

TANS

Taxpayers for Aircraft Noise Solutions

tanspvnj@gmail.com

January 23, 2024

Steven C. Jones on behalf of
Marie Kennington-Gardiner
FAA Eastern Region Administrator
1 Aviation Plaza
Jamaica, New York 11434
9-AEA-RA-Office@faa.gov

Dear Mr. Jones,

Thank you for your response. Please see below our comments and additional questions that have arisen from your response. Furthermore, the Pascack Valley Mayors Association requested 1 seat on TANAAC to represent the 10 Pascack Valley Towns that are experiencing excessive Air Traffic Noise due to the increased private jet traffic utilizing Teterboro Airport, and they were denied. Therefore, we created TANS.

TANS has over 50 members and 1,100 signatures to date on our first petition. Here is the link:

<https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/reduce-air-traffic-noise-en-route-teb-airport>

The following Mayors and Councils passed a resolution supporting the TANS petition, Park Ridge, Woodcliff Lake, Hillsdale, Westwood, Washington Township and Hackensack. Documents attached. These governing bodies represent over 90,000 residents. We are not a small group, and we deserve to be heard. Therefore, we hope you will continue an open dialogue and consider our concerns. We believe there are attainable solutions to alleviate the excessive Air Traffic plaguing our communities, preventing us from "Quiet Enjoyment".

See the following responses to the questions you provided where presentations have previously addressed similar questions at the TANAAC:

- 1. Why are the FAA air traffic controllers not directing more traffic to the RNAV-GPS X Runway 19 alternate route? Are these controllers managing the air traffic from TRACON on Long Island?**

Per FAA Order JO 7110.65AA, Paragraph 2-9-3e; "Instrument/visual approach/es in use. Specify landing runway/s unless the runway is that to which the instrument approach is made. *Before advertising non-precision approaches, priority should be given to available precision, then APV approaches.*" Therefore, Air Traffic Controllers are required to prioritize precision approaches over non-precision approaches. If conditions permit and the non-precision approach is available, the obligation is on the pilot to request it. Per 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 91.3(a) "The pilot in command of an aircraft is directly responsible for, and is the final authority as to, the operation of that aircraft."

The FAA cannot force a pilot to fly one approach over another.

Please clarify your last statement above that the FAA cannot force a pilot to fly one approach over another. If a pilot requests the RNAV GPS X approach into runway 19 at Teterboro and there is an instrument landing approach available, can the pilot overrule the Air Traffic Controller and choose the RNAV GPS X approach, and the Air Traffic Controller must allow it? Furthermore, can you explain if there are different waypoints for such concentration, or if we can develop additional waypoints, so that the jets can reach the instrument landing system approach (ILS) via such alternate waypoints with a result of more reasonable and favorable dispersion of air traffic, and thereby reduce an oppressive and dangerous concentration when the Air Traffic Controller does not want the pilot to use the RNAV GPS X approach into runway 19?

2. In good weather, why not reasonably divide the arrivals between the ILS approach, the RNAVGPS X approach, and the other runways into Teterboro Airport?

Safety of flight is paramount to our mission. Wind, weather, runway availability and deconfliction of traffic flows as well as other aircraft are the primary factors considered in the runway selection process. Air traffic control does consider noise when evaluating all aspects of runway and approach assignment. But the primary mission is safety.

You state that Air Traffic Control does consider noise when evaluating all aspects of runway approach assignment. Are the TRACON controllers aware of our issues with noise and the map we have shared showing the excessive concentration of traffic over one location at an altitude that often is below 2000 feet? As a result of which, residents are unable to enjoy their yards, and/or are awakened during the night to loud and low noise of these private jets, their homes shake and school children in one community cannot have the classroom windows open due to the

excessive and extremely loud air traffic noise. If they are aware, how were they made aware? Is it part of their training?

- 3. Why can't the FAA make the RNAV-GPS X route be the preferred route on Saturdays and on Sunday mornings (this is when the volume of arrivals via Runway 19 is at its low point).**

As stated above, there are multiple factors that are considered for runway utilization. What the community may deem as preferred may not be what is feasible based on all other safety factors. This includes the traffic volume in TEB which impacts the ability to use RWY 19 X as well as the traffic flows of Newark International (EWR), LaGuardia (LGA) and John F. Kennedy International (JFK) Airports. Additionally, this procedure is not available for use during periods of poor weather, low visibility or high traffic volume due to complexity of the airspace and air traffic controller workload. The best opportunity for the alternative approach procedure to be used is during the overnight hours when air traffic demand and complexity for the New York and New Jersey metropolitan area is reduced.

