

TETERBORO AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TANAAC)
SUMMARY OF MEETING
Virtual Meeting
April 24, 2024, 6:00PM
ATTENDANCE

TANAAC Voting Members & Representatives

| TANAAC Co-Chairpersons | | Present | Not Present |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| TANAAC Co-Chairperson, Borough of East Rutherford, Paul J Griffo | Borough of Rutherford | X | |
| TANAAC Co-Chairperson, Scott Marsh - Interim Airport Manager Teterboro Airport | Port Authority of NY & NJ | X | |
| | | | |
| TANAAC Member Towns | | Present | Not Present |
| Mayor Daniele Fede | Borough of Bogota | | X |
| Peter Kortright III, Principal Planner | Bergen County Government | X | |
| Mayor Robert Zimmerman | Borough of Carlstadt | | X |
| Councilmember George Cronk | Borough of East Rutherford | X | |
| Deputy Mayor Kathy Canestrino | City of Hackensack | X | |
| Mayor Ron Kistner | Borough of Hasbrouck Heights | | X |
| Borough Administrator, Lisette Duffy | Borough of Little Ferry | X | |
| Councilmember Sam Conoscenti | Borough of Maywood | X | |
| Councilwoman Karen Surak | Borough of Moonachie | X | |
| Councilman Brad Haberlin | Borough of Moonachie | X | |
| Mayor John H. Anlian | Village of Ridgefield Park | | X |
| Mayor Vencent Bessetti | Township of Rochelle Park | | X |
| Councilmember William McKeever | Town of Secaucus | X | |
| Mayor Yris Encarnacion | Township of South Hackensack | | X |
| Mayor Michael Pagan | Township of Teaneck | | X |
| Mayor John P. Watt | Borough of Teterboro | | X |
| Borough Clerk, Gina Affuso | Borough of Wood-Ridge | X | |

Attendees

| Name | Organization |
|---|--|
| Mary McCarthy, Director - NYAPIO | FAA |
| Rick Vander Wende, Manager of Contract Services Teterboro Airport | Port Authority of NY & NJ |
| Cheryl Ann Albiez Senior Public Information Officer | Port Authority of NY & NJ |
| Juan Rojas, Senior External Relations Client Manager | Port Authority of NY & NJ |
| Adeel Yousuf, Program Manager | Port Authority of NY & NJ |
| Gabriel Andino, Manager Noise Abatement Teterboro Airport | Teterboro Airport/Avports |
| Michael Fiscus, Assistant Manager Noise Abatement Teterboro Airport | Teterboro Airport/Avports |
| Alejandra Cabrera, Noise Specialist Teterboro Airport | Teterboro Airport/Avports |
| John Kastens, Manager, Airport Services Teterboro Airport | Teterboro Airport/Avports |
| Alex Gertsen, NBAA | National Business Aviation Association |
| Stephen Chandoha | Signature Flight Support – Teterboro Airport |
| Pablo Navarrete | Signature Flight Support – Teterboro Airport |
| | |
| Mark Bromberg | Guest |
| John Brown | Guest |
| Diana Castino | Guest |
| Sophia Clossey | Guest |
| Christie Del Rey-Cone | Guest |
| Lois Ditommaso | Guest |
| Bailey Fedarick | Guest |
| Warren Feldman | Guest |
| Audrey Herget | Guest |
| Gregory Hoffman | Guest |
| Dave Kingma | Guest |
| Kathryn Lamond | Guest |
| Ava Lilore-Sciancalepore | Guest |
| Grace Methe | Guest |
| Jennifer Micco | Guest |
| Matthew Murray | Guest |
| Theodore F. Preusch | Guest |
| Ella Raber | Guest |
| Susan Selekmán | Guest |
| Mayor Michael Sheinfield (Hillsdale) | Guest |
| Shalini Singhai | Guest |
| Nancy Torres | Guest |
| Christine Currens | Guest |
| Lynn Paulison | Guest |
| Makayla | Guest |
| Maryjo Johnson | Guest |
| Dial in – xxx-xxx-4124 | Guest |
| Dial in – xxx-xxx-2395 | Guest |
| | |
| | |

TANAAC – 1st Quarter 2024 Meeting
Teterboro Airport
April 24, 2024 – 6PM
Virtual Meeting
Minutes Summary

Scott Marsh, Interim Airport Manager Teterboro Airport, opened the meeting and welcomed committee members and guests.

