new hospital site in Paramus. He also suggests that, once the alternate flight path is utilized, that a portable noise monitor be placed outside the Paramus hospital site so as to obtain realtime data.

Ms. Sheridan explained that the alternate route flight path was modeled many times for the NEPA process and is clearly indicated on maps. Installation of a portable noise monitor would have to wait until hospital construction was complete so as not to take in any ambient construction noise during the monitoring process. The decision as to whether or not to installation of portable noise monitors would be a decision made by the TANAAC members and would involve reviewing the by-laws to make sure that the site is within the five mile radius of TANAAC's jurisdiction.

Mr. Griffo confirmed his agreement with Ms. Sheridan's response.



Ms. Goldfischer-Hollander thanked the TANAAC committee for their time.

A question was asked about the progress of the new FAA Air Traffic Control Tower.

Scott Marsh explained that construction was ongoing for the new tower. They are currently doing ground preparation work. They are looking at 2024 as the date for the commissioning and operation of the new tower.

Ms. Canestrano asked to be notified when FAA training on the alternate procedure takes place.

Ms. Sheridan confirmed that she would convey notifications on this and any other related items.

Ms. Moclair-Shea confirmed that information regarding training and implementation of the new alternate approach would be available on the FAA Delay Reduction Program (DRP) website. The site can be found at [https://www.faa.gov/about/office\\_org/headquarters\\_offices/arc/programs/nyapio/delay\\_reduction\\_plan/](https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/arc/programs/nyapio/delay_reduction_plan/). They will also put information about implementation of the new alternate procedure on the TANAAC website.

Peter Kortright questioned whether the FAA had anticipated or received any information from the new Biden administration with regard to climate change and does the FAA see any changes in terms of policy that would affect the Bergen County area.

Steve Jones responded that it is a bit too early to identify any policy changes that will be put in place as result of the new Biden administration at this time.

Mr. Kortright observed that the Bergen County region and communities contain environmentally protected wetland and that the FAA and the airport community have to be sensitive to this fact and in protecting the wetlands for the surrounding communities.

## **Conclusion**

With no other business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.

The next regular meeting of TANAAC is scheduled for Wednesday, April 28, 2021.