Regarding your response here, can the FAA make the RNAV GPS X approach the preferred route during overnight hours? What would prevent that from happening?

- 4. Based on the attached map, can any reasonably astute aviation professional seriously suggest that this concentration is appropriate? Newark Airport has slot controls in place that do not allow more than 79 arrivals/departures each hour. Teterboro approaches that number periodically and is smaller. Why not establish a maximum number per hour for Teterboro?**

The map attached to your letter contains no information on how it was created. Not only do we not know the span of time covered by the flight tracks, but it also appears to include high-level overflights that have little impact on noise levels on the ground.

The map referenced was created by Gabe Andino's team, AV Port Teterboro Management sub-contractor. The map indicates that it is a 24 hour period of arrivals into the 19 at Teterboro Airport. Furthermore, it DOES NOT include any high-level overflights. And I quote from an email received from Gabe Andino (also shared as an attachment). I also have re-attached the map from our original letter.

"Good morning Audrey,

The maps provided were created using the airport's operations and noise monitoring software program, ANOMS. Data provided is filtered to display only aircraft arrival flight tracks for Runway 19. It does not include high altitude overflights or operations from other area airports besides TEB. Arrival tracks displayed cover the time period of 12:00 am June 22, 2022 through 12:00 am June 23, 2022.

Best regards,

Gabriel Andino

Avports | Teterboro Airport

P: 201.393.0399 | C: 201.481.1126 | F: 201.440.2416

[Visit the TEB Noise Office website for noise program information](#)

- 5. Please compare the present flight map with a pro forma flight map with RNAV-GPS X Runway 19 approach carrying a more significant quantity of arrivals. Please share this comparison with us via email.**

The PANYNJ can provide the data you request for operations at the airport. The PANYNJ maintains Runway Utilization reports of all its airports and these reports are available on their website. But to clarify, a snapshot to identify the concentration or comparison of runway utilization on maps are not used for the scheduling process for GA flights.

- 6. Does Essex County Airport prevent increased use of the RNAV-GPS X Runway 19 alternate approach? If it does, please explain how, and why changes there are not being addressed to allow relief to the residents of the Pascack Valley and surrounding towns.**

The runway configurations at Essex County Airport (CDW) can have an effect on the usage of the TEB RNAV X RWY 19 approach, but these situations are few and far between - for the majority of the time, the answer is 'no'. TEB RWY 19 noise abatement procedures are in place and are followed to the maximum extent possible barring operational volume and other impacts associated with weather.

Can you please share, more specifically, when CDW has an impact on the usage of TEB RNAV X RWY 19 approach with data? Is it arrivals or departures at CDW that have an impact? Is it a particular type of aircraft, day or time of day? Is it from a particular runway? Does CDW use an instrument landing approach?

Unfortunately, your response has not proven helpful in addressing our concerns regarding excessive Air Traffic by private jets using Teterboro Airport. These individuals flying privately into Teterboro airport should not be held in higher regard over the

taxpaying residents that reside below their Air Traffic pattern and experience excessive noise and vibration living 10-12 MILES outside of Teterboro Airport. These individuals have options, like flying commercial. We the resident taxpayers have no option other than requesting the FAA, Air Traffic Controllers, pilots, etc. respect our rights to "Quiet Enjoyment". The BEST solution to Air Traffic Safety would be LESS of it!! Mass Transit is pushed all over the Country, trains, buses, commuter lanes, etc. Why not in the air?? In the era of Climate Change and Carbon footprints, one would think that ALL would be on board to limit carbon emissions by utilizing commercial air travel over private air travel. Please review our responses and additional information.

We look forward to your reply.

Taxpayers for Aircraft Noise Solutions (TANS) Representatives...

Warren Feldman (Woodcliff Lake) *WF*

Audrey Herget (Park Ridge) *AH*

Mary Ellen Stickel (Washington Township) *MES*

tanspnj@gmail.com

Cc: Governor Murphy

Congressman Gottheimer

NJ State Senator Holly Schepisi