Mr. Marsh turned the meeting over to Paul Griffo, Co-Chair for his opening remarks.

Mr. Griffo welcomed everyone to the meeting and shared his hopes for a productive meeting.

Mr. Marsh proceeded with the first item on the agenda which was an Airport Operations update as summarized here:

The airport has two construction projects starting shortly. Construction on both projects will be ongoing for the next 12 months.

- Runway 1/19 Rehabilitation Project 2024/2025 – This project involves the rehabilitation of Runway 1/19. Work is anticipated to begin this week and will continue for the next 12 months. The primary bulk of the work for this project will take place this summer/fall.
- Stormwater Drainage System Rehabilitation Project 2024/2025 – This project involves the rehabilitation of stormwater drainage systems. This project is anticipated to commence later this summer and will continue until next summer.

Hours of Work for the Runway 1/19 Rehabilitation Project are summarized below. These hours are also applicable to the Stormwater Drainage Project. Closures for both projects will be coordinated to maximize time and reduce the impact on airport operations.

- Hours of Work and Airport Closures
 - Runway 1/19 overnight closures (April 2024 thru April 2025):
 - Weekdays 10:30p.m. to 6:30a.m.
 - Runway 1/19 weekend closures:
 - 38-hour closures – Friday 10:00p.m. to noon Sunday
 - Airport weekend closures:
 - 12-hour closures – Sunday 12:00AM midnight to Sunday 12:00PM noon (July 6, 2024 – September 1, 2024)

During construction closures Airport operations will take place on Runway 6/24. On average only 5% of operations occur during nighttime hours and weekend.

Mr. Marsh then turned the meeting over to Mr. Gabe Andino, Manager Teterboro Airport Noise Abatement Office, for the next item on the agenda.

Mr. Andino introduced Mary M. McCarthy, Director of the New York Area FAA Program Integration Office. Ms. McCarthy showed a community engagement video called “*Teterboro Airport Air Traffic Control System*” which gave a New York airspace and Teterboro air traffic procedures overview. Ms. McCarthy explained that this video provided a good understanding of the ways airspace around Teterboro Airport worked. Additional information can be found on the FAA website at <https://www.faa.gov>.

Questions/Discussion

At this point Mr. Andino opened the floor for any questions on the FAA presentation.

Questions raised by representatives from TANAAC member towns are summarized here:

Borough of Little Ferry:

Ms. Lisette Duffy, Borough Administrator for Little Ferry, said that she had been receiving complaints from residents who lived on streets near the airport, who said they were being impacted by excessive noise and smell. She asked if there was a way to budget funding to construct a wall/sound barrier between the airport and these residential streets. She was particularly concerned with Seiler Court. She commented that noise and smells from aircraft were impacting the quality of life for those residents.

Mr. Andino explained that more information about the impacted areas was needed and said that he would contact Ms. Duffy directly to follow up with her.

City of Hackensack:

Kathy Canestrino, Deputy Mayor of Hackensack, reminded the committee that she had been a part of the planning for the Runway 1/19 offset approach from the beginning and that it was never part of that plan to advertise the approach only at night. She said the original request was for the route to be advertised during nighttime hours only in the early stages so that the pilot community could get adjusted to using it during a less busy time. She said that “it was never discussed as a solution only for evening hours. She went on to describe the “tremendous” amount of work the FAA put into researching the safety and viability of the procedure and she asked that the FAA look into making the approach the preferred route during the day on Saturdays when traffic was low. She reminded the group that one of Teterboro Airports slowest days was Saturday. She brought up her comments, from previous TANAAC meeting, that aircraft with the potential for a maximum weight greater than 100,000lbs should not be allowed to fly in or out of Teterboro Airport. She thanked Mr. Andino and the Noise Office staff for their assistance in providing her with flight data from 2023 and mentioned that based on her analysis of that data, peak time for arrivals to Runway 19 was around 4:00PM and the maximum number of arrivals during that time were 39 flights/hour. The average number of arrivals between 2:00PM to 6:00PM were 18 to 20 flights/hour. She was concerned that Teterboro airport was not considered to be “at capacity” with those arrival numbers, and that Hackensack residents, especially those in the area of Summit Avenue and the Medical Center, were suffering because of this. She suggested that it would be very helpful if Mr. Andino included data on the maximum number of flights in his quarterly TANAAC presentations going forward. She felt that people would be interested in that data.

