

RO KHANNA
17TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES

COMMITTEE ON
THE BUDGET

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515-0517

613 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-2831
(202) 225-2899(F)

DISTRICT OFFICE
800 LARAYETTE STREET, SUITE 208
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050
(408) 438-2720
(408) 438-2721(F)

khanna.house.gov

September 18, 2018

The Honorable Daniel K. Elwell
Acting Administrator
Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20591

RE: Pending Bayside Visual Approach San Carlos Airport (KSQL) (Bayside Visual RWY, Amdt 30)

Request FAA withdrawal of pending flight path

Dear Mr. Elwell:

The Bayside Visual Approach (BVA) for Surf Air flights into San Carlos Airport is currently in pending status with a scheduled FAA publication date of April 25, 2019. I respectfully request that publication of this pending flight path be withdrawn.

Surf Air is no longer flying planes into San Carlos Airport. The BVA approach was created for the sole purpose of reducing Surf Air aircraft noise over the peninsula cities, such as Atherton, Menlo Park, and Palo Alto. Since Surf Air is no longer flying into San Carlos Airport, there is no need for this proposed flight path.

The FAA has a longstanding policy that airplane noise should not be shifted from one community to another. Based on a letter from FAA Regional Administrator, Dennis Roberts, "The BVA is a proposed chartered visual approach and will be flown in visual flight rules (VFR) by anyone, including Surf Air." FAA approval of the BVA would create a published flight path where an established FAA flight path does not currently exist. The Bayside Visual Approach would effectively shift airplane noise from the peninsula over to Sunnyvale. This is contrary to FAA's longstanding policy regarding noise shifting between communities.

During closed session meetings that took place in 2016, officials from Surf Air, the FAA, and San Mateo County conceived, developed, and made decisions regarding this new BVA flight path without any presence or representation from Sunnyvale. Sunnyvale officials were informed of the new path only days before the BVA trial was to begin, even though this community is directly impacted by the new flight path. My constituents have informed me that during the subsequent BVA open comment period nearly one-year later (Oct/Nov 2017), well over 900 separate signed resident letters were submitted to the FAA in opposition to the Bayside Visual Approach. These comments should not be ignored.

For the reasons outlined above, the pending BVA procedure should be rejected by your agency, and I strongly request that the Bayside Visual Approach be withdrawn from consideration. I appreciate your full and fair consideration regarding this highly-sensitive topic, consistent with applicable laws, statutes, and regulations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ro Khanna', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ro Khanna
Member of Congress

Reference Bayside Visual Approach (BAYSIDE VISUAL RWY, AMDT 30)

FAA IFP gateway:

https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/procedures/application/?event=procedure.results&tab=productionPlan&nasrId=SQL#searchResultsTop