Borough of Moonachie:

Mr. Brad Haberman, Councilman for Moonachie asked how runway usage at the various airports in the area impacted one another.

Ms. McCarthy responded by providing an example. If LGA airport had a change in wind direction and had to use a certain runway for landing, that decision would impact other nearby airports such as Teterboro by requiring them to switch to a runway to match LGA’s runway pattern.

Questions raised by guests are summarized here:

Ms. Jennifer Micco of Rutherford had some questions on how runway usage was determined.

Ms. McCarthy responded that runways at Teterboro Airport were selected based on availability, weather conditions, wind direction, and interaction with other airports in the area. Once the active runway is determined then all flights land on that runway.

Ms. Christie Del Rey-Cone, Rutherford Councilmember, was concerned with the notion of giving pilots a voluntary option to use the alternate route and asked if there was a process in place to determine the reasons pilots were not using that approach more.

Ms. McCarthy explained that the “FAA could not force a pilot to take a procedure that they would not be comfortable with”. The FAA does not maintain data on pilot preference on flight route usage. She followed this up by saying that generally a straight-in approach was the preferable approach for most pilots to use.

Councilmember Del Rey-Cone commented that the Runway 1/19 offset approach was not a valid solution and that it might be time to look into other solutions that would both appeal to a pilot and also protect the residents. She asked if there was a survey mechanism that could be used to determine pilot’s reasons for not using the Runway 1/19 offset approach.

Mr. Marsh explained that the airport Noise Office staff communicated with aircraft operators on a regular basis to ensure that they were aware of options available to enable them to choose to be “good neighbors” to area residents and that a survey had been conducted on usage of the alternate route as part of a larger survey of the pilot community conducted last year.

Mr. John Brown from Maywood followed up on what Deputy Mayor Canestrino had said earlier and asked if the alternate procedure was originally supposed to be offered “full day”. He went on to comment that “people were finally realizing that this plan had failed” and that they “could now go forward and look for another solution”

Ms. McCarthy explained that when the procedure was proposed the community intended it to be used all day, but that was not something that the FAA could agree to since conditions allowing for use of the route were only available at night due to interaction with Essex County Airport.

Ms. Lois Ditomaso from Rutherford had a question about aircraft alternating between landing on Runway 1 and Runway 6 earlier that day.

Mr. Andino said he would look into the details and get back to her.

Ms. Lynn Paulison of Demerest asked for clarification on what the video meant about “avoiding residential neighborhoods”.

Ms. McCarthy replied that that statement was made in relation to the Runway 1/19 offset approach procedure.

Sue Selekmán of Cresskill asked if there was a process in place to monitor how frequently aircraft traveled over any particular area. She asked how the two construction projects at Teterboro would impact her community and asked how often aircraft landed at Teterboro.

Ms. McCarthy explained that the FAA does not track aircraft flights in that way. Pilots flew “at will” and any airports that took federal funds for development were required to accept these flights. The FAA allows

aircraft to land at any airport as long as there is sufficient separation between flights and the airport is not at capacity. She added that Teterboro Airport was not near capacity. During construction when Runway 1/19 was not available aircraft would take off and land using Runway 6/24.

Mr. Marsh explained that when construction is planned near Runway 1/19, that runway will be closed, and Runway 6/24 will be used. Winds and traffic flow will dictate whether or not aircraft can land and depart Runway 24 or land and depart Runway 6. Construction work for both projects is scheduled to take place during overnight hours and will be coordinated to maximize scheduled closures. Scott went on to say that construction projects at Teterboro are typically scheduled during nighttime hours to minimize the impact on air traffic and also to minimize the impact on local communities.

Ms. Nancy Torres of Wood-Ridge wanted to know if Teterboro Airport had a limit on the size of aircraft and asked if the FAA could consider some relief from flights over the weekend.

Ms. McCarthy explained that Teterboro Airport had a 100,000lb weight limit restriction in place. Requirements for limitation to the number of aircraft allowed at an airport fall under the "Airport Noise and Capacity Act".

Ms. Ella Raber of Woodcliff Lake asked if anyone were looking into the environmental impact of pollution in addition to aircraft noise.

Mr. Marsh advised Ms. Raber that an environmental impact assessment study of the air quality around Teterboro Airport had been conducted in the past.

Mr. Greg Hoffman, Park Ridge Councilmember, asked about the cost of the FAA Runway 1/19 Alternate Approach Procedure study and how the study was funded.

Ms. McCarthy did not have information on the cost. Procedure development on safety and an environmental assessment were funded by the FAA.

Councilmember Hoffman asked if the nearby radio tower was considered when the FAA was conducting the study on the Runway 19 alternate approach procedure and if it was a foreseeable concern for the route at that time. He asked when the study was conducted, and he wondered how they justify the expense of the study if the approach was not being used.

Ms. McCarthy replied that the tower was taken in to consideration when the approach was created. The FAA established the approach based upon a request by the Port Authority and by TANAAC. The study was published in 2019/2020 and was conducted a year or two before then. The FAA felt that an RNAV procedure would be more useful than the visual approach. The offset approach is being used mostly by pilots who flew in to Teterboro frequently. The airport has a large transient community of pilots who are not familiar with the Airport. These pilots are much more comfortable flying the straight in approach instead of the offset approach.

Councilmember Hoffman wanted to know if any other survey mechanism was in place that could obtain information from pilots on use of the approach and asked how the FAA could know that the pilot community was not comfortable with the radio tower if they were not talking with them.

Ms. McCarthy explained that the FAA generally do not have information on who is piloting an aircraft in real time, and she explained that the information regarding the tower as a deterrent was "more anecdotal in nature".

Mr. Marsh clarified that the Teterboro Airport Noise Office was in contact with pilots on a regular basis.

Mr. Andino added that a survey was performed in 2021 by the Teterboro Airport Users Group that had a few questions about the procedure in it. They received a number of different responses from the pilot community about the alternate procedure and why pilots chose to use it or not. Pilot concerns were a mix. Including some comments concerning the WABC radio tower located along Route 17 in Lodi. The issue with the tower is that some pilots were hesitant to use the approach because it is too near the tower. This was especially true for those pilots who are not familiar with the airport. There is a period of getting used to the approach. Noise Office staff continue with outreach to the flying community to promote the alternate approach procedure.

Ms. Christine Currens from Woodcliff Lake followed up on what Ms. Raber said about an environmental study. She asked if short term and long term health concerns, such as asthma and cancer as well as cluster studies were included. She went on to comment about the altitude of airplanes and felt that planes were flying very low. She asked if the FAA had changed the height restrictions of aircraft on approach to Teterboro and wanted to know what year altitude levels were put in place.

Ms. McCarthy replied that aircraft on approach will be lower than when on route, but the FAA had not changed altitude for aircraft over the Woodcliff Lake area, she was not sure when they established the instrument landing system but would provide information on the last time the procedure was amended.

Ms. Currens asked if there was a possibility altitudes could be reduced even further.

Ms. McCarthy replied that this was not likely since aircraft over the Woodcliff lake area had to descend at a steady 3 degree angle on a stable approach to land at Teterboro.

Old Business

Mr. Andino continued the meeting with the next item on the agenda which was an update on *the Letter of Request to the FAA for Proposed Noise Abatement Measures* and the *14 CPR Part 150 NCP*.

The TANAAC committee letter of request was submitted to the FAA in June of 2023. The four measures requested in the letter are as follows:

1. Review the feasibility of developing and publishing an Offset approach Procedure to Runway 6.
2. Implement a Published Approach Procedure to Runway 1 and increase usage of this runway for arrivals.
3. Increase usage of the RNAV (GPS) X RWY 19 Approach during daytime hours by advertising this procedure on the TEB Automatic Terminal Information Service (ATIS) as the approach in use during daytime hours on Saturdays and non-peak daytime hours on Sundays.
4. Review the feasibility of increasing aircraft altitude at the Initial Approach Fix, UNVIL, for the ILS RWY 19 and RNAV (GPS) Y RWY 19 approaches from 2,000 ft. to 3,000. Ft.

Mr. Andino explained that these four measures, as well as the measures identified in the recent Part 150 NCP, and some measures identified by other area airports, were all bundled together into a priority list and submitted to the FAA for review in a recent letter.

Ms. McCarthy confirmed that the FAA received the letter a few days ago and was reviewing the measures at this time.

New Business

Mr. Andino thanked Ms. McCarthy for her time during tonight's meeting and moved on to the next item on the agenda which was a brief description of recent regional and national operator outreach efforts conducted by Noise Office staff as summarized here:

Recently Noise Office Staff manned a Teterboro Airport exhibit at the *NBAA Schedulers and Dispatcher's Conference*. This outreach effort allowed the airport to have direct contact with flight planners, operators and crew members. In addition, they spoke at the most recent *Teterboro Users Group (TUG) Meeting*. During these events Noise Office staff spoke about noise abatement measures and provided information on flight procedures available at Teterboro Airport.

Noise Office Airport Statistics Report (1st Quarter 2024)

Mr. Andino continued the meeting with the next item on the agenda which was a Noise Office Statistics report for the 1st quarter of 2024 as summarized here:

Aircraft Movements:

The airport had a total of 37,460 aircraft movements during the 1st quarter of 2024. Overall movements were up 0.34% compared to prior years.

Airport Nighttime Activity (11:00PM to 6:00AM):

We had 1,566 nighttime movements between the hours of 11:00PM and 6:00AM. Nighttime flights made up 4.17% of total movements. Nighttime activity was down for the quarter.

Noise Exceedance Violations:

Noise violations are exceedances of the airport noise limits for aircraft taking off from Teterboro Airport. The airport issued a total of 12 first time violations and 2 second time violations during the first quarter of 2024. The airport has a policy of "three strikes and you are out". This means that three violations notices issued within a two year period can result in an aircraft being banned from Teterboro Airport permanently.

Runway Utilization:

For the 1st quarter of 2024 the airport was in a south-flow pattern a little more than half of the time. This meant departing and arriving aircraft took off and landed from South to North. The most utilized runway for arrivals was Runway 6 with 41.51% of arriving flights using this runway. The most utilized runway for departures was Runway 24 with 51.53%% of departing flights using this runway.

Helicopter Route Utilization:

The southern route to and from Manhattan was the primary helicopter route used for 76.19% of arrivals and 72.55% of departures.

RNAV (GPS) X Runway 19 Offset approach Utilization – 1st Quarter 2024

Runway 19 Arrivals: 24 Hours – Out of a total of 6,985 arrivals, 117 utilized the offset approach. This reflected an overall 24 hour usage of 1.70%.

Runway 19 Arrivals: (Nighttime) - 10:00PM – 7:00AM – Out of a total of 667 arrivals during nighttime hours, 114 utilized the offset approach. This reflected a usage of 17.09%.

Overall use of the RNAV (GPS) X Runway 19 approach is down for the 1st quarter 2024. The downward trend in usage may be due to several factors including weather, visibility, and air traffic volume. When available the approach is designated as the approach in use and advertised on the information system for

pilots. In some instances, pilots were not taking the alternate approach but were instead flying the straight in approach. Reasons for this vary but may range from the proximity of the WABC tower to a desire by pilots to maintain a stabilized approach by using the straight in approach.

Day/Night Aircraft Noise Average – DNL(A):

- RMS 101 – (7th & Berry Street in Carlstadt) – 55.0 DNL (0.0 No change)
- RMS 102 – (Hamilton Street in Hasbrouck Heights) – 36.3 DNL (+3.0 increase)
- RMS 103 – (Prospect Ave – Hackensack) – 62.6 DNL (+3.1 increase)
- RMS 104 – (Park Street – Hackensack) – 51.7 DNL (-1.4 decrease)
- RMS 105 – (Bogota High School) – 49.7 DNL (+1.4 increase)
- RMS 106 – (Joseph Street – Moonachie) – 51.6 DNL (-0.5 decrease)

Noise Complaints:

The airport received 15,970 noise complaints from 155 complainants during the 1st quarter of 2024. 7,633 of these complaints came from 13 callers using third-party application software to register complaints. Complaints were down for the quarter.

Aircraft Noise Complaints – TANAAC Member Communities (Within 5-mile radius of the airport):

Communities within a 5-mile radius of Teterboro Airport that registered the most complaints were Maywood with 5,249 complaints from 2 resident, (one Maywood resident registered 5,210 of the complaints all by himself.), Rutherford registered 324 complaints from 6 residents, and Hackensack registered 271 complaints from 8 residents.

Aircraft Noise Complaints – Non-TANAAC Member Communities (Outside of 5-mile radius of the airport):

Communities outside of a 5-mile radius of Teterboro Airport that registered the most noise complaints were Newark with 6,301 complaints from 1 resident, Cresskill which registered 1,741 complaints from 2 residents, (one Cresskill resident registered 1,475 of those complaints.), and Tenafly which registered 835 complaints from 9 residents, (two Tenafly residents registered 820 of these complaints).

Noise Complaints – Nature of Disturbance:

By far the majority of callers chose “Too Loud & Low” as the reason for their complaint with 12,498 callers giving this as the reason for their complaint, and “Too Loud” with 1,536 callers giving this as the reason. The second most cited reason was “Too Frequent”, with 4,611 callers giving this as the reason for their complaint. To a lesser extent “Too Low: was cited by 844 callers. The remaining reasons given were “Too early, or Too Late”, “Excessive Vibration” and “Change in Flight Pattern”.

Noise Complaints – Regional Complaints:

The majority of complaints from within a 5-mile radius of the airport came from Hackensack, Teaneck, and Maywood to the north of the airport. Lyndhurst, Carlstadt, and Rutherford, to the south of the airport. A larger volume of complaints from within a 20-miles radius of the airport came from areas to the north in Upper Bergen County.

OPEN DISCUSSION

At this point Mr. Andino opened the meeting to questions and comments as summarized below:

Questions raised by representatives from TANAAC members towns are summarized here:

City of Hackensack:

Deputy Mayor Canestrino of Hackensack asked if they had received any feedback from the FAA on the measure to increase usage of the RNAV (GPS) X RWY 19 Approach during daytime hours on Saturdays and non-peak daytime hours on Sundays.

Ms. McCarthy explained that the FAA were looking at the options presented to them. She cautioned that the FAA also had to consider aircraft volume in this area, particularly involving Essex County Airport. The FAA was reviewing the request to see what could be done.

Deputy Mayor Canestrino reiterated her request that even if they had a few hours on the weekend when the route could be used it would be a help to her residents. She felt that once pilots became more familiar with the route they would feel more comfortable asking for it during the day and on weekends.

Ms. McCarthy added that another issue they faced was that Teterboro Airport had a core group of pilots that fly in to Teterboro frequently and were familiar with it, but that Teterboro Airport also had a large group of flights flown by “transient” operators. These transient operator flights were by pilots who flew to Teterboro Airport occasionally and she was not sure how successful they would be in getting those pilots to choose the alternate route.

Deputy Mayor Canestrino asked the FAA to consider the measure and “not give up” on this yet. She went on to reference the 100,000 lb. weight limit at Teterboro and asked how data is monitored to prove that aircraft capable of flying at a weight over 100,000lbs were not coming into Teterboro Airport over the 100,000lbs limit.

Mr. Marsh explained that airport rules and regulations state that “operations at Teterboro Airport cannot exceed 100,000 lbs.”. When an aircraft operates at Teterboro it cannot exceed that weight. We require operators to show documentation for aircraft that are capable of flying over 100,000 lbs. When they operate at Teterboro Airport they must complete a form that provides information on the actual weight at which they are flying. Operators must indicate what changes have been made to their aircraft either by Operations specifications (which is approved by the FAA) or a maintenance change, to show that the aircraft is operating below 100,000 lbs. while at Teterboro. The 100,000 lb. rule is strictly enforced.

Deputy Mayor Canestrino asked if they were operating with less fuel to bring them into compliance with the 100,000lb rule.

Mr. Marsh explained that there were multiple factors that added weight to an aircraft. Fuel was one of them. The others include such things as the number of passengers and the amount of luggage.

Deputy Mayor Canestrino observed that in her opinion fuel would be the biggest component to the aircraft’s weight. She requested a copy of the form that operators completed in order to show compliance with the 100,000lb rule.

Deputy Mayor Canestrino went on to comment that “the footprint of aircraft were getting larger, and they were dispersing noise over a greater area then the smaller aircraft”. She added that the rule was put into effect for a reason, and she hoped that the airport would stand behind it.

Mr. Marsh assured Deputy Mayor Canestrino that they stood behind the rules that were in place at the airport.

Bergen County Government:

Mr. Peter Kortright, Bergen County Executive, requested that they take a roll call attendance of TANAAC members present starting at the next meeting.

Mr. Marsh reassured Mr. Kortright that a roll call would be taken at TANAAC meetings going forward. He went on to say that attendance for tonight's meeting was being tracked on TEAMS and would be available in the meeting minutes summary.

Mr. Kortright thanked him and said that the reason he brought it up was so that the public was aware who participants were and their input. He went on to say that TANAAC members have to speak up more since they are underrepresented during these meetings, and he felt that the roll call would help with that.

Borough of East Rutherford:

Mr. Griffo provided details about the prior environmental study as follows:

TANAAC commissioned a study on air pollution many years ago. Rose Heck, Fred Dressel and Paul Griffo were the three people on the TANAAC committee at that time who fought very hard for this air pollution study to be conducted. The study was commissioned because of anecdotal information about cancer clusters to the east of the airport. They found a company to conduct that study and Mr. Griffo recollected that it cost quite a large amount of money at that time to conduct the study. The final report was disappointing to them. Results came back as "inconclusive". There were too many unknowns. Since two major highways, Route 17 and Route 46, are part of the local environment of the airport, it was impossible to tell the difference between car exhaust and air plane exhaust.

Questions raised by guests are summarized here:

Ms. Jennifer Micco from Rutherford wanted to know how violations were issued.

Mr. Andino explained that the airport monitored noise events via six permanently stationed noise monitors located around the airport. These monitors are used for obtaining routine general noise data, to track individual events, and to monitor any exceedances of Teterboro Airport's established noise limits by departing aircraft. If an aircraft exceeds established limits they will receive a violation letter from the Airport Noise Office. The airport has a policy of "three strikes and you are out". This means that if three violation notices are issued within a two year period this can result in an aircraft being banned from landing at Teterboro Airport *permanently*.

Ms. Lynn Paulison from Demarest wanted to know where Demarest ranked on the Aircraft Noise Complaint table for Non-TANAAC Member Communities.

Mr. Andino pulled up that table to show that Demarest had 34 complaints from 11 complainants during the 1st quarter of 2024.

Ms. Paulison thanked Mr. Andino and complimented him as a "rock star" for being responsive, polite and sympathetic to resident's concerns.

Ms. Louis Ditomaso of Rutherford wanted to know what triggered a noise complaint.

Mr. Andino explained that noise complaints were made by residents who contact the Airport Noise Office directly. Noise violations were exceedances that were monitored via noise monitors that are permanently stationed around the airport.

Mr. Andino went on to explain that the airport has a limit on noise levels for each runway. We have a 95 decibel limit on three of our four runways. Runway 24 is a bit different and has a departure limit of 90 decibels during daytime hours and an 80 decibels limit during night time hours between 10PM and 7AM. The stricter limit on Runway 24 is because there are a lot of homes closer to the airport on that side. If an aircraft departs and is over the decibel level limit assigned to a particular runway (as measured by one of the permanent noise monitors) the Noise Office will do an investigation, and if they determine that there was an exceedance, they will issue a violation letter to that aircraft operator.

Ms. Ditomaso questioned who decided on the decibel level limits. She felt that 90 or 95 decibels was very loud.

Mr. Andino explained that the decibel level limits were set by the airport and approved by the FAA back in the late 1980's after research by a consulting firm. Mr. Andino went on to say that in the past aircraft were much louder, so the 90 decibel limit set by the airport was based on the standard at that time. Today we do not have many aircraft that reach 90 decibels as they pass over our noise monitors. Aircraft are much quieter, but we cannot change our noise limits because those limits were grandfathered in and are the strictest in the county. If we change our limits we lose our grandfather status and would not be allowed to have any noise limit restrictions at all.

Maryjo Johnson from Bergenfield mentioned that she was a "big fan of Gabe". She went on to say that she was looking through information available on-line from the Port Authority website and that Teterboro Airport was one of the busiest private jet airports in the country and had the highest number of complaints per movement of any New York Area airport. She questioned if anyone kept track of the actual number of passengers on each of these flights. She mentioned that the issue that was not being taken into perspective was that Bergen County residents were being negatively impacted and their quality of life was suffering for a "luxury" that most residents of Bergen County could not experience. She added that while they were making a good effort, she felt that standards needed to be changed. She felt that the designation of TANAAC town to Non-TANAAC town was unnecessary and "everyone in Bergen County" was being affected. She brought up that Bergen Count was also the fly over route for Runway 31 at LGA and she felt that the FAA was controlling the quality of life (from a noise perspective) of all Bergen County residents. She felt that relying on noise monitors near airports as opposed to tracking the number of complains was "farcical". She also believed that many people had given up on registering formal noise complaints due to "feelings of burn out when nothing changed". She suggested "looking at the number and complaints and seeing which companies were generating the highest number of complaints". She appreciate the time and the work put in so far, but she" felt that what was done in the past would not work going forward". She suggested a "new approach was needed to meet the needs of people who will never have the opportunity to fly in a corporate or private jet".

Mr. Andino followed up that they have done a thorough analysis of complaints, and the data reflect that a core issue was that only a few people were filing the majority of complaints.

Maryjo observed that it appeared that the routes were changed so that aircraft "flew over the same households over and over again" and that it had become "essentially a highway instead of an approach where pilots could pick from a wider number of ways to approach the airport rather than the same exact path over and over again". She went on to say that under this new system "houses are being flown over and over again, so it is going to be the same people complaining".

Mr. Andino clarified that what he mentioned earlier was that they have a small number of people that submit a lot of complaints. These complaints carry as much weight as a person who only submits one or two complaints. At the end of the day, what they look at is households in relation to the community as a whole.

He gave the example, “if you and your neighbors are impacted by a flight path, and your neighbors as well as yourself also make complaints, then that becomes an area of concern”.

Ms. Torres from Wood-Ridge asked if the construction projects scheduled to take place this year was going to result in more noise in areas such as Hasbrouck Heights and Wood Ridge.

Mr. Andino replied that it was hard to say until construction was under way, and they had more data. Traffic may shift during nights and weekends and some communities might see an increase in activity on a temporary basis but residential neighborhoods in Hasbrouck Heights and Wood-Ridge are not typically impacted by Teterboro traffic.

Ms. Torres followed up by asking if Newark traffic would be impacted as well and who would she need to appeal to at Newark Airport.

Mr. Andino explained that Newark Airport does not have a group like TANAAC. He suggested that she submit any complaints to Newark Airport through the Port Authority website.

Ms. Torres then asked about the noise monitors. She questioned the 90 decibel level and why it could not be changed if it was set so long ago.

Mr. Andino explained that in the 1990’s congress passed legislation under the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA). In it they mandated that all aircraft had to meet certain noise level requirements. Newer aircraft had to be manufactured to be much quieter and stricter federal standards for aircraft were put in place. After this, noise restrictions at airports were made harder to implement. Airports like Teterboro (that had restrictions in place already) were allowed to keep their restrictions in place under a “grandfather” clause as long as they did not alter or make any changes to them. As a result, Teterboro’s noise restrictions are “frozen” at their current levels.

CLOSING REMARKS

At this point with no other questions/discussion Mr. Andino thanked everyone for attending tonight’s meeting and expressed his appreciation for the varied ideas presented and announced that the next TANAAC meeting was scheduled for **Wednesday, July 24, 2024 at 6PM.**

With no further business to come before the committee the meeting was adjourned by Mr. Marsh at 8:17